

**PLANNING COMMITTEE held at COUNCIL CHAMBER - COUNCIL OFFICES,
LONDON ROAD, SAFFRON WALDEN, CB11 4ER, on WEDNESDAY, 8
APRIL 2026 at 10.00 am**

- Present: Councillors J Emanuel and R Freeman (Co-Chairs)
- Councillors G Bagnall, N Church, G Driscoll, R Haynes, R Pavitt,
R Silcock and M Sutton
- Officers in attendance: N Brown (Head of Development Management and Enforcement), R Beale (Senior Planning Officer), C Forster (Head of Legal and Monitoring Officer), C Gibson (Democratic Services Officer), G Henry (Senior Planning Officer), R McKeown (Essex CC Highways), A Neale (Planning Officer), L Parsons (Essex CC Highways), M Shoesmith (Strategic Applications Team Leader) and A Vlachos (Principal Planning Officer)
- Public Speakers: S Bampton, Councillor J Cheetham, M Clarke, W Critchley, M Dempsey, T Dodkins, A Draper, Councillor R Freeman, Councillor S Gill, C Loon, L Martin, C McNeilly, J McNeilly, G Mottram, G Pettit, B Pope, Councillor R Ramm, L Sivyler, K Wheeler, L Whiteley, J Woodhouse and R Woodhouse.

PC98 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Emanuel took the Chair for the start of the meeting. She welcomed Councillor Driscoll as a full Member and Councillor Bagnall back to the Committee.

There were apologies for absence from Councillors Criscione, Loughlin and Lemon. Councillor Silcock substituted for Councillor Loughlin.

Declarations of interest were made by:

- Councillor Silcock- As a local retailer, he indicated that there could be a perception of bias by members of the public and he would recuse himself and take no part in the decision-making process (Items 6, 7 and 9).
- Councillor Church (declaration made when the agenda item was reached)- Due to a potential business relationship, he indicated that there could be a perception of bias by members of the public and therefore recused himself, taking no part in the decision-making process (Item 8).

PC99 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Chair raised an issue relating to page 13 item PC92 and asked that the minute be revised to clarify her proposal. Revision reads "The Chair proposed approval of the application, together with ensuring a revised parameter plan was

in place (to ensure sufficient buffer zones for the TPO trees and veteran tree) and moving BNG targets towards 20% or finding something tangible to benefit the community. The corresponding condition regarding the parameter plan will also need to be in place in the permission.”

With this amendment in place, the minutes of the meeting held on 11 March 2026 were approved as an accurate record.

PC100 QUALITY AND SPEED OF MAJOR AND NON-MAJOR APPLICATIONS

The Head of Development Management and Enforcement presented the standing Speed and Quality Report. He said that very healthy quality performance was reported.

The report was noted.

PC101 UTT/25/2027/FUL - WATER CIRCLE, GREEN STREET, ELSENHAM

The Senior Planning Officer presented an application for Outline planning permission with all matters reserved (including access) for a flexible commercial development at the Water Circle site.

She provided Members with an update on all developments since the Addendum List had been published, including revised Conditions. She recommended that the application be approved subject to those items set out in section 17 of the report, the Addendum report and matters raised verbally.

In response to questions from Members, officers:

- Said that the site area exceeded the area allocated in the new Local Plan.
- Outlined the modelling undertaken by Highways, particularly around Four Ashes junction. Only “committed” development was factored into the modelling and, therefore, Local Plan allocations could be not factored into the highways assessments.
- Said that the Railton Report provided by the Parish Council had been considered by officers within the report.
- Said the whole site was in the Countryside Protection Zone (CPZ).
- Said that the outstanding 10% biodiversity net gain could be covered in the Draft Head of Terms within the S106 to ensure policy compliance.
- Apologised and explained the reasons for the many changes made since the Addendum Report had been published.
- Provided some clarification to the 24/7 operational times and the potential for conditions to manage hours of operation. It was also stressed that the applicant’s Environmental Statement does not state there are significant impacts resulting from operational times but if Members were still concerned then a condition might be appropriate.
- Responded to questions relating to Local Plan Core Policies 4 and 48 but also expanded why Core Policy 46 is of significance for the allocated portion of the site especially in relation to office use provisions.

- Said that this was a mid-box development, not seeking to compete with larger logistics sites and that the cascade mechanism to secure office use would come out in the Draft Head of Terms/S106 negotiations.
- Said that traffic around and through Stansted Airport was managed by the Airport Police.

Members discussed:

- There being a lot of traffic movement and the difficulty accessing the M11. It was highlighted again that Highways could only consider “committed developments” in any modelling exercises.
- That there should be no blanket 24/7 operations.
- The late changes (particularly conditions) highlighted since the Addendum List was published.
- The 40% increase in size.
- Night-time light pollution concerns.
- Questions on intensification of use, impact and appropriate scale.
- Questions relating to Core Policy 48 remaining unanswered, with no clear demonstrated need or justification (despite UDC Policy Officer clarifications).
- Concerns with the impact on the CPZ and relevance of Core Policy 12.
- It not being a great location, lack of active travel options/unrealistic access for pedestrians and cyclists, alongside general road safety concerns due to increased HGVs/traffic to/from the site.
- Cumulative highways impact of the development
- The need to regenerate the site with appropriate business units.
- The need to protect local residents.
- Concerns that the location is not sustainable.
- The need for a new application, sympathetic to the Local Plan.

Members were encouraged to defer the application, rather than refuse it.

The Chair proposed deferral of the application. This would allow the opportunity to revisit:

- compatibility with CP48, especially demonstration and verification of need and active travel options.
- Clarity on highway assessment, especially the impact on Four Ashes junction (including how the forthcoming Local Plan allocations are considered) and formal response to matters raised by Railton.
- Conditions to be finalised.
- Impact on CPZ.
- Residential amenity impact, especially with regards to 24/7 industrial use of the site.
- Proposed use classes (potential for reconsideration).

This was seconded by Councillor Pavitt.

RESOLVED that the matter be deferred in line with the proposal above.

G Pettit, W Critchley and Councillor J Cheetham (Takeley PC) spoke against the application. L Martin (Applicant) spoke in support.

The meeting adjourned from 12.10 pm to 12.20 pm.

PC102 **UTT/25/1568/DFO - LAND SOUTH OF RADWINTER ROAD, SAFFRON WALDEN**

The Strategic Applications Team Leader presented a Reserved Matters application for the approval for the layout, scale, appearance, landscaping and associated details for the development of 233 dwellings, including affordable housing, in accordance with the outline planning permission (UTT/21/2509/OP).

She 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 the concerns expressed by Saffron Walden Town Council and Swards End Parish Council had been fundamentally addressed.
- Identified play areas and open spaces.
- Confirmed affordable housing arrangements.
- Confirmed that Anglian Water had been notified.
- Confirmed that a Construction Management Plan had been picked up within the Conditions.
- Confirmed that Church Street traffic lights and traffic flow matters were covered by S106 and Condition 21 of the Outline consent.
- Confirmed that sustainability issues had been picked up within para 14.3.40 of the report.

Members discussed:

- Their general positive support for the scheme, although the site was quite constrained.
- Concerns at the size of the three storey builds at the entrance to the site.
- The need for more mature trees to be installed at an early stage and for a 10-year plant back requirement to be included within landscaping conditions.
- The need to be mindful of pond safety, particularly near the play space by the SuDs ponds to the north.

Councillor Pavitt proposed approval of the application, with additional requirements within the landscaping condition to secure the play space by the SuDs ponds to the north and for more mature trees to be included around the Avenue, alongside a 10-year plant back condition.

This was seconded by Councillor Haynes.

RESOLVED that the Strategic Director of Planning be authorised to grant permission for the development subject to those items set out in section 17 of the report together with the additional requirement detailed above-Conditions.

K Wheeler (Agent) spoke in support.

The meeting broke for lunch between 1.10 pm and 1.45 pm. Councillor Emanuel left the meeting and Councillor Freeman took the Chair for the afternoon session.

Councillor Silcock recused himself ahead of the next item.

PC103 **UTT/25/1929/OP - LAND NORTH OF GARNETTS LANE AND STEBBING ROAD, FELSTED**

The Senior Planning Officer presented an application for Outline planning permission for the erection of up to 70 dwellings, together with associated access, public open space, landscaping, drainage and infrastructure, with all matters reserved except for the primary means of vehicular and pedestrian access. She corrected a statement and said that high level pre-application talks had been undertaken prior to the application being submitted.

She 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 road through the school was owned by the Highways Authority.
- Said that a condition for a haul road could not be imposed but Condition 5 required a construction management plan and for routing to be agreed.
- Said that the Landscape Officer was satisfied with the proposals and that the area had not been identified as a valued landscape.
- Said they could not specify that the Parish Council be worked with.
- Explained the role of the Felsted Community Trust as being a separate entity to Felsted Parish Council.

Members discussed:

- The loss of an unobstructed view and whether fully considered.
- The low level of harm as stated by the Conservation Officer.
- The need for the Heads of Terms uplift re biodiversity net gain to be taken to 20%.
- The possible conditioning of a haul road, with support for local residents.
- Road safety concerns due to very narrow roads.
- The Parish Council being obliged to give general support to the application.

Councillor Church proposed approval of the application and to also enhance the Construction Management Plan to consider appropriate construction access, including a possible haul road, which could mitigate nuisance and disturbance to residents.

This was seconded by Councillor Driscoll.

On the casting vote of the Chair:

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

- A) Completion of a s106 Obligation Agreement in accordance with the Heads of Terms as set out; and
- B) Conditions, to include the proposals above.

And if the freehold owner shall fail to enter into such an agreement, the Strategic Director of Planning shall be authorised to refuse permission following the expiration of a 6-month period from the date of the Planning Committee.

M Clarke and A Draper spoke against the application. Councillor R Ramm (Felsted PC) spoke in general support of the application. C Loon (Agent) also spoke in support.

PC104 **UTT/25/2498/OP - LAND NORTH OF RAYNE ROAD, BANNISTER GREEN, FELSTED**

The Senior Planning Officer presented an Outline planning application with all matters reserved except access for the erection of up to 100 dwellings, associated landscaping and open space, with access from Rayne Road. development.

She recommended, on the basis of the tilted balance, that the application be refused.

In response to questions from Members, officers:

- Stressed that in their view there was clear coalescence between two hamlets and that this was of primary concern.
- Said there had been no Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) interaction with the Council.

Members discussed:

- The need for hamlets to keep their identities and the fact that this was clear coalescence in this instance.
- The scale of the proposal being too large and overbearing.
- The site being outside the built framework of the village.

Councillor Church proposed refusal of the application, and this was seconded by Councillor Sutton.

RESOLVED that the Strategic Director of Planning be authorised to refuse permission for the application for the reasons set out in section 17 of the report.

Councillor R Freeman (Felsted PC) spoke against the application. T Dodkins (Agent) spoke in support.

The meeting briefly adjourned between 3.15 pm and 3.20 pm.

Councillor Haynes left the meeting and Councillor Silcock rejoined.

PC105 UTT/25/2404/FUL - LAND AT HILL GREEN, WICKEN ROAD, CLAVERING

The Principal Planning Officer presented a full planning application for the erection of 28 proposed new dwellings, including 11 affordable dwellings, 6 self and custom build plots and associated infrastructure.

He recommended that the application be approved, subject to those items set out in section 17 of the report and a section 106 agreement for planning obligations.

At this point Councillor Church recused himself and left the meeting.

In response to questions from Members, officers:

- Said that there would be a separate footpath alongside the 6.1m wide access road.
- Said that in respect of sequential flood risk assessments, no objections were raised by Essex CC (Lead Local Flood Authority), and the site was in Flood Zone 1.
- Said that very little weight could be given to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.
- Detailed the affordable housing mix.
- Said that the sustainability test had been addressed within the officer's report and the recently adopted Local Plan changed the previous position and has greater weight than appeal decisions in the area.
- Said there was no definition regarding whether the development is "within the existing built area" of Clavering (Larger Village) and the officer's assessment showed that the site included houses and residential curtilages on three sides.
- Said there would be control measures in place for the proposed 6 self-build dwellings as part of the s106.
- Said that from a Highways Authority perspective, the design and layout were acceptable and addressed any road safety and capacity concerns, including turning of refuse vehicles within the site.
- Said that the design was supported by the Urban Design officer who find the scheme to be in broad compliance with the Uttlesford District-Wide Design Code (2024).

Members discussed:

- The need to focus on the linear character of the village, sustainability, scale and active travel situations.
- Whether much had changed since previous applications in relation to the impact and harm on the Conservation area and listed buildings. Whether the proposed development was in the wrong place and that impact and

scale were significant. There had been no objections from the Conservation Officer, but heritage harm had been found by officers.

- The development being cleverly designed with the building standard looking good, with it being not possible for a linear layout.
- Concerns about the self-builds.
- Whether the proposal would be outside of the existing built area of Clavering as per Core Policy 3 (CP3) of the Local Plan.
- The built-up nature of the area around the proposal regarding the number of sides.

Councillor Sutton said that she considered the development to be a good one and saw no reason to turn it down; she proposed approval and this was seconded by the Chair. This proposal was lost.

Councillor Driscoll proposed that the application be refused on the grounds of not being in accordance with CP3; the development being outside of the existing built area of Clavering. This was seconded by Councillor Pavitt.

RESOLVED that the Strategic Director of Planning be authorised to refuse permission for the development in accordance with the above proposal.

J Woodhouse, L Sivyer, C McNeilly, J McNeilly, R Woodhouse and Councillor S Gill (Clavering PC) spoke, and a statement was read out by G Mottram on behalf of Councillor Oliver, all against the application, S Bampton (Agent) spoke in support.

Councillor Silcock then withdrew from the top table, to speak on the following item.

PC106 **UTT/26/0385/FUL - ROSEMARY COTTAGE, CAUSEWAY END ROAD, FELSTED**

The Planning Officer presented an application seeking planning permission to construct one new dwelling and new access onto Causeway End Road, to the rear of Rosemary Cottage within the existing rear garden. He explained that a previous application had been refused in January 2026 on design grounds, and the new application had reduced the height and size of the proposed dwelling. On planning balance, 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 the eaves were now substantially lower.
- Confirmed that the property would not overlook any other properties.
- Said that they considered this to be in a built area, in accordance with Core Policy 3 (CP3) of the Local Plan.

Members discussed:

- Potential light and road noise.

- Concerns about the gravel roadway; all managed within Condition 3 which covered hard surfacing, including driveways.
- Mature landscaping; covered within Condition 4.
- There being no possible reasons for refusal given CP3 specifying that this was in a built area.

The Chair proposed approval of the application, and this was seconded by Councillor Driscoll.

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-
Conditions.

Councillor Silcock spoke against the application, having called the item in. He then withdrew from the meeting. B Pope and L Whiteley spoke against the application. M Dempsey (Applicant) spoke in support.

Councillor Silcock returned to the meeting ahead of the next item.

PC107 UTT/25/3444/TPO - OPEN SPACE, LUKENS DRIVE, GREAT DUNMOW

The Head of Development Management and Enforcement presented an application for notification of intent to carry out tree works to 1 tree opposite 28 Lukens Drive.

He recommended that no objections be raised.

There were no questions or debate on the application.

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.

PC108 UTT/26/0148/TPO - HOME PASTURES, HATFIELD HEATH

The Head of Development Management and Enforcement presented an application for notification of intent to carry out tree works to 2 trees on open space land Home Pastures.

He recommended that no objections be raised.

There were no questions or debate on the application.

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 5.40 pm.