

# Bulmer Parish Council

Minutes of the Extraordinary Bulmer Parish Council Meeting

Held on 29<sup>th</sup> February 2016 at the Village Hall, at 7.30pm

Present: Cllr. M.Crome, Cllr. C.Leigh, Cllr. C.Ponty, Cllr. S.Morgan, Cllr. P. Fulcher, Cllr. R. Raymond, Cllr. S. Buchanan . Mrs D.Jacob (Parish Clerk & Responsible Financial Officer),  
36 members of the public.

## **16/028 Welcome and Apologies for Absence**

The Chairman welcomed all those present. Apologies received and accepted from C.Cllr. D. Finch

## **16/029 Declarations of interest**

Received from Cllr.S.Morgan regarding proposed site number 551

## **16/030 Public Participation session**

The Clerk advised the Chairman that if more than 5 members of the public wished to speak then Standing Orders would need to be suspended, the Chairman consulted the members of the public and 4 hands were raised to speak. Members of the public raised issues regarding the Call for sites (Planning Development) – Church Road resident raised concerns regarding planning of houses directly in front of their property, obstructing light and privacy. A resident from Park Lane expressed concern regarding the pumping station constantly being blocked, surface water and drainage issues, Highway access to the proposed site would be onto a main road which is at present an accident black spot. A resident expressed concerns regarding green field rather than brown field sites being put forward.

One e-mail has been received from a member of the public expressing their views.

**16/031 District Councillor Wendy Scattergood** - declined to address the meeting due to an interest, as she is a member of the planning committee

## **16/032 LOCAL PLAN 2033 - Sites discussed and Comments to submit to Braintree District Council**

### **Comments from Bulmer Parish Council to the District Local Plan - Bulmer**

We would initially refer you to the **Bulmer Village Design Statement (VDS)** Approved in 2011 by Braintree District Council. Pages 11 to 15 are most relevant. This is followed by comments to each specific site.

Your attention is drawn to the VDS statements –

‘Open spaces such as Church Meadow, Coe’s Meadow, Plough Green, Lt. Dean Spinney, Allotments (Turnpike Piece) at Park Lane and the paddocks at Almshouse Field, Lower Houses and those behind the south side of Bulmer Street, should be protected and maintained.’

‘Development outside the village envelopes should be resisted.’

‘The two most popular comments, way above all others, were that “All views are important” and “Views including the Church”. The latter was mostly general, but occasionally specific, such as “View of the church from the footpath behind Upper Houses”.’

‘Residents indicated in their responses to the questionnaire that the development of villages open space would be strongly resisted.’

‘Existing trees are a significant and valued feature of the parish. They should be protected as far as good sense and safety allow.’

**‘A small development of residential development may be supported in the parish, but should be limited to 10 in one place to avoid damaging the character of the Parish.’**

‘In-fill sites for new builds are preferred, but should wherever possible retain views to the open countryside, and where possible retain views to the open countryside, and where possible open up new vistas to the country side.’

Signed.....

16<sup>th</sup> May 2016

## **Proposed site allocations**

### **BULM 155 – Land East of St. Andrews Rise**

Our previous response in 2012 was as follows and remains the same.

- BUL 1 – Do not support development of this site. This area has an important open space that provides views from many locations to the Grade I listed church of St Andrew's at the heart of Bulmer. Comments during the Parish Council consultation have included, "*it should be made an area of outstanding natural beauty*". Access to the site is poor. The site was proposed for affordable housing some time ago and was strongly opposed by local residents.
- There are no suitable sites for gypsies/travellers.
- There are no further amenity/play spaces to identify.

This although outside the village envelope & conservation area it has **POSITIVE VISTA VIEWS** from the Grade I listed church which is in the conservation area.

### **BULM 156 – Land North of 20 Church Road**

This site is outside the village envelope and although it does not meet VDS recommendations, it is one of the preferred sites.

More street parking could add to current issue of parking.

### **BULM 157 – Land North of Hillcrest**

This site is outside the village envelope and does not meet VDS recommendations in that the views from BULM156 would be blocked to the east. Highway Issues – This currently has issues with off road parking near the bend and Bulmer School..

Not a suitable site.

### **BULM 158 - Land North of Church Road (opp.pond)**

Highway Issues – Around the blind corner with access to the Aubries Estate, street parking makes negotiation around corner dangerous. The corner has suffered from flooding in recent years.

Potential drainage issues/sewage and surface water.

Objection of houses as they would be overlooking bungalows – Lack of Light would be of concern and privacy and blocking view from outside village envelope to the bungalows.

It is noted an outline Planning Application has been submitted for this site.

Not a recommended site.

### **BULM 159 – Land east of Church Road (opp. No.s 1-10)**

Outside the Village envelope and does not meet the VDS recommendations

Highway Issues – Around the blind corner with access to the Aubries Estate, street parking makes negotiation around corner dangerous. The corner has suffered from flooding in recent years.

Potential drainage issues/sewage and surface water.

Not a suitable site.

Signed.....

16<sup>th</sup> May 2016

**BULM 160 – Land rear east no.s 1- 4 Ryes Lane**

This site is outside the village envelope.

Highway Issues – Access would be a concern, A131 accident black spot.

Views of Sudbury and the surrounding area would be affected..

Not a suitable site.

**BULM 161 – Land west of Smeetham Hall Lane (adj. Bulmer Cottage)**

Outside the village envelope.

Prime agricultural land.

There are ancient oak trees near this site.

Although it does not meet the VDS guidelines, this would extend the extent of the Village – but would be a potential favourable site as the potential owners would not be used to an open view to the east if BULM 162 is adopted

**BULM 162 – Land east of Smeetham Hall Lane (adj. Ridgcroft)**

Outside the village envelope.

Prime agricultural land.

There are ancient oak trees near this site.

Although it does not meet the VDS guidelines, this would extend the extent of the Village – but would be a potential favourable site as the potential owners would not be used to an open view to the west if BULM 161 is adopted.

Site 161 and 162 would be of the least obtrusive, of all the proposed sites.

**Site 163 – Land east of Church Road/Sudbury Road (south of the Old Vicarage)**

Outside the village envelope and does not comply with the VDS recommendations.

Fronts onto the conservation area which describes this stretch along Church Rd as “**POSITIVE VIEWS WEST**”. Views of natural beauty to Sudbury and beyond.

Potential highway Issues due to the crossroads with Sudbury Road, also many ancient trees.

Not a recommended site.

**BULM 164 – Land at junction of Church Road and A131**

Our previous response in 2012 was as follows and remains the same.

*The Parish Council stated that the ‘Village Design Statement (VDS) gives strong guidelines and views on how the village should be developed and the landscape of open fields and the trees retained. Parishioners’ most frequent response was that they wished to stick to the VDS, and therefore objected to all four areas being developed.*

- Do not support development of this site. Concern about access issues. The site is thought to contain an earth work of ancient origins. The woodlands are also visually important.
- There are no suitable sites for gypsies/travellers.

Highway Issues, accident black spot dangerous corner.

Not a recommended site.

**BULM 504 – Griggs Farm, Bulmer Street**

The proposed site, half is inside the village envelope and the entire site is inside the conservation area. The site includes a “**Buildings Townscape Merit**” property,

Highway Issues, access would be on a blind corner.

Signed.....

16<sup>th</sup> May 2016

This site meets the criteria of the VDS by being an “infill” however access would be a potential danger.  
Not a suitable site.

### **Site 551 Bulmer Tye – North of A131**

The only Brown field site although outside the village envelope put forward and is noted it has recently put on the market for let.

Bulmer would welcome further industrial Business opportunities in Bulmer, rather than residential development.

Does not meet the criteria of the VDS.

Not a suitable site.

Due the short notice to meet BDC deadlines for its response, the council has full council meeting on the 21<sup>st</sup> March, and is holding its Annual Assembly Public meeting on the 12<sup>th</sup> April and may have other comments to add to those above.

*A Bulmer resident made the following points at the councils meeting regarding the proposed building sites that have been put forward:*

*“The majority are positioned outside the village envelope which should be protected from development.*

*They are mainly on Green Field sites.*

*Many are on prime agricultural land.*

*When compared to other local villages of similar character such as The Maplesteads, the Belchamps, Wickham St. Paul and Gestingthorpe, there are a disproportionately high number of proposed sites at Bulmer*

*The character of Bulmer would be altered irrevocably if these proposed sites were passed. the proportions of the village would be changed to such an extent that it would no longer be small, rural village.*

*The road system and infrastructure in the area is already struggling to cope, without the increased population getting in their cars to travel out of the area to where the work is”.*

**Clerk to send comments to Braintree District Council as requested.**

**16/033 Date of next meeting**

Monday 21<sup>st</sup> March 2016

Meeting closed at 8.25pm.

Signed.....

16<sup>th</sup> May 2016