

**PLANNING COMMITTEE held at COUNCIL CHAMBER - COUNCIL OFFICES,  
LONDON ROAD, SAFFRON WALDEN, CB11 4ER, on WEDNESDAY, 30  
JULY 2025 at 10.00 am**

Present: Councillors R Freeman (Co-Chair) and Councillor J Emanuel (Co-Chair).

Councillors N Church, G Driscoll, M Lemon, R Pavitt and M Sutton

Officers in attendance: R Beale (Senior Planning Officer), N Brown (Head of Development Management and Enforcement), C Forster (Planning Lawyer), A Neale (Planning Officer), J Procter (Democratic Services Officer), M Shoesmith (Strategic Applications Team Leader) and A Vlachos (Principal Planning Officer)

Public Speakers: R Barry-Jackson, I Carter, J Collins, T Donovan, C Glossop, C Griffin, Councillor R Haynes and E Woods.

**PC19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Freeman took the Chair.

Councillors Loughlin, Bagnall and Haynes were not in attendance as committee members as they had yet to undertake the annual mandatory training session required to participate in decision making at Planning Committee.

Councillor Haynes was in attendance as a public speaker.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Bagnall, who was substituted by Councillor Driscoll.

Declarations of interest were made by:

- Councillor Emanuel declared non-pecuniary interest on land to the West of Thaxted Road, Debden as she knew one of the site's neighbours but had not discussed the application.

**PC20 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the meeting held on 2 July 2025 were approved as an accurate record.

**PC21 QUALITY AND SPEED OF MAJOR AND NON-MAJOR APPLICATIONS**

The Head of Development Management and Enforcement presented the standing Quality and Speed of Major and Non-Major Applications Report.

He highlighted that the Council was well within the threshold for the quality of Major and Minor Applications and that the speed of applications was consistently at 100%.

He said that all legal costs of appeals for 2024-25 had been recovered.

The report was noted.

## **PC22 S62A APPLICATIONS REPORT**

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

He said that he hoped this report would soon not be necessary as a standing item and the final application was to be Friends School. The other outstanding application could not continue as an S62A application and therefore would not be validated.

He reported that officers had not expected the Friends School application to be considered at a hearing.

The report was noted.

## **PC23 UTT/24/3144/DFO - LAND NORTH OF STANSTED AIRPORT, THIRD AVENUE, STANSTED**

The Strategic Applications Team Leader presented an application for reserved planning matters following outline planning permission being granted for “the demolition of existing structures and redevelopment of 61.86Ha to provide 195,100sqm commercial / employment development predominantly within Class B8 with Classes E(g), B2 and supporting food retail/ food/beverage/nursery uses within Classes E (a), E(b) and E(f) and associated access/highway works, substation, strategic landscaping and cycle route and other associated works with matters of layout, scale, appearance and other landscaping reserved”. Outline planning permission was granted in August 2023 subject to a schedule of conditions and a Section 106 Agreement.

She recommended that the application be approved for the Phase 3 Reserved Matters development subject to those items set out in section 18 of the report.

She drew attention to the addendum which highlighted that the MAG Aerodrome Safeguarding team had no objection to the discharge of condition 54 relating to wind shear.

The applicant had applied to discharge a number of conditions as part of the application, including conditions 5, 7, 21, 38, 50, 54, 78, and 79. She noted that

condition 38 would be removed from consideration as further information was required before it could be discharged.

In response to questions from Members, officers said:

- The units had solar panels located between the roof lights and inclusion of the panels had been conditioned.
- Place Services' issues over ecological information outlined in paragraph 10.20.2 had been resolved with no objection to the Reserved Matters application details. Place Services were happy with the discharge of conditions 78 and 79.
- There would be sufficient land with opportunity to build remaining, following the removal of the Titan hanger to maintain balance between commercial and domestic flights. This had been addressed as part of the outline stage at phase 2.
- Further information on foul water drainage would be required to discharge Condition 38 and the development could not continue if this was not submitted and approved. The condition was imposed by the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA).
- Rainwater harvesting was included as a condition (BREEAM Condition 10 of the outline consent).

Members discussed:

- Potential pollution that could be caused as part of drainage and whether it would affect Stansted Brook which fed into the Stort, a recognised chalk stream.

It was pointed out that the wording on 14.8.12 should be corrected from "Prior to commencement of development on any phase, except demolition, shall take place..." to "Prior to commencement of development on any phase, except demolition, shall not take place..."

Councillor Emanuel proposed approval of the recommendation, subject to the above correction being issued where appropriate.

This was seconded by Councillor Church.

RESOLVED that the Strategic Director of Planning be authorised to grant permission for the development subject to the conditions set out in section 18 of the report in addition to the correction outlined in the above motion.

*Councillor Emanuel took the Chair at 10.35 am.*

## **PC24     UTT/25/0348/DFO - LAND TO THE EAST OF WEDOW ROAD, THAXTED**

The Senior Planning Officer presented an application for Details following outline application UTT/21/1836/OP - Details of Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for 49. dwellings including discharge of conditions 6 (surface water

drainage), 8 (Biodiversity Enhancement Layout), 18 (foul water drainage) and 19 (housing mix), and partial discharge of condition 14  
She recommended that the application be approved, subject to the conditions set out in section 17 of the report.

She noted that the flood authority had no objection to the proposal and there would be a betterment from the proposals, although this was not required. Whilst disappointing, the proposed surface-finish materials were acceptable and would provide an adequate environment for future residents.

In response to questions from Members, officers said:

- The green space reserved in the application would be retained as a public open space.
- The lead local flood authority was content that the application would not worsen Thaxted's flooding issues. The development could act as a betterment to the flooding issues, but this was not a requirement.
- Cycle and pedestrian access to Wedow Road was secured by condition in the outline application and not access for vehicles.
- There was no formal buffer zone between the attenuation ponds and trees, but they were located outside of the root protection areas.
- The existing attenuation pond would be reprofiled to compensate for what would be taken up by the new access road that cut through to ensure the same capacity was retained.
- There would be play equipment on the site, but this would be part of the public open space as opposed to a formal play area.
- The plan was in general accordance with the design code. The applicant had presented adequate reasons for deviations from the code.
- Officers had worked up to a landscape proposal that was acceptable which had as much planting as was feasible. There were strong conditions relating to landscaping which would be implemented.
- The route which included a bridge would be suitably surfaced.

Members discussed:

- Crispey Brook, the waterway adjacent to the site, which was not classified as a chalk stream as the protection classification did not go down to brook level. The river it ran into was derived from chalklands but then ran over clay and was not classified as a chalk stream.
- Members noted that they had received lobbying emails from the developer. Officers said this was not an issue but encouraged developers to include officers in these communications for the sake of clarity.

Councillor Freeman proposed approval of the application.

This was seconded by Councillor Church.

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.

*Councillor R Haynes spoke against the application. C Glossop (Applicant) and E Woods (Agent) spoke in support.*

*The meeting was briefly adjourned between 11.10 and 11.20.*

**PC25      UTT/25/1160/DFO - LAND TO THE WEST OF THAXTED ROAD, DEBDEN**

The Principal Planning Officer presented a reserved matters application for the reserved details of access, appearance, scale, landscaping and layout, following the grant of outline permission (reference UTT/20/0264/OP) for the erection of 25 no. private and affordable dwellings. The application proposes 10 no. affordable units and open spaces to the front and centre of the site. The outline permission was granted subject to conditions and a (signed) section 106 agreement for affordable housing, public open space and a village hall contribution.

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

He noted the application successfully separated drainage from open spaces (as required by the previous appeal decision) and confirmed that it complied with the Design Code.

In response to questions from Members, officers said:

- The Highway Authority would have asked for a legal agreement if the new footway was to be built on land that did not belong to the Highway authority or to the developer, which had not happened.
- The development management team had complied with guidance on notifying the public and the public right to representation. Objections and other comments from the public had been included in the report and considered when determining the officer's recommendation.
- Maintenance of meadows, open spaces and recreation areas was usually offered to the parish council, however normally this was not taken up and would therefore be offered to a management company. This was part of the section 106 agreement.
- Access had been reviewed and cleared by Essex Highways in terms of the technical assessment.
- The outline planning permission had been granted by UDC. When the reserved matters initially came to Committee, Members wished to reject it on design grounds but had been convinced by officers to defer. The application was then appealed against non-determination. The Inspector was content from a design and layout perspective but dismissed the application on the overlap between SUDS and open space, which meant that neither of them would be functional for its intended purposes. The main issues of the previous application had therefore been determined as acceptable by the Inspector but had been improved with pre-application discussions including planning and urban design officers.
- The design was broadly compliant with the Design Code but did not need to meet every point.
- The density was 23.8 dwellings per hectare. There was no specific policy dictating density for the site, but the density had already been approved by the outline permission and accepted by the Inspector.

- There would be some low-level fencing around drainage pond; the precise nature of which would be determined when the landscaping conditions were discharged.
- Although it would have been preferable to have a finalised drainage scheme in place at this stage of the application, the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) would not have agreed to the indicative drainage scheme as part of the reserved matters application if attenuation capacity were not sufficient. The matter was also conditioned in the outline permission and therefore would be picked up in due course. If the LLFA were not content the relevant condition could not be discharged, and the development could not proceed. The applicant would have to supply all relevant information as part of the application to discharge the condition. The officer quoted an email from the LLFA outlining this position.
- The conditions covered external lighting.
- Changes from the previous application included the addition of terminating vistas on the dead-ends, an open space at the heart of the development instead of parking and back-to-back gardens, brick walls with soft landscaping replacing back-to-back fencing, an informal footpath at the northern boundary, visitors' spaces moved to a more discreet location, plots with active frontages and others. "Informal" meant that it was not a public right of way but a benefit for residents which promoted walking.
- The application met parking standards which were detailed in paragraph 14.6 of the officer's report.
- Condition 19 included provision for bat sensitivity in regard to lighting.
- Safeguarding preservation of the rural character of the area could be added to the external lighting outlined in condition 11.
- Highways would not accept the layout if the turning circles were unsuitable for bin collection vehicles. It would be appropriate for residents to move their bins to the bottom of dead-end roads in the development up to a distance, which was adhered to on the proposals.
- The Council was still expecting the examiner's report on the Local Plan submission and was not yet in the position of having an up-to-date Local Plan.

Members discussed:

- Changes from the previous version of the application.
- Adequate parking for the number of dwellings.
- Concern as to whether external lighting could alter the appearance of the village entrance and affect wildlife e.g. bats.
- Concern over narrowing of the road making it more hazardous for cars.
- The possibility of a discussion with Essex Highways regarding Uttlesford's rural nature and how this affected appropriate lighting for roads. Officers said they would take this forward with an informative.
- The possible hazards caused by bin lorries needing to turn within the development.

Councillor Pavitt proposed approval of the application subject to the following amendments and additional conditions:

- Condition to change the construction management plan to read “prior to commencement of the development” and add that onsite parking of site operatives including delivery vehicles should be specified within the statement to be submitted.
- Condition that landscaping maintenance cover be increased from five to ten years.
- Informative to encourage the developer to minimise lighting along Thaxted Road in consultation with the Highway Authority when the relevant discussions are to be taken place. More than necessary lighting would have an impact on the rural character and appearance of the area on this edge-of-settlement location and should be avoided.

This was seconded by Councillor Lemon.

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 the additional items outlined in the motion above.

*J Collins, I Carter and C Griffin spoke against the application. T Donovan (Agent) spoke in support.*

## PC26 **UTT/25/0827/HHF - RAILS STABLES, WATLING LANE, THAXTED**

The Planning Officer presented an application for conversion of roofspace to an existing cart lodge to create a new annex facility.

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

He noted the cart lodge had originally been constructed in 2011. The application included obscured glass and there were no concerns with overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing effects.

In response to questions from Members, officers said:

- The occupancy of the annex was tied to the house as part of condition 5.
- Condition 3 required solar panel plans to be submitted for approval prior to any development commencing which would allow the inset panels to be conditioned.
- Place Services had supported the application as the conservation authority.
- Place Services had referred to the fabric shop as an example of the listed buildings in the area, not necessarily implying it continued to function as one.
- In terms of heritage assets, visibility was a factor in applications in conservation areas and not in applications for listed buildings.
- Initially the western window was also proposed to have obscured glass but this was not deemed a good habitable space from a design point of

view. The east-facing window retained the obscured glass, but this had been offered by the applicant and was not strictly required.

- In the case of this application, although the property had in the past been linked to a listed building this relationship had been severed.
- There would be a side view of the solar panels from the three adjacent Bull Ring properties.
- It was not unusual to have a window in the proposed position.

Members discussed:

- The position of the staircase.
- Whether the opaque glass was appropriate.
- The effect on setting the original construction of the cart lodge would have had in 2011.
- Whether it was unusual to have a window in the proposed position in such a built-up area and whether it constituted an overlook issue.
- Noise insulation on power boxes.
- Whether the obscured glass condition should be removed.

Councillor Church proposed approval of the application with amendments that condition 4 outlining the obscured glass be removed and an additional condition be added that the solar panels be inset to the roof.

This was seconded by Councillor Freeman.

The motion was defeated.

Councillor Pavitt proposed approval of the application with the additional condition that the solar panels be inset to the roof.

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 solar panels being inset to the roof.

*Councillor R Haynes and R Barry-Jackson spoke against the application.*

*The meeting ended at 1.05 pm.*