

Addendum List –Planning Committee 8th July 2026

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
4	UTT/25/3242/FUL Land At Sunnybrook Farm Braintree Road Felsted	A Financial Viability Assessment (prepared by Arebray Development Consultancy Ltd, dated 17 February 2026) was submitted by the applicant. This was reviewed by the Council's independent consultant Pathfinder Development Consultants who provided a Financial Viability Assessment (dated 03 April 2026). Both Viability Assessments can be found on the public portal (https://publicaccess.uttlesford.gov.uk/online-applications/search.do?action=simple&searchType=Application) using the reference number of the application.
		<p>The following comments were received by the Essex Infrastructure Officer, requiring contributions from the development:</p> <p><u>Education, waste and libraries:</u></p> <p>Essex County Council (ECC) seeks the following developer contributions that would be subject to a planning obligation (including monitoring fees):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Education</i> <p>No contributions sought.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Waste</i> <p>The development will generate household waste and recycling into facilities that operate at or above capacity and, therefore ECC seek a Recycling Centre for Household Waste contribution of £2,560.03 index linked to BCIS All-In Tender Price Index Q1- 2025, and a £1,248.82 index linked to BCIS Q1 - 2025.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Libraries</i> <p>The development is expected to create additional usage of local libraries, and therefore ECC seek a contribution of £1,874.93 index linked to BCIS All-in Tender Price Index.</p> <p>Monitoring Fees will be charged at a rate of £750 per obligation.</p>
		<p>The SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION in paragraph 3.1 of the report states that “The pattern of development in the area is predominantly linear” – this should be omitted.</p>
		<p>Footnote 13 of the report refers to the Letter Regarding Preliminary Financial Viability Assessment (24 November 2025), page 2, not the Planning Statement.</p>

		<p>All references to the Uttlesford Design Code SPD (July 2024) should be substituted with references to the newly updated and adopted Uttlesford Design Code SPD (June 2026). For clarity, the recommended reasons for refusal are annotated below – a typo in reason for refusal 3 is also corrected:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal would not be in a suitable location for housing having regard to the spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy of the Development Plan. Therefore, the development would be contrary to Core Policy 3 and Development Policy 1 of the Uttlesford Local Plan 2021-2041 (adopted March 2026), and policy FEL/HN5 of the Felsted Neighbourhood Plan (made February 2020). 2. The proposal, due to its location, would significantly harm the character and appearance of the countryside through the physical and visual coalescence between settlements, and the subsequent erosion of their individual identities and established settlement pattern, and through the loss of the countryside's intrinsic character and beauty. Accordingly, the development would conflict with Core Policies 41 of the Uttlesford Local Plan 2021-2041 (adopted March 2026), policy FEL/ICH4 of the Felsted Neighbourhood Plan (made February 2020), code ID1.1C of the Uttlesford Design Code (adopted June 2026), and paragraph 187(b) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024). 3. The proposal, by reason of its layout and design approach, would not secure a well-designed place because it would not be visually attractive as a result of good layout, nor sympathetic to its surrounding built environment, and it would not establish a strong sense of place using the arrangement of streets and spaces to create an attractive and welcoming place to live. The proposal would conflict with Core Policy 52 of the Uttlesford Local Plan 2021-2041 (adopted March 2026), policy FEL/ICH1 of the Felsted Neighbourhood Plan (made February 2020), codes M1.5C, C1.1C of the Uttlesford Design Code (adopted June 2026), and paragraphs 11(d)(ii), 135(a)-(d), 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024). 4. The application constitutes 'major development' whereby affordable housing units would be required to be delivered on site. In the absence of this provision (or appropriate justification for exceptional circumstances), the proposal would be contrary to Core Policy 56 of the Uttlesford Local Plan 2021-2041 (adopted March 2026), the Supplementary Planning Document 'Planning Obligations' (adopted June 2026), and paragraphs 11(d)(ii), 61, 63, 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).
--	--	---

		<p>5. The proposal would not provide an appropriate mix of houses in the interests of meeting housing need and creating socially mixed, vibrant and inclusive communities. The application has not provided an evidence-backed justification for non-compliance with the relevant policies. Accordingly, the scheme would conflict with Core Policy 53 of the Uttlesford Local Plan 2021-2041 (adopted March 2026), code U1.5C of the Uttlesford Design Code (adopted June 2026), and paragraph 61 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).</p> <p>6. In the absence of a mechanism to secure the delivery of the tariff per dwelling required for the Essex Coast Recreational Avoidance & Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) that would mitigate the adverse impacts of recreational pressure on designated Habitats Sites along the Essex Coast, the scheme would conflict with Core Policy 38 of the Uttlesford Local Plan 2021-2041 (adopted March 2026), policy FEL/HN8 of the Felsted Neighbourhood Plan (made February 2020), the Supplementary Planning Document 'Essex Coast RAMS' (adopted 2020), and paragraphs 187(b), 193(a) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).</p> <p>7. The application failed to provide a mechanism, such as a section 106 legal agreement, to secure the following planning obligations as required by planning policy and guidance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Provision of 6 affordable houses (35.3%). ii. Provision of accessible and adaptable dwellings: iii. 5% of market homes to be M4(3)(a) compliant iv. 10% of affordable homes to be M4(3)(b) compliant. v. Provision and on-going maintenance and management strategy of public open spaces for 30 years. vi. Maintenance and monitoring of significant on-site Biodiversity Net Gain. vii. Contribution for waste. viii. Contribution for libraries. ix. Contribution to the public art fund or on-site delivery of public art. x. Payment of the Council's legal costs. xi. Payment of monitoring fees. <p>In the absence of such a mechanism, the proposal would conflict with Core Policies 5, 52, 37, 39, 53, 56, 67, 67a and Development Policy 9 of the Uttlesford Local Plan 2021-2041 (adopted March 2026), Schedule 7A (Biodiversity Gain in England) of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990, the Supplementary Planning Document 'Planning Obligations' (adopted June 2026), the Essex County Council's Developers' Guide to Infrastructure Contributions (2026), the Planning Practice Guidance, and the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).</p>
--	--	--

5	<p>UTT/26/0114/FUL</p> <p>Land Adj To 1 Myrtle Villas Chelmsford Road Felsted</p>	<p>All references to the Uttlesford Design Code SPD (July 2024) should be substituted with references to the newly updated and adopted Uttlesford Design Code SPD (June 2026). For clarity, the recommended reasons for refusal are annotated below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal would not be in a suitable location for housing having regard to the spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy of the Development Plan. Therefore, the development would be contrary to Core Policy 3 and Development Policy 1 of the Uttlesford Local Plan 2021-2041 (adopted March 2026), and policy FEL/HN5 of the Felsted Neighbourhood Plan (made February 2020). 2. The proposal, by reason of its location, would offer limited accessibility to services and facilities via sustainable modes of travel. Future occupants of the dwellings would therefore rely heavily on private cars to meet their day-to-day needs instead of prioritising sustainable modes of travel. Accordingly, the development would conflict with Core Policies 26, 27, 28 of the Uttlesford Local Plan 2021-2041 (adopted March 2026), code M1.2C of the Uttlesford Design Code (adopted June 2026), and paragraphs 109, 115(a) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024). 3. In the absence of consistent flood risk information for the areas used to calculate the greenfield runoff rate and attenuation storage, the application failed to demonstrate that the development would not increase flood risk on the site or elsewhere or that the operation of the sustainable drainage systems would be effective. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Core Policies 36, 37 of the Uttlesford Local Plan 2021-2041 (adopted March 2026), and paragraphs 181, 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024). 4. In the absence of a mechanism to secure the delivery of the tariff per dwelling required for the Essex Coast Recreational Avoidance & Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) that would mitigate the adverse impacts of recreational pressure on designated Habitats Sites along the Essex Coast, the scheme would conflict with Core Policy 38 of the Uttlesford Local Plan 2021-2041 (adopted March 2026), policy FEL/HN8 of the Felsted Neighbourhood Plan (made February 2020), the Supplementary Planning Document 'Essex Coast RAMS' (adopted 2020), and paragraphs 187(b), 193(a) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

		<p>5. The application failed to provide a mechanism, such as a section 106 legal agreement, to secure the following planning obligations as required by planning policy and guidance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Provision of 5 affordable houses (41.6%). ii. Provision of accessible and adaptable dwellings: iii. 5% of market homes to be M4(3)(a) compliant iv. 10% of affordable homes to be M4(3)(b) compliant. v. Provision and on-going maintenance and management strategy of public open space for 30 years. vi. Maintenance and monitoring of significant on-site Biodiversity Net Gain. vii. Contribution for waste. viii. Contribution for libraries. ix. Contribution to the public art fund or on-site delivery of public art. x. Payment of the Council's legal costs. xi. Payment of monitoring fees. <p>In the absence of such a mechanism, the proposal would conflict with Core Policies 5, 52, 37, 39, 53, 56, 67, 67a and Development Policy 9 of the Uttlesford Local Plan 2021-2041 (adopted March 2026), Schedule 7A (Biodiversity Gain in England) of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990, the Supplementary Planning Document 'Planning Obligations' (adopted June 2026), the Essex County Council's Developers' Guide to Infrastructure Contributions (2026), the Planning Practice Guidance, and the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).</p>
6	<p>UTT/25/2426/FUL</p> <p>Land Located Between Thaxted Substation And The Cutlers Solar Farm Site Cutlers Green Lane Thaxted</p>	TBC
7	<p>UTT/26/1025/FUL</p> <p>Adjacent Old House Barn Parsonage Road</p>	TBC

	Takeley	
8	UTT/26/0488/DFO Land East Of Goodacres Church End Broxted	TBC
9	UTT/26/0342/FUL Rowney House Thaxted Road Debden	Representations were received in addition to those summarised in the officer's report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land ownership concerns. • Electric vehicle chargers close to neighbouring outbuilding and oil tank. • Bins near electric vehicle chargers.
10	UTT/26/0737/HHF Midden Top Road Wimbish Essex	TBC

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.