



Unit 4 Brices Yard, Butts Green, Clavering Essex, CB11 4RT  
Tel: 01799 551261 Web: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED]

**Section 62A Planning Application: S62A/2024/0058 Land adjacent to Village Hall, East of Cambridge Road, Ugley, Bishops Stortford, Hertfordshire, CM22 6HR**

**Summary of Consultation Responses:**

Essex County Council- Archaeology

“Archaeological recommendations are being made on this application.”

UDC Environmental Health Officer

No objection subject to conditions

UDC Housing Officer

No Objection

Historic England:

No comment

Natural England

No comment

Urban Designer

*“The proposal is, in general terms, compatible with the surrounding buildings in terms of scale, massing, and form. Ugley is a relatively dispersed settlement and so this development would create a node of increased density relative to existing dwellings along Pound Lane. However, given the sites proximity to the B1383 and the sites use as a former gravel pit, this is considered to be a sustainable location for development.*

*The layout in design terms is acceptable and the scheme broadly complies with the Uttlesford Design Code, subject to comments below.”*

The response provided by the Urban Designer is positive and acknowledges the sustainable credentials of the site and the high quality of the design. They did request some minor points of clarification re road layout and open space which was provided 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2024.

Place Services- Ecology

No objection subject to conditions

Woodland Trust

Holding Objection re Vetran Trees.

A note has been provided by A. R. Arbon MBE, Consultant Ecologist, 38 years and N.P.T.C. Qualified Tree Surgeon, which confirms that *“the trees noted TC and TD are both noteworthy, both are retained as part of the application and the development has been located a suitable*

*distance from them to ensure their protection. Additional build-up of soil in the areas where it was previously extracted will improve the existing environment for the tree. This combined with the proposed covenant preventing their removal will ensure that the trees and their valuable habitat is preserved and enhanced by this application.”*

The Councils Tree Officer has subsequently responded confirming that the scheme is acceptable subject to the following conditions.

- Detailed tree survey and root protection scheme
- Submission of existing and proposed ground levels,
- Full soft and hard landscaping scheme

#### Lead Local Floor Authority

No objection subject to conditions

#### Environment Agency

No objection subject to conditions

#### Place Service- Heritage

*Concludes that the proposal “would cause less than substantial harm, to the significance of the listed building due to inappropriate within their setting, in terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, December 2023), Paragraph 208 to be relevant. Therefore, the proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of the listed buildings contrary to Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.”*

This concludes with the assessment undertaken by Brighter Planning. Which concludes as follows:

*“In summary the Historic England guidance accepts that the setting of a heritage asset is not fixed and may evolve over time. The heritage assets to the north of the site have been developed to focus on the main routeway of the Cambridge Road. The proposed development will not alter this relationship of the heritage assets and the proposals will not be read in the main views of the assets given the screening of the development site and the orientation and location of the proposed development away from the heritage assets. In retaining the mature boundary screening and being set away from the boundaries of the site, the housing will not result in any harm to the significance or setting of any of the identified listed buildings. The development in being inward looking and screened to the main road boundaries will not visually compete with the heritage assets or their setting.”*

A further response has been prepared by Brighter Planning and is provided with this summary note.

#### ECC Highways

No objection subject to conditions.

*“The Highway Authority has previously secured development funds from developments in the area that have already commenced, for a new bus service which has the potential to connect the site to Stansted village and Bishops Stortford in one direction and Stansted airport in the other. For the above reason the Highway Authority recommends a condition that will enable the new development to benefit from this new upcoming bus service via the installation of new bus stops onto Pound Lane and further improvements on the existing bus stops on Cambridge Road.*

*The combination of infrastructure improvements proposed will give the development access to 2 regular bus services adjacent to the site – which **collectively will enable residents to access services and facilities by sustainable travel.*** [our emphasis added]

The availability of public transport in this location is comparatively high for the district where 70% of the District's population living in the villages and countryside outside of Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow<sup>1</sup>. The provision of these additional bus stops is therefore also a benefit for the existing residents of Ugley.

## **UDCs Objections**

Further to the committee meeting the Council have raised objections specifically in regard to Heritage, Character and Appearance and Location of the Development

### 1) Heritage

As set out in the Heritage Assessment prepared by Brighter Planning, conclusions referenced above it is the applicant's position that the proposed development will cause no harm to the referenced heritage assets that are separated from the site by notable features, including established vegetation, a road, and non-listed buildings.

Prior to Place Services response re Heritage the UDC planning officer wrote in his report that:

*“There is some separation distance between the site and the heritage assets, and **the visual impact of the development at the proposed scale may likely not be significant.** The Council's Heritage Officer has been consulted as part of this application, no comments have been received, and any comments received are required to be submitted directly to PINS.”* [our emphasis added]

It would therefore appear that the Planning Officers initial assessment of the heritage impact was similar to the applicants.

### 2) Character and Appearance

As noted by the Urban Designer the “*proposal is, in general terms, compatible with the surrounding buildings in terms of scale, massing, and form*”. As set out in the planning statement at 6.22 only limited weight can be given to Policy S7 because it is out of date and inconsistent with the NPPF. The site itself doesn't read as wider countryside, due to its location within the built form and the established vegetation that surrounds the site. Its development will therefore be well contained and will not have a notable impact on the countryside.

Also as set out at 6.18-6.20 of the planning statement it is a former gravel pit and is therefore Previously Developed Land in line with the NPPF Definition.

### 3) Location of the Development

As noted above The Highways Authority and the Urban Designer consider that the site is a sustainable location, due to the to the relatively good access to public transport and the brownfield nature of the site. Future residents will therefore have better access to public transport than the majority of the district. It should be noted that the Council are unable to meet their house requirements on sites that are more sustainably located than the application site, meaning that if development is not permitted on this site, it will likely necessitate development in less sustainable parts of the district.

---

<sup>1</sup> Uttlesford Reg 19 Local Plan (2018)