

FELSTED PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Planning Meeting held on Tuesday 20 October 2020 electronically 6 pm

Attending: Councillors Andy Bennett (Chairman), Alec Fox, Richard Freeman, Penny Learmonth and Roy Ramm. In attendance Heather Read/Clare Schorah - Assistant Clerks

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Cllr Graham Harvey

2. Declarations of Interest

Cllr Andy Bennett declared a prejudicial interest in application UTT/20/1617/FUL Moorlea Bartholomew Green and stated that he would remove himself from the meeting when the matter was discussed.

Cllr Penny Learmonth declared a prejudicial interest in UTT/20/2375/FUL Land at Watch House Green and stated that she would leave the meeting whilst the application was discussed.

3. Public Forum

There were 2 members of the public present.

4. Approval of Minutes of previous Meeting

The minutes of the September meeting were formally approved. They will be signed when the Planning Committee next physically meet.

5. New Applications Considered

[UTT/20/2375/FUL](#)

Land At Watch House Green

Construction of 4 no. detached dwellings and garages with new access off Braintree Road

Comment: Objection

The Parish Council objected to the PIP and we continue to object to this full application.

When the PC objected to the PIP it was aware of the content of the then emerging

Neighbourhood Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan was also referenced in the officer's report, but was not a considered document in the decision notice. When assessing the original PIP,

the officer said that the Felsted Neighbourhood Plan was "yet to be put to a local

referendum" and so it only carried limited weight. The Plan is now "Made" and therefore by implication it should be considered as part of this application and carry significantly more weight.

The Neighbourhood Plan identifies 63 new dwellings which deliver community infrastructure and local need. These 63 new dwellings are either the subject of planning approved or are in process planning applications. The Felsted Neighbourhood Plan is therefore delivering

houses and, to maintain trust and support for the Neighbourhood Planning process, it is vital that Planning authorities support their delivery and refuse developments which fail to comply with the policies within the Neighbourhood Plans, as is the case with this application.

Over the last 18 months together with the houses supported in the Neighbourhood Plan there are a total of 187 additional dwellings already approved for the Parish.

Apart from the continuous pressure put on the Parish infrastructure in general, the PC has specific and significant concerns about the increasing pressure on Felsted Primary School.

When the Head last reported, he stated that the School was full in every year group apart from one. Using the ECC formula of 0.3 primary children per dwelling where are 62 additional primary school children expected to be schooled?

The recent inspector decision (last week) for APP/C1570/W/20/3252134 - UTT/19/2994/OP - Land To Rear Of Jolly Boys Lane South And Causeway End Road, Felsted, recognised the lack of 5/3yrs supply but this was determined as not strong enough to warrant the building of

houses in an unsustainable location and so the appeal was refused. The precedent has therefore been set that the lack of a 5/3yr housing supply does not in itself carry sufficient weight to justify approving a planning application.

Watchhouse Green has been targeted by various developers and continues to be targeted. It has had in excess of 100 extra dwellings approved in two years. This is a 100% increase in the size of the settlement. It is an area without shops so any housing built there will require motorised transport to access facilities. This is unsustainable in accordance with policy H7 of the Uttlesford Local Plan 2005.

In recognising that the approved PIP holds weight in the final decision for this full application, Felsted PC strongly believes that the, now Made, Felsted Neighbourhood Plan adds new weight to the decision making process for this application, in fact sufficient weight to now refuse this application.

[UTT/20/2424/HHF](#)

6 Crix Green Villas Crix Green Road

Erection of single storey side extension

No Comment

[UTT/20/1617/FUL](#)

Moorlea Bartholomew Green Lane Bartholomew Green

Demolition of existing dwelling and the erection of 1 no. detached dwelling and garage

Comment: Whilst not objecting to this application the PC wish to highlight the TPO on the Oak Tree sited on the boundary with Thyme Cottage. They have an expectation that the developers/contractors will respect the TPO, ensuring that the tree receives appropriate care/attention during the construction process thus preventing the health of the tree from being adversely affected.

[UTT/20/2472/HHF](#)

Mariskalls Mill Road

Proposed 3-bay detached garage, with first floor accommodation for home office/studio (amendments to approved scheme under ref UTT/20/1432/HHF).

No Comment

6. Decisions received since 15 September

[UTT/20/1818/HHF](#)

Farley House Braintree Road

Proposed vehicular access

Permission Refused 15th September 2020 *“failed to demonstrate adequate visibility splays”*

[UTT/20/1821/HHF](#)

Belvedene Willows Green Main Road

Proposed demolition of conservatory and erection of single storey rear extension, lowering of roof and internal alterations.

Permission Granted 22nd September 2020

[UTT/20/1972/HHF](#)

Terleys Mole Hill Green Molehill Green Road

Proposed demolition of existing garage and construction of new timber frame cartlodge:

Amendment to application UTT/18/2645/HHF currently under construction.

Permission Granted 24th September 2020

[UTT/20/1903/LB](#) / [UTT/20/1902/HHF](#)

Mill House Cock Green Cock Green Road

Addition/extension to cart lodge front elevation. Cladding to annexe front and rear elevation, additional windows to front elevation. Addition of dormers and roof lights to swimming pool roof and windows to rear pool elevation. New doors and glazing to swimming pool building

together with rear elevations first floor bedroom, ground floor kitchen relocation and new doors to kitchen. Internal remodelling and structural work.

Withdrawn 24th September 2020

[UTT/20/0766/OP](#)

Great Greenfields Gransmore Green Gransmore Green Lane

Outline application with all matters reserved except for access for the Construction of 1 no. dwelling.

Permission Refused 29th September 2020 *“The proposed development would be entirely inappropriate and not in keeping to the pattern of development for the areawould fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building, including its setting”*

[UTT/20/1970/HHF](#)

Drummonds Stevens Lane

Section 73A Retrospective application for single story rear extension

Permission Refused 8th October 2020 *“ will cause harm to neighbouring amenity by causing an overbearing and overshadowing effect to this rear amenity space by virtue of the extensions increased height and level of bulk and massing.”*

[UTT/20/0028/DFO](#)

Land Off Stevens Lane

Details following outline permission UTT/17/0649/OP (granted under appeal ref: APP/C1570/W/18/3205707) - Details of access, appearance, landscaping, layout, scale for 7 no. dwellings

Permission Granted 7th October 2020

7. Appeal Decisions since 15 September

[UTT/19/2940/HHF](#)

Cromwells Watch House Green

Proposed first floor front extension, two storey extension to North East elevation and garage conversion

Appeal Allowed 16th September 2020

[UTT/20/0097/FUL](#)

Pond Park Farm Cock Green Road Cock Green

Retrospective application for variation of condition 1 on UTT/19/1718/FUL (within 3 months of the date of permission the roof will be clad with natural slate) to within 3 months of the date of permission the existing roof of barn "J" shall be painted black.

Appeal Allowed 28th September 2020

8. Government White Paper Consultations:

i) Changes to the Current Planning System

The PC submitted a letter of objection to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government as follows:

We are responding to this consultation with a single point made against Q1, but which is submitted as an objection to the proposals as a whole.

The target of 300,000 houses a year, 1 million over the term of this parliament, is a political target. The calculations are being modified simply to give the result desired, why not 0.4 or 0.6%? What is the specific data which supports 0.5%, other than it gives the desired answer?

To modify the process to give this extra housing will only result in inappropriate development in the wrong places, with easy opportunities pounced upon by developers seeking to make money, rather than contribute to the sustainable future of communities. The damage will be permanent. This is not the answer to

getting the economy moving again. There are hundreds of thousands of houses already with planning permission but which have not yet been built. Why simply add to that total, why not force developers to build what they have permission for? It is wrong to set such a permanently scarring process to achieve a political gain.

It is also wrong to increase the point at which affordable housing requirements apply. This is a critical area of housing need across the UK, so why remove it? We need a mix of housing supply across the country and this can only impact that, again for a short term political gain.

ii) Planning for the Future

The PC will draft a response to be submitted by the 29th October deadline.

9. Stansted Airport Planning Appeal – Update

The following response has been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate:

MAG has done all it possibly could to avoid central government scrutiny of its plans, going so far as removing a year from the forecast time period to void automatic referral to the SoS. They attempted to avoid scrutiny of the impact from the reality that this appeal to increase passenger numbers would allow the use of an extra 50,000 flights a year. This is because the 274,000 current limit is self-restricted to 225,000 flights through the conditions put upon the split between passenger and freight flights and the use of larger aircraft to achieve the current passenger limit. The environmental and noise impact from this increase has not been examined.

All along MAG has said that it would respect local judgement of its expansion plans and would not seek central government opinion nor approval. However, now that local determination has gone against MAG, they have shown their true colours, in their complete disinterest in local decision making when it does not provide the decision they want, by taking the application to appeal.

Whilst none of this is a planning reason for refusal, it does underline the point being made by the 47 Parish Councils who objected to the expansion plans, that MAG has no interest in community impact or genuine community engagement. They fail against every requirement to truly listen to the communities their operations impact, demonstrated by the fact that they have done absolutely nothing to mitigate the order of magnitude increase in noise complaints received after the 2016 flightpath changes. They do nothing to manage the impact of their operations and are interested in only ticking appropriate boxes which allow them to achieve their goal of expansion, and delivery of an increased share price. Manchester Airport group simply sees Stansted as a recent investment for which they want maximum return, whatever the local cost.

We would urge refusal of this appeal. Over recent months government policy has begun to evolve to accept that analysis through average noise levels is meaningless when you are disturbed every few minutes or perhaps woken once an hour by a plane screaming overhead, it is every single noise event that causes stress and damages the health of residents, not an average noise level. Much more detailed community engagement policies are also now in place, policies which this application managed to avoid needing to meet by being submitted early. It would be morally wrong to consider this appeal under legislation and regulations which are now considered inadequate and out of date. The impact of doing so would be permanent.

It is not right to trot out their line that ‘there will be winners and losers’. This appeal must be made to update its proposals in line with emerging change and noise management policy and guidance and must provide a comprehensive up to date noise mitigation plan to current regulations. It must also be made to detail the true environmental impact of the additional 50,000 flights released for use should this appeal be allowed.

10. Date and time of next meeting:

Tuesday 17th November electronically at 6 pm

..... Chairman

17 November 2020

Residents wishing to make comments on Planning Applications or view other comments submitted can go to the Uttlesford District Council Website:

<https://publicaccess.uttlesford.gov.uk/online-applications>

To find out more about Appeals please go to the Planning Inspectorate Website:

<https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk>