

**PLANNING COMMITTEE held at COUNCIL CHAMBER - COUNCIL OFFICES,  
LONDON ROAD, SAFFRON WALDEN, CB11 4ER, on WEDNESDAY, 7 MAY  
2025 at 10.00 am**

Present: Councillors R Freeman (Co-Chair) and J Emanuel (Co-Chair).  
  
Councillors G Bagnall, N Church, R Haynes, J Loughlin, R Pavitt  
and M Sutton

Officers in attendance: N Brown (Head of Development Management and  
Enforcement), S Aley (Planning Lawyer), C Gibson (Democratic  
Services Officer), G Henry (Senior Planning Officer), A Neale  
(Planning Officer), M Sawyers (Senior Planning Officer) and  
C Tyler (Principal Planning Officer)

Public Speakers: J Bell, G Clarke, Councillor A Driscoll, Councillor G Driscoll, E  
Dunn, Councillor J Emanuel, R Goldsmith, J Griffiths, Councillor  
N Hargreaves, J McArthur and B Ross.

**PC151 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Freeman took the Chair for the whole meeting.

There were apologies for absence from Councillor Lemon.

Declarations of interest were made by:

- Councillor Loughlin- as the applicant for Item 11; would recuse herself.
- Councillor Emanuel- as Ward and PC Member for Item 7 and having a similar case in her ward as Item 8; would recuse herself from both items. She would speak as a PC representative on Item 7.

**PC152 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 April 2025 were approved as an accurate record.

**PC153 SPEED AND QUALITY REPORT**

The Head of Development Management and Enforcement presented the standing Speed and Quality Report. He highlighted “a sea of green” indicators. He said that UDC was still awaiting a response from MHCLG to the formal de-designation request and anticipated interim arrangements being in place once de-designation was in place.

The report was noted.

**PC154 QUALITY OF MAJOR APPLICATIONS REPORT**

The Head of Development Management and Enforcement presented the standing Quality of Major Applications report.

He reported that UTT/24/0741/FUL – Land Known as 7 Acres Warish Hall Farm was no longer pending.

The report was noted.

**PC155 S62A APPLICATIONS REPORT**

The Head of Development Management and Enforcement presented the S62A Applications report.

He reported that UTT/25/0906/PINS – Land Located between Thaxted Substation and The Cutlers Solar Farm Site had not yet been validated but was in the system.

The report was noted.

**PC156 UTT/24/0543/OP - LAND NORTH OF BEDWELL ROAD AND OLD MEAD ROAD, UGLEY AND HENHAM - RECOMMENDED TO BE WITHDRAWN FROM AGENDA**

The Head of Development Management and Enforcement said that UDC had received a further consultation response from Place Services (Ecology) retaining their holding objection to the application. As such, officers were recommending that this application was withdrawn for consideration from this meeting and deferred.

Members unanimously supported this action.

*Councillor Emanuel removed herself from the round and sat with the members of the public.*

**PC157 UTT/24/3061/OP - LAND NORTH OF WICKEN ROAD & WEST OF SCHOOL LANE, NEWPORT**

The Senior Planning Officer presented an Outline application with all matters reserved except access for the erection of up to 90 dwellings, including affordable housing, with land reserved for future community use, public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access point.

She said that:

- The applicant had submitted visualisations from various viewpoints last week.
- The Council had now received an updated consultation last week from UDC Conservation Officers.
- Some of the visuals had been included within the presentation.
- The second reason for refusal had been removed relating to storey heights.
- There had been a late consultation with Active Travel, but standing advice had been received the previous Friday.
- The reasons for refusal had been reworded and changed; hard copies would be circulated to review. An additional S106 reason for refusal has been added.

She circulated revised reasons for refusal to replace those outlined in section 17 of the report as follows:

1. The application site lies outside the defined settlement development limits of any village or town as defined by the Uttlesford District Local Plan as Adopted (2005) and is thereby located within the countryside. The proposal would introduce a sizeable new development to an area of open countryside.

The proposals by reason of its siting, size, quantum and scale would have a harmful impact upon the rural character and appearance of the area. There is no substantive justification for the proposal specifically relating to the developments' need to take place there or being appropriate in the countryside. The proposal would significantly harm the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside resulting in landscape and visual effects from a number of publicly accessible viewpoints and failing to perform the environmental role of sustainability, contrary to Policies S7 and ENV3 of the Uttlesford District Local Plan 2005 (as Adopted), Policies NQRHA1, NQRHA2 and NQRHA3 of the Newport Quendon & Rickling Neighbourhood Plan Neighbourhood Plan (2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

2. The application lies within the setting of Newport Conservation Area and the setting of the Church of St. Mary the Virgin (grade I listed). The Local Planning Authority has a duty under Section 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting and significance of any features of special architectural or historical interest.

The proposals lack supporting details, specifically information on the character, massing, scale and design of the dwellings and the new community facility in order to provide the ability to fully assess the acceptability of the location of the development and its likely impacts. As such, the proposal it is concluded would detract from the architectural interest of the heritage assets and, therefore, the Local Planning Authority are unable to adequately assess the heritage harms arising from the development. In the absence of relevant information, the proposal fails to accord with ENV1 and ENV2 of the Uttlesford District Local Plan 2005 (as Adopted) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

3. The proposed development would trigger the requirement for:

- 40% affordable housing contributions (split across the affordable rent, intermediate tenures and first homes).
- NHS England (Primary Care) contributions to primary healthcare services arising from the development amounting to £150,480\*
- NHS England (Secondary Care) contributions to secondary health services arising from the development amounting to £30,502.80\*
- NHS England (Community Health Care) contributions at £31,741.20\*
- East of England Ambulance Service Trust (EEAST) contributions at 34,772.00\*
- Education contributions to Early Years (£161,911.00 indexed linked to Q1-2024), Primary Education contributions of £539,703.00 and Secondary Education contributions of £494,856.00. \*
- Libraries contributions of £7002.00 to improve, enhance and extend facilities.
- Payment of the council's reasonable legal costs.
- Payment of monitoring fee.

\*(subject to change once final housing mix / accommodation finalised)

This requirement would need to be secured through a S106 Agreement. At the time of issuing this decision a S106 Agreement had not been completed. As such, the proposals are contrary to Policies H9 and GEN6 of the Adopted Local Plan (2005) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

In response to questions from Members, officers:

- Said that the site had been previously removed from the emerging Local Plan for Highways reasons but there was no objection from Highways to this specific application.
- Confirmed that full weight could be attached to an up-to-date Neighbourhood Plan.
- Confirmed that the development would impact Neighbourhood Plan 'protected views' across the site.
- In response to the reasons why the application has not been refused on Policy GEN7 given the site is near Local Wildlife Site; Officers said that no ecology objections had been raised by Place Services (Ecology).

Members discussed:

- Concerns that the benefits could be assessed as greater than "limited" and whether the reasons for the officer's recommendation were strong enough.
- Whether the application was defensible at appeal.
- Concerns that UDC Landscape Officer only afforded moderate weight to the scheme.
- The very strong significance of locally valued landscape views and this potentially being the last "unspoilt" view of Newport and the church in particular.
- That, with the location of the chalk stream, this was considered to be a special site.

- Their general support for the views expressed by Newport PC, together with the significance of an up-to-date Neighbourhood Plan.

The Head of Development Management and Enforcement addressed the reasons for recommending refusal. He said that they had been strong in a previous application and were even stronger now there was a current Neighbourhood Plan in place. These had been robustly tested previously. He said that any typos and language used within the revised reasons for refusal would be tidied up.

Councillor Pavitt supported the officer's revised recommendations and proposed refusal. This was seconded by Councillor Sutton.

RESOLVED that the Strategic Director of Planning be authorised to refuse permission for the development, for the revised reasons circulated by the Senior Planning Officer.

*Councillor N Hargreaves, R Goldsmith and Councillor J Emanuel (Newport PC) spoke against the application. Councillor Emanuel left the room following her contribution. E Dunn (Applicant) spoke in support.*

*The meeting adjourned at 11.00 am and reconvened at 11.10 am*

PC158     **UTT/24/1282/FUL - LAND TO THE NORTH OF BIRCHANGER LANE, BIRCHANGER**

The Principal Planning Officer presented an application for provision of additional six pitches for two static caravans per pitch and provision of covered communal amenity space. He corrected a typo in para 14.3.13.1 of his report that "the development would **not** result in any merging of neighbouring site/towns".

He recommended that the application be approved, subject to the conditions set out in section 17 of the report.

In response to questions from Members, officers:

- Said that previous conditions had been monitored and there were outstanding issues in respect of landscaping and ventilation. A Breach of Conditions notice had been served to attempt to resolve the position.
- Said that a Needs Survey had been undertaken and intelligence obtained for each family.
- Said that the planning principles had already been determined in that the entire site could be used as a Gypsy and Traveller site and any consideration of refusal of the application would have to be based on new grounds. This was seen as akin to an approval in principle.
- Said that the shelter was an open-sided roof.
- Said that the bund on the site would need to be moved to allow for caravans to go in place and for landscaping.
- Confirmed there would be 6 further pitches and that the Executive Summary should have referred to an "**unmet** need of 7 pitches".
- Said that no personal conditions could be added to those already detailed.

Members discussed:

- Human Rights Act concerns.
- Concerns regarding the imposition of a further 19 conditions.
- Noise emitted from the airport and motorway. The need for strong noise and air pollution conditions.
- The need for strong landscaping conditions. Condition 11 could be boosted to ensure protection for the bunding.
- Some family members currently needing to live off-site.
- The need to future proof arrangements moving forward.
- The special circumstances identified on Green Belt land. This view had been taken by the Planning Inspector.

Councillor Loughlin proposed approval of the application. This was seconded by Councillor Freeman from the Chair.

RESOLVED that the Strategic Director of Planning be authorised to grant permission for the development subject to the conditions set out in section 17 of the report.

*J McArthur, B Ross and Councillor A Driscoll (Birchanger PC) spoke against the application. G Clarke (Agent) spoke in support.*

*Councillor Emanuel returned to the meeting at 12.00pm.*

#### PC159 **UTT/24/2820/FUL - ALPENROSE, BEDLARS GREEN, GREAT HALLINGBURY**

The Planning Officer presented an application for the proposed demolition of existing bungalow and erection of 4 detached dwellings.

He recommended that the application be approved, subject to the conditions set out in section 17 of the report.

In response to questions from Members, officers:

- Said that the corner area to the Southeast had been left as a wild scrub area for biodiversity reasons.
- Said that it was not unusual or unacceptable for an adjoining garden to be overlooked from a neighbouring window.

Members discussed:

- The potentially big site with the cramped look of the dwellings. Views were expressed that this looked much more like a suburban development.
- Lack of amenities.
- Poor unsympathetic design concerns. Not fitting the streetscene.
- Garden being overlooked by neighbouring windows.
- Concerns regarding vehicle numbers.

Councillor Bagnall proposed refusal of the application on the grounds of GEN2 and of being out of character with the area. This was seconded by Councillor Church.

RESOLVED that the Strategic Director of Planning be authorised to refuse permission for the development on the grounds of GEN2 and of being out of character with the area.

*Councillor G Driscoll spoke against the application and J Griffiths (Agent) spoke in support.*

PC160     **UTT/25/0506/OP - LAND BETWEEN RUNNELS HEY AND SILVERTHORN, GREAT CANFIELD ROAD, GREAT CANFIELD**

The Senior Planning Officer presented an Outline application with all matters reserved except access and layout for the erection of 1 self-build dwellinghouse.

He recommended that the application be approved, subject to the conditions set out in section 17 of the report.

In response to questions from Members, officers:

- Confirmed that sustainability was a material consideration in this case but that a previous appeal had made no mention of sustainability.
- Said that Place Services (Ecology) were happy with the information provided and had raised no concerns.
- Said that a Construction Management Plan would cover matters such as storage conditions.
- Said that matters relating to the retention of the buffer zone would be secured under landscaping issues in reserved matters. In addition, tree protection issues would be picked up at the same time; this could be conditioned at the current time on the basis that no development could take place until protected tree conditions were put in place.
- Said that other sites in the area had been deemed to be sustainable.

Members discussed:

- The importance of the conditions being set.
- Common orchids being a protected species by law and being covered under any ecological conditions.
- A further condition being added in respect of Permitted Development Rights to take out for the curtilage buildings.
- Some concerns regarding wildlife; Place Services (Ecology) had reviewed all ecological data and were satisfied.
- There being a turning area in place.

Councillor Church proposed approval of the application, together with additional conditions relating to tree protection and Permitted Development Rights.

This was seconded by Councillor Sutton.

RESOLVED that the Strategic Director of Planning be authorised to grant permission for the development subject to the conditions set out in section 17 of the report, together with additional conditions relating to tree protection and Permitted Development Rights.

*Councillor G Driscoll spoke against the application and J Bell (Agent) spoke in support.*

*Councillor Loughlin left the meeting at 1.10 pm.*

PC161     **UTT/25/828/TPO - 24 BLYTHWOOD GARDENS, STANSTED**

The Head of Development Management and Enforcement presented a notification of intent to carry out tree works to one oak tree.

Councillor Pavitt proposed that no objections be raised. This was seconded by Councillor Bagnall.

RESOLVED that no objections be raised to the proposed tree works.

*The meeting ended at 1.12 pm.*