

Late List –Planning Committee 23.11.2022

This document contains late items received up to and including the end of business on the Friday before Planning Committee. The late list is circulated and placed on the website by 5.00pm on the Monday prior to Planning Committee. This is a public document and it is published with the agenda papers on the UDC website.

Item Number	Application reference number	Comment
6	UTT/22/2760/PINS Land East of Station Road Elsenham	<p>New paragraphs:-</p> <p>9.1.6 : <u>UDC: Environmental Health</u> : Note that the site was previously used as agricultural land. Whilst this is considered to be low risk, there is the potential for contaminated land to be present. The developer is responsible for ensuring that development is safe and suitable for use for the intended purpose or can be made so by remedial action. Conditions are suggested re: Land Contamination, Site Characterisation, Site Remediation Scheme, Remediation Implementation and Verification, Reporting of Unexpected Contamination, Construction Environmental Management Plan, External lighting and Air Quality.</p> <p>9.1.7 The site is located near the busy M11, Stansted Airport and in close proximity to a railway line and industrial site. The acoustic assessment submitted shows that a reasonable level (internal and external) can be achieved with the use of a specific scheme of glazing and trickle vents. It should be noted that this scheme includes a relaxation of the recommended levels from BS8223:2014 by 5dB at night in warm conditions when occupants are likely to need to have their windows open. Whilst this could be considered acceptable, it is recommended that an alternative means of ventilation, air cooling and heating is installed to remove the need to open windows for thermal comfort and thereby provide a better internal noise environment for future occupants.</p> <p>Most of the external amenity space is below the upper acceptable limit of 55dB, with a few isolated exceptions that marginally exceed this. Although this might be considered acceptable, there are measures that could be taken to improve the noise environment for future users that should be explored (to achieve the more desirable 50dB criteria).</p> <p>9.1.8 <u>ECC Place Services : Conservation</u> : The proposed development site lies to the east of Elsenham Station which was opened in 1845. The Grade II listed Waiting Room on East Side of Line at Elsenham</p>

		<p>Station, Station Road (list entry number: 1305711), is a mid-nineteenth century single-storey timber framed and weather-boarded building with a timber canopy featuring an ornamental shaped fascia supported on cast iron columns. Historic Ordnance Survey (OS) maps show this building to the south of an associated station building on the same side of the line and what appears to have formerly been a station house on the west side of the line (also to the north of the listed building), now only in partial use for retail purposes. There is an unsightly modern pedestrian footbridge located just to the north of the listed building which was introduced for safety reasons in 2007, following a tragic fatal accident at the level crossing.</p> <p>9.1.9 Historic OS mapping from the late nineteenth century shows a Nursery with large glasshouses in proximity to the station which would have enabled the speedy transport of produce to London and Cambridge. The development site forms part of the historic, open agrarian setting of the listed building which has been its backdrop since the mid-nineteenth century. The setting helps to reveal the historic context and location of the listed station building away from the main areas of local settlement, contributing to its historic interest. I am in agreement with the Heritage Statement submitted with the application that the proposal to introduce a large housing development on this site will, with regards to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2021), lead to less than substantial harm, making Paragraph 202 relevant. In my opinion, this would be less than substantial harm towards the middle, rather than the lower end, of the scale. I am also of the opinion that the proposal will fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building, contrary to Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.</p> <p>9.1.10 <u>ECC Place Services: Ecology</u> : No objection subject to securing biodiversity mitigation and enhancement measures via legal agreement and conditions .Summary We have reviewed the Ecological Assessment (SES, October 2022), relating to the likely impacts of development on designated sites, protected and Priority species & habitats and identification of appropriate mitigation measures. We are satisfied that there is sufficient ecological information available for determination of this application.</p> <p>10.2 : 1 letter of representation has been received ; objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued creep of development in the rural area – Secretary of State made it clear when large development of 1000 homes was rejected a few years ago that over development of this area is not acceptable and unsustainable. Since then development has continued to creep; • Loss of agricultural land – loss of this land should be a matter of last resort
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport – largescale development along this London to Cambridge Line will overcrowd this service – transport providers have no appetite for increasing the service or investing in larger trains. The bus service is infrequent and does not co- ordinate with the train service. • Flooding risk analysis is flawed and inaccurate. • Site access is on a bend in a rural road and will be dangerous • Site is located on a prominent incline and will be the dominant view on the approach to the village • Development in Elsenham has been disproportional • This development and others have not contributed to the community.
7	UTT/22/1802/FUL Wood field (Land Adj 'Land West of Woodside Way) Dunmow	<p>Under Paragraph 14.14.1 the financial contribution towards works to the public rights of way 18/15, 18/79 and 18/87 should read as £12,360.</p> <p>Conditions 9 & 25 to be amalgamated to read as follows:</p> <p>No development shall take place, including any ground works or demolition, until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved plan shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Plan shall provide for;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant should ensure the control of nuisances during construction works to preserve the amenity of the area and avoid nuisances to neighbours and to this effect: • No waste materials should be burnt on the site, instead being removed by licensed waste contractors. • Prior to the commencement of works a Dust Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved by Regulatory Services. Work shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved plan which should make reference to current guidance on the Assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction – Institute of Air Quality Management or an acceptable equivalent. • Consideration should be taken to restricting the duration of noisy activities and in locating them away from the periphery of the site (this is notwithstanding any Prior Consent that exists for the site under section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974); • Hours of works: works should only be undertaken Monday - Friday 7.30am - 6pm , Saturday 7.30am - 1pm, Sunday and Bank Holidays No work where noise is audible at the site boundary. (this is notwithstanding any Prior Consent that exists for the site under section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974). • the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors, • loading and unloading of plant and materials, • storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development,

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • wheel and underbody washing facilities. • Routing strategy for construction vehicles • Protection of any public rights of way within or adjacent to the site • It is noted that that the construction access will be through a development on roads that may not be adopted at the time construction starts. The plan should state how any damage by construction vehicles on newly built roads will be monitored and remedied. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to the commencement of work a method statement must be provided to the local authority for approval to prevent the pollution of ground and surface waters. This will also include during works and the location of any hazardous materials including fuel from vehicles and equipment. <p>REASON: To ensure that on-street parking of these vehicles in the adjoining streets does not occur, that loose materials and spoil are not brought out onto the highway in the interests of highway safety and in the interests of the amenity of surrounding locality residential/business premises, in accordance with policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies as adopted as County Council Supplementary Guidance in February 2011, Policy GEN1, GEN2 & GEN4 of the Adopted Local Plan and the NPPF.</p> <p>Informative: If it is known or there is the likelihood that there will be the requirement to work outside of these hours or there will be periods where there will be excessive noise that will significantly impact on sensitive receptors Environmental Health at Uttlesford Council must be notified prior to the works as soon as is reasonably practicable. The developer is advised to consult nearby sensitive noise premises and may be advised to apply for a Prior Consent under Section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Care must be taken to prevent the pollution of ground and surface waters. This will include during works and the location of any hazardous materials including fuel from vehicles and equipment. • Where any soils that are known to be contaminated are being excavated or exposed a site waste plan must be prepared in order to store treat and dispose of the materials in accordance with the waste duty of care. It is recommended that advice is sought from the Environment Agency on this matter. • Where there is requirement for dewatering the site, the relevant consent must be sought from the Environment Agency. • Where there is a requirement to obstruct or alter watercourses a consent under section 23 of the Land Drainage Act must be obtained.
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All site lighting shall be located, shielded or angled in a manner that does not cause disturbance, alarm or distress to occupants of any nearby dwellings. • Construction and Demolition shall also be done in accordance with “London Good Practice Guide: Noise & Vibration Control for Demolition and Construction” by The London Authorities Noise Action Forum, CIEH, Arup and AECOM. • Where there any reclamation and storage of soils it shall be done in accordance with instructions from the Environment Agency including Environmental Permitting requirements. The applicant should take note that: Prior to commencement soils for storage must be classified before the waste is moved, stockpiled, reused, and disposed (hereafter referred to as ‘stockpiling’) of in accordance with the Guidance on the classification and assessment of waste (1st Edition v1.1) Technical Guidance WM3 (EA, NRM, SEPA, NIEA, 2018) (or ‘WM3’). Representative samples of soils must be undertaken in accordance with Appendix D of WM3 and presented to the local authority and other responsible authorities for approval prior to stockpiling. • Prior to stockpiling the quality and condition of soils used for stockpiling must be approved by and in accordance with the Environment Agency.
8	UTT/22/1508/DOV Sector 4 Woodlands Park Dunmow	The following correspondence to be included:

Myriad House
33 Springfield Lyons Approach
Chelmsford, Essex, CM2 5LB

T 0300 555 0500
E enquiries@chp.org.uk
W chp.org.uk



Creating homes
shaping places

Our Ref: Woodlands Meadow – Sector 4
Direct Line [REDACTED]
No: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]
Date: 26 August 2022

Mr D Hermitage
Director of Planning
Uttlesford District Council
Council Offices
London Road
Saffron Walden
Essex
CB11 4ER

BY EMAIL ONLY

Dear Mr Hermitage


Re Affordable Housing Land at Woodland Park Sector 4, Gt Dunmow





I am writing to confirm CHP Ltd interest in acquiring the affordable housing land at Woodlands Park, Sector 4. CHP has been discussing the acquisition of the land with Wickford Development Company and subject to Board approval and the successful conclusion of build contract negotiation with EJ Taylor & Sons Ltd, a purchase price of £1 has been agreed.

Uttlesford is one of CHP's core development areas and we already have almost 500 affordable homes in the District. The range of house types proposed at Woodlands Park, will help meet the varied housing needs of the district. The proposed layout is thoughtful and well designed and will assist in the effective management of the homes and will enable service charges to be kept to a minimum. CHP manages the affordable housing on schemes of varying sizes, from development where only a few homes are required to be affordable to schemes where over 100 homes are required. Earlier this year we completed a development in Braintree for 74 homes all of which were affordable, providing a mixture of flats and house for rent and shared ownership.

The acquisition of these homes is in line with CHP's Growth Strategy and Corporate Objective to provide 'More Great New Homes'.

Yours sincerely


Helen Shackleton
Head of Growth

		<p>[External] RE: UTT/22/1508/DOV - Sector 4 Woodlands Park Great Dunmow</p> <p>  James Pinnock - Principal Development and Viability Officer To  Laurence Ackrill </p> <p style="text-align: right;"> ↩ Reply ↩ Reply All → Forward   </p> <p style="text-align: right;">Tue 08/11/2022 10:12</p> <p>Good morning Laurence,</p> <p>Thank you for your time this morning,</p> <p>As discussed having reviewed the previous work and in light of the current economy and the ongoing effects on the industry which has resulted in extremely fine margins and increased lending criteria (rates & risk) I would support the counter offer the applicant has made and agree with Altair's assumptions that this is fair.</p> <p>Kindest regards</p> <p>James Pinnock Principal Development & Viability Officer Planning Service Place and Public Health</p> <p>Essex County Council Email: [REDACTED] www.essex.gov.uk Essex County Council, County Hall, Chelmsford, Essex, CM1 1QH</p>
9	UTT/22/1404/OP Land South of Braintree Road Dunmow	none
10	UTT/22/0618/OP	Following the preparation of the committee report and formal comments from Essex County Council highway authority, the applicant has submitted a further covering letter and a revised Safety Audit. The Covering

	Land at Spare Penny Lane South Gt Sampford	Lettering is provided in full as per below. Given the late timings of the submission of this information, it is acknowledged that the Highway Authority have not review this information.
--	--	---



ENGINEERING

Mr L Trevillian,
Uttlesford District Council,
Director Planning and Building Control,
Council Offices,
London Road,
Saffron Walden,
CB11 4ER

Our ref: MJB/2789

17 November 2022

Dear L Trevillian,

**Re: Proposed Erection of 18 Dwellings on Land at Spare Penny Lane South,
Great Sampford: Planning Application UTT/22/0618/OP**

In response to the latest comments provided by the Local Highway Authority (LHA) regarding the above application I would like to provide a further response as detailed below and supported by the attached information.

The initial paragraph indicates that the primary issue relates to the safety of the shared surface access and public footpath along the same route, thus we have had an updated Safety Audit carried out which is attached for your information and which shows no safety issues associated with the proposal.

With regards the main body of the response I have numbered the below according to the corresponding points in the highways objection letter.

1. This reason remains identical to that of the original LHA objection, to which a detailed response has already been provided alongside supporting information including which appears to have been ignored by the LHA with absolutely no justification provided including visibility splays, speed survey information and highway boundary details which clearly demonstrate that the junction is acceptable.

It was also drawn to your attention to the fact that the LHA previously considered the intensification of use of this junction by traffic associated with construction of 18 dwellings acceptable under Planning Application UTT/16/2555/OP. Nothing has changed at this junction since this previous application was made.

As such I would be grateful if the LHA would please now either withdraw this objection point, or provide a full response to the detailed additional information already submitted regarding this reason for objection, rather than simply repeating the same wording with absolutely no justification as to why the information already submitted is not considered acceptable.

		<p>If neither occurs the applicant will appeal any reason for refusal on this ground based upon evidence already submitted and the previous highways response to Planning Application UTT/16/2555/OP which considered the intensification of use of this junction acceptable from a highways perspective.</p> <p>2. In addition to the information previously supplied which appears to have resolved parts of this previous reason for objection, the remainder of the reason appears to relate primarily to the safety of the shared surface section of access road.</p> <p>We have therefore had a revised Safety Audit carried out to include this section of the proposals and I attach a copy. This clearly shows that there are no safety concerns associated with the length of shared surface carriageway and footpath/public right of way (PROW), with no safety concerns raised. This should fully deal with points a) and b) ii) of this reason for refusal.</p> <p>With regards point b) i), I attach drawing 2789-08 which shows a delivery van entering and exiting in both directions from the site access onto Spare Penny Lane South without overrunning/overhanging any footway. With regards the refuse vehicle as detailed in the previous response this only needs to enter to/from Spare Penny Lane to the southeast due to the nature of the no through roads in the vicinity, whilst if any part of the refuse vehicle details already supplied is not considered acceptable for any reason, then as previously confirmed a private collection service will be used. This should ensure that point b) i) is fully dealt with.</p> <p>With regards point c), firstly this crossing point was included in the updated/revised Safety Audit which is attached, and no safety issues were raised. Secondly, the crossing is provided where the existing kerbs are just north of the junction with the B1053 and overrunning does not occur in this area as evidenced by Street View etc which show no evidence of vehicles overrunning this section. North of the crossing, attached drawing 2789-04 Revision C now shows a 1.5m grass verge separating the footway and carriageway which should ensure that there are no issues with any minor overrun that does occur onto this verge. I trust this fully deals with point c).</p> <p>The remaining sections of the second reason for highways refusal should now be fully resolved.</p> <p>3.) With regards points a), b) and c), I attach an extract from the Transport Statement submitted as part of Planning Application UTT/16/2555, which shows the same 6m wide shared surface access coming off Spare Penny Lane South, which has to run for the same length and at the same width as is proposed under the current application, with the same length of public footpath, as shown in our previous response.</p> <p>There do not appear to be any differences between the originally accepted access length or width and that which is now proposed.</p>
--	--	--

Therefore the LHA need to either remove this part of the reason for objection or confirm specifically the differences between the previously approved access point and current proposal, in order that we can revise the section of access as necessary to ensure that it also fully meets LHA requirements.

With regards point d) we have provided tracking showing emergency vehicles using the access to demonstrate that it will be acceptable and suitable for its intended use, along with dimensions etc.

As far as I am aware this should be all that is needed, however if the LHA require any further information regarding the emergency access if the LHA can be specific as to what they actually require we will provide any further information required.

In summary, the information provided above and attached should adequately resolves all points raised in the LHA objection to the proposed development, however if anything further is required if the LHA can provide a specific response we will endeavor to provide any further information required as soon as possible.

Yours sincerely

Mike Brindley,
For and on behalf of
MTC Engineering (Cambridge) Limited

Further to the above covering letter the applicant refers to pparagraph 14.3.4 of the committee report whereby it refers to the 417 & 419 bus timetables no longer applying. The applicant has now provided the most recent timetable from Stephenson's (bus company) website which are stated to be almost identical to that shown in the applicant's highways statement.

		However, it should be noted that this bus serve is a private independent operator whereby the public require to ring and book a service and this service could be dependent on whether there are substantial bookings in the area for it to operate. Nevertheless, it is not public transport service and is operational is very limited.
11	UTT/22/1248/FUL Plot 800 Chestford Research Park Lt Chesterford	none
12	UTT/22/1848/FUL Land West of London road Newport	<u>Parish Council Comments Received 17/11/2022</u> Newport Parish Council welcome the addition of air source heat pumps, photovoltaics and support the changes to the garages. From a design perspective it is disappointing to lose the 4E house type with the large balcony as this was an attractive feature. It is also disappointing to lose the detailing to the front of house type 5A. The replacement is rather flat in comparison. We do understand that the escalating costs of materials are a factor. The palette of colours is attractive and there remains a good mix of detailing and variation to ensure that the development retains interest and texture. We note the concerns raised by a resident regarding the garden sizes for plots 18 and 27. The same resident also notes that the carport for the 3 bedroom houses do not meet the dimension standard from Essex being 5520x3313 not 7x3m. The loss of parking spaces is a concern for the 4 bed properties with only 2 spaces proposed for these dwellings.
13	UTT/22/2568/FUL Land North of Water Lane Stansted	A further representation letter has been received objecting to the removal of the conditions, comments include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The road has already started to deteriorate since the commencement of the development, • Evidence of damage to verge from delivery and plant materials, • ECC Highways should not have to pay for the repairs, • The conditions should not be removed
14	UTT/22/1910/HHF & UTT/22/1911/LB Mudwall Farm	17 Reasons for refusal

	<p>Bishops Green High Easter Road Barnston</p>	<p>Additional reason for refusal based on updated comments from ECC Place Services Ecology received on 18.11.2022</p> <p>2 Insufficient ecological information had been submitted to demonstrate that no harm would be inflicted on the protected species in order to demonstrate compliance with biodiversity duty under s40 NERC Act 2006 and prevent wildlife crime under s17 Crime and Disorder Act 1998. In the absence of this information the proposal, , would contradict the aims of Policies GEN7 and ENV7 of the Uttlesford Local Plan 2005 and advice within the National Planning Policy Framework 2021</p>
--	--	--

Note – The purpose of this list is to draw Members attention to any late changes to the officer report or late letters/comments/representations. Representations are not reproduced in full they are summarized

Late items from **STATUTORY CONSULTEES** are reproduced in full.