

## ADDENDUM LIST –Planning Committee 24/07/24

**Officers please note: Only** Late items from **STATUTORY CONSULTEES** are reproduced in full.  
**Others are summarised.**

**Statutory consultees are listed below:**

**Highway Authority**  
**The Health & Safety Exec**  
**Highways Agency**  
**Local Flood Authority**  
**Railway**  
**Environment Agency**  
**Historic England**  
**Garden History Society**  
**Natural England**  
**Sport England**

**Manchester Airport Group** (*MAG is the highway authority for the airport road network + the also section of Bury Lodge Lane running south from the northside entrance to the airport. On these roads, it therefore has the same status as Essex CC and National Highways do for the roads that they administer.*)

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
7	[REDACTED]	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
8	UTT/24/1618/PINS	<p>Land South Of Bedwell Road Ugley</p> <p><u>Two typos - corrections</u></p> <p>Paragraph 10.1 – The deadline for consultee responses is 6<sup>th</sup> August, not the 30<sup>th</sup> July. The deadline for UDC to provide their response is 30<sup>th</sup> July.</p>

		<p>Paragraph 13.6.3 – the word ‘acceptable’, should be ‘acceptability’</p> <p><u>UDC Design</u></p> <p>The proposal is, in general terms, compatible with the surrounding buildings in terms of scale. However, with regards to massing and layout, the proposal is primarily governed by the presence of the M11 motorway with the layout and massing a direct response to noise mitigation. As such, this does create incongruous massing in comparison with the existing neighbouring development.</p> <p>The apartment block is clearly designed to be an acoustic buffer and has an architectural language appropriate to this function, with small windows on the motorway side and a monolithic appearance that is very different to the rest of the site, it cannot be said that the affordable housing provision is tenure blind. These apartments are very different to the detached and semi-detached houses elsewhere on the site and as the apartment block is entirely allocated as affordable, I do not agree with the statement in the Design &amp; Access Statement that this will “create an ‘integrated community’”.</p> <p>The Design &amp; Access Statement states that the development will be landscape-led, however, that is not apparent in the drawings. It is not clear what the landscaping strategy is that is leading the design. The large portion of retained woodland does not appear integrated within proposals and is essentially a sterilised buffer to the motorway.</p> <p>The public realm of the development overall could be improved and currently lacks a coherent centre or destination. The primary road ends at a dead-end adjacent to play equipment and the pocket park, which could form a centre to development, is only partially visible from the primary entrance road.</p> <p>The development is proposed in a sustainable location, close to the railway station at Elsenham, however, the layout, massing and integration of affordable and market housing could be improved.</p> <p><u>UDC Housing</u></p> <p>The mix and tenure split of the affordable properties are given below; this mix should be indistinguishable from the market housing, with good integration within the scheme and be predominantly houses with parking spaces. This mix/tenure split is based upon the need identified within the Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) May 2024.</p>
--	--	--

	1 bed	2 bed bungalow	2 bed flat/house	3 bed house	4 bed house	total
Affordable rent	4	1	3	5	1	14
Shared ownership	0	0	1	0	0	1
First Homes						5

The applicant is proposing that all 14 of the affordable rented properties are flats which does not match the mix identified as being required within the LHNA May 2024. The proposal includes 1 affordable 2bed bungalow and 5 first homes which meets the Council's policy.

A property schedule has not been provided which would have been useful and needs to include the size of each property and size of amenity space in square metres. Each property needs to meet NDSS.

#### Place Services Archaeology

The Historic Environment Record shows that recent excavations to the south of the proposed development found evidence of a medieval settlement, and indications of Late Iron Age and Roman occupation with features including pits and ditches (EHER 48393). Within the area of the proposed development fieldwalking has identified prehistoric artefacts and medieval pottery (EHER 4694). There is therefore the potential for the presence of prehistoric, Roman and medieval remains within the proposed development area.

No objection subject to a condition.

#### Place Services Ecology

No objection subject to the conditions within the outline planning consent.


		[REDACTED]
		[REDACTED]
		[REDACTED]
		[REDACTED]
		[REDACTED]

		<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
10	[REDACTED]	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
		<p>[REDACTED]</p>
		<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>

		<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[REDACTED]</li> <li>[REDACTED]</li> <li>[REDACTED]</li> <li>[REDACTED]</li> <li>[REDACTED]</li> <li>[REDACTED]</li> </ul> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
--	--	--



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>[REDACTED]</li><li>[REDACTED]</li><li>[REDACTED]</li></ul> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
--	--	--

		<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
--	--	---

		<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
		<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>[REDACTED]</li><li>[REDACTED]</li><li>[REDACTED]</li></ul>
		[REDACTED]
11	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
12	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
13	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

		[REDACTED]
14	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
15	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
16	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
17	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

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.