

Your ref: UTT/21/2509/OP
Our ref: As above
DD: 07769 687142
E: steven.butler@bidwells.co.uk
Date: 5 October 2021

Henrietta Ashun MRTPI
Principal Planning Officer
Uttlesford District Council
Council Offices
London Road
Saffron Walden, CB11 4ER

Dear Henrietta,

**UTT/21/2509/OP: LAND SOUTH OF RADWINTER ROAD (EAST OF GRIFFIN PLACE), SEWARDS
END**

I write in respect of the above. The purpose of this letter is to provide a comprehensive response to various matters that have arisen with the application to date.

Responses to comments from consultees

In response to requests for further information from the Lead Local Flood Authority (“LLFA”) and Minerals & Waste Authority we submit the following documents:

- **Drainage Statement and Operations & Maintenance Manual** (prepared by CTP) – both of which are intended to supplement the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and to provide a response to the LLFA’s comments dated 8 September 2021. Please note that Rosconn Strategic Land, as a land promoter, is the applicant for this outline submission and would not be the applicant for any detailed future submission. There are therefore some aspects to the LLFA’s requests that cannot be satisfied in detail at this outline stage;
- **Site Waste Management Plan** (prepared by Tetra Tech) – prepared in response to and at the request of ECC Minerals & Waste as advised in its consultation response dated 3 September 2021. As with the above, there are some aspects that cannot be satisfied in detail at this outline stage but information is provided as appropriate.

We trust these will be uploaded to UDC’s portal website and have copied the relevant consultees into this letter.

We also seek to respond to comments from the Environmental Health Officer (“EHO”) dated 7 September – In respect of air quality, and with reference to Appendix B of the submitted Transport Assessment, we consider that there is very limited chance of the committed link road not coming forward. The link road within the Bellway scheme approved under UTT/18/0824/OP and UTT/19/2355/DFO is now under construction, the link within the Linden scheme approved under UTT/13/3467/OP and UTT/16/1856/DFO has now been completed, and we understand that the remaining Dianthus site has now been sold to a housebuilder, with Reserved Matters submission imminent.

Bidwell House, Trumpington Road, Cambridge CB2 9LD
T: 01223 841841 E: info@bidwells.co.uk W: bidwells.co.uk

We also note that the EHO raises comments relating to noise that may arise from the neighbouring commercial units (which we presume to be the units to the west including Walden Cabs the taxi firm). We are seeking direct contact with the EHO to discuss this matter but in the interim please note our observations as follows.

There are existing residential properties adjacent to the west of the commercial units, recently constructed under planning permission 13/3467/OP which was granted in 2015. There is also a building immediately to the north of the commercial units, for which planning permission for conversion from an HMO to 4 no. bedsit flats was granted in 2020 (reference UTT/20/0008/FUL). We cannot see any EHO correspondence on UDC's planning portal relating to potential noise impacts from the taxi firm or other units.

Our proposed scheme includes a pedestrian/cycle link along the western boundary; this sets the actual residential development areas back from the commercial units so they are at least as far away as the existing residential properties to the west and north. Therefore, the potential impact of the commercial units is unlikely to be any greater than is already experienced by existing properties close by. The impact of noise from the commercial units does not seem to have been considered a concern as recently as 2020, based on the HMO conversion application. As above, we are seeking to discuss this matter further with the EHO to properly scope the extent of further assessment work, if required.

Outstanding responses yet to be received from consultees

We note the earlier email from UDC's Urban Design Officer and look forward to engaging in due course. We seek outstanding responses from the Highways Authority and UDC's Landscape Officer, noting that the consultation expiry date passed on 13 September.

UDC's Scoping Opinion response

The Scoping Opinion response was issued on 16 September 2021 under UTT/21/1138/SO. We are pleased to see that UDC is in agreement with a significant amount of the scope we provided within the submitted Scoping Report. However, we have the following comments to make in respect of the requested inclusion of specific further elements.

- **Heritage** – we note the contents of paragraph 39 of the Scoping Opinion, which relates to the suggested inclusion of heritage matters within the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment ("LVIA"). Our appointed heritage consultant (BSA Heritage) advises against conflating the assessment of heritage assets within the LVIA. This is because heritage and landscape assessment are both subject to different methodologies, different policy tests and different legislative references.

The relationship between the Site and Pounce Hall is explicitly referenced in our submitted Heritage Statement which concludes that there would be a neutral/no affect from the development proposals on this Grade II listed building (HER 27190 on Figure 1 attached to this email). Pounce Hall lies circa 300 metres north east of the site and is the closest designated heritage asset to it.

The other designated heritage assets referred to in UDC's response, at Tiptoft Farm, form a compact group which lies more than a kilometre east of the site's eastern boundary (a west to east access drive to the farm is just visible on the eastern edge of the attached figure, north east of Bear Hall, albeit the assets are a further 200 metres east at their nearest). These include a Grade I listed medieval manor house, scheduled moat around it and also a post-medieval Grade II brick dovecote to their east.

BSA Heritage considered this group of assets during their initial screening of the wider study area using online sources and the National Heritage List for England in particular. They are conscious of the moat and manor house being of the 'highest significance' as defined by the NPPF. However,

given distance and topography, it was decided they were unlikely to be affected by development within the site.

Having reviewed the situation now, the land rises up to the east of the site and to a ridge south of Seward's End, before declining to the east and south east. The assets at Tiptoft Farm are therefore shielded from the site and land to their west by topography. Aerial images also confirm that the group of assets at Tiptoft Farm are surrounded by dense vegetation including trees.

The site visit confirmed that there was no view of Tiptoft Farm from within the site and that existing vegetation on this boundary is well established. Since BSA Heritage visited the site, the proposals for the site include the eastern, higher parts of the site being left as open space with additional planting and retention of the existing northern and eastern vegetation belts. In this context, the proposals would certainly not harm the significance of the Tiptoft Farm assets, nor an appreciation of them. However, given a lack of inter-visibility, the site cannot influence the setting of the assets at all, although if there were views between the two what is being proposed could be assessed as an improvement.

Taking account of the above, we consider that heritage matters requested by UDC as part of the scope are adequately assessed as part of the submitted Heritage Statement.

- **Noise & vibration** – You will note our comments above in respect of noise, which we are seeking to pick up directly with the EHO. However there does not appear to be a defensible basis upon which the EHO has requested the additional scope of work in respect of vibration. It makes reference to correspondence that does not exist and is at odds with the scope that had already been sought from and discussed with the EHO in February this year (correspondence attached). We would therefore be grateful if you would please provide clarity on this matter.
- **Major Accidents and Disasters** – this was referenced in the scoping report, but not scoped in as deemed not to be significant. The only justification provided by UDC is related to evaluating the effect of major flood events, which we consider is already adequately considered in other submitted chapters of the Environmental Statement. We would welcome your confirmation of this and/or be more specific on the scope.
- **Climate Change** – We're not convinced this is a significant effect based upon the scale of the development proposed, and in any event the impacts/effects of climate change have been considered in other chapters i.e. climate change allowances for flood risk assessment and drainage design. As with the above, we would welcome your confirmation of this.
- **Ecology** – Note that we had already scoped this matter into the assessment and is included within the Environmental Statement, with response to the scoping consultee responses received at earlier stages of the scoping process.

We trust the above confirms our position and we would seek clarification on the outstanding queries/matters raised in respect of the Scoping Opinion response.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely



Steven Butler BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI
Associate, Planning

Enc. Drainage Statement, Operations & Maintenance Manual, Site Waste Management Plan, correspondence with UDC's Environmental Health Officer February 2021.