PLANNING COMMITTEE held at COUNCIL CHAMBER - COUNCIL OFFICES, LONDON ROAD, SAFFRON WALDEN, CB11 4ER, on WEDNESDAY, 6 JULY 2022 at 10.00 am

Present:	Councillor M Lemon (Chair) Councillors G Bagnall, J Emanuel, P Fairhurst, R Freeman, G LeCount, R Pavitt, M Sutton and J De Vries
Officers in attendance:	C Edwards (Democratic Services Officer), C Gibson (Democratic Services Officer), A Luck (Environmental Health Officer), N Makwana (Senior Planning Officer), B O'Brien (Senior Planning Officer), M Shoesmith (Development Management Team Leader), E Smith (Solicitor) and C Tyler (Senior Planning Officer)
Public Speakers:	E Durrant, J Hartley-Bond, R Haynes, G Jones, Councillor G Mott (Elsenham PC & Ugley PC), R Siddle and M Young.

[redacted]

[redacted]

PC178 **S62A/22/0000004 (UTT/22/1474/PINS) - LAND EAST OF PARSONAGE ROAD, AND SOUTH OF HALL ROAD TAKELEY**

The Senior Planning Officer presented an application for the erection of a 14.3MW solar photovoltaic farm with associated access tracks, landscaping, supplementary battery storage and associated infrastructure.

The report was in relation to a major planning application submitted to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) for determination, with the Council having the status of consultee.

The report recommended that PINS approve the application subject to completion of a S106 Obligation Agreement in accordance with Heads of Terms and Conditions as set out in Section 16 of the report.

The Senior Planning Officer responded to questions from Members in respect of:

- The possible benefits of the development.
- The position relating to Listed buildings.
- Provision of electricity for the airport.
- Landscape mitigation.
- The validity of the tilted balance argument
- S8 and the CPZ.
- CIL Regulations.
- De-commissioning arrangements.

Members discussed:

- S8 and not compromising the CPZ.
- Benefits to the airport of green energy against the benefits to the community.
- Potential harm to a heritage asset.
- Appropriate landscape buffers.
- The proposed location and any evidence of alternative sites having been considered.
- De-commissioning and restoration of the site; whether professional counsel had been taken.
- Control of the S106 Agreement.

.

Councillor De Vries had joined the meeting at 10.45 am but took no part in the discussion.

Councillor Bagnall proposed that PINS refused the application as it contravened S7, S8, ENV2 and E4. This was seconded by Councillor Sutton. The motion was lost on the casting vote of the Chair.

Following discussion on the next Agenda item, Councillor Bagnall raised a point of order and this item was returned to.

The Chair then proposed that PINS approve the application in line with the report's recommendation. This was seconded by Councillor Le Count. The motion was lost.

Councillor Fairhurst proposed that a neutral response be communicated to PINS but that the following concerns be highlighted:

- Landscaping around properties.
- The need for consideration of other sites.
- Re-enforcing the S106 Agreement such that it is future proof.
- That the CPZ is considered sacred and that this proposal conflicts with S8.

Councillor Emanuel seconded the motion.

RESOLVED to communicate a neutral response to PINS but that the following concerns be highlighted:

- Landscaping around properties.
- The need for consideration of other sites.
- Re-enforcing the S106 Agreement such that it is future proof.
- That the CPZ is considered sacred and that this proposal conflicts with S8.

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

The meeting ended at 3.30 pm.