

## HIGH EASTER PARISH COUNCIL

### MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF THE PARISH COUNCIL held in High Easter Village Hall on Monday 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2021 at 7.30pm

Present: Cllrs Nigel Boreham, Andrea Davis, Janet Robinson, Paul Sutton (chair), Jo Windley,  
and the Clerk Allison Ward

6 Members of the public (leaving after agenda item 21/71)

Matthew Wood – Phase2Planning (leaving after agenda item 21/71)

Phil Mangham – On behalf of the applicant (leaving after agenda item 21/71)

**21/67 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE** were received from Cllr Robert Lodge and Cllr Neil Reeve who are both on holiday, their apologies were accepted by the meeting. The meeting was chaired by the vice-chairman.

**21/68 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS FOR THIS MEETING** – None.

#### **21/69 PUBLIC FORUM**

Cllr Sutton welcomed Matthew Wood and Phil Mangham to the meeting and invited Matthew as the agent for the application to open the public discussion.

The scheme is for 5 houses of 3, 4 and 5 bedrooms. Given the previous unsuccessful application the agent confirmed they had worked to address the issues raised and for this reason have submitted a full application and not outline application which they hope gives greater clarity and addresses both the heritage considerations and those raised by Essex Highways. Matthew concluded, this is seen as an evolution of the previous scheme, and it is hoped closer to something the parish could consider supporting.

Cllr Sutton asked if landscaping is a reserved matter given there is no landscaping plan with the application, the agent confirmed it was not however was of the view if the parish felt there was insufficient information Uttlesford could include a condition for a landscaping plan, or if the matter is important to the parish the agent and applicant could look to incorporate this before a decision is made.

Cllr Sutton noted the inaccuracies in the planning statement,

- a. Point 2.5 - The site is not within or abutting a conservation area, this is incorrect as the site abuts the conservation area on its southern edge.
- b. Points 2.6 and 6.10 – The Punch Bowl has never been a public house; it was a restaurant, but this has now closed.
- c. Points 2.6, 6.11 and 6.82 – The bus service is very limited with a service 4x per week.

The resident from Elm House which adjoins the site was invited to speak and raised the following objections.

- a. Like the first proposal, the site is totally non sustainable, the village has no facilities and almost no public transport. These properties will require 100% use of car at a time when Uttlesford and others have declared a climate emergency.
- b. The site borders the conservation area and the plans do not include any buffer zone.
- c. Close to the historic heart with grade 1 listed church, grade II Elm House, The Cottage and Punch Bowl all near the site. The application suggests minimum impact; however, the proposal is for modern houses in the heart of the historic village, how can the impact not be significant. Certainly, when approaching the village along School Lane, development on this site will transform the approach in a negative sense and have an impact on what is currently dominated by The Cottage and the church, utterly out of keeping with surrounding buildings and has a significant impact on heritage assets. Disagree with heritage assessment.
- d. The road narrows to 3m just beyond the proposed site access, it is inappropriate to have more traffic on a heavily cycled route.
- e. The traffic assessment was completed in early March 21 when lockdown restrictions still applied.
- f. School Lane suffers from significant flooding, there are concerns that developing this site will add to these problems.

Signed  
Robert Lodge (Chairman Parish Council)

Other residents supported these comments adding their views that the proposed development was inappropriate for the village, will adversely change the character, nothing has changed from the previous application and whilst there are more details than previously, heritage impact and highway safety are both still concerns.

The Clerk read an email from the residents at School House who sent apologies to the meeting. This asked the Parish Council to consider calling in the application for decision by the planning committee and went on to ask that the Parish Council acknowledges the flooding issues at School Lane in any response to Uttlesford. The additional surface water from the proposed site does not appear to have been addressed in the application and there are concerns this will increase the frequency and severity of flooding at School Lane. The Clerk will forward information on a specific flooding issue on the applicant's land which remains unresolved to Phil Mangham.

Cllr Sutton asked the agent if there are any views on where the surface water from the site will go, the agent confirmed it was not something specifically addressed and will look into it. Cllrs noted the ditch in front of the site appears to run down towards the sewage works where the most significant flooding issues exist.

*1 Resident arrives.*

As there were no further comments from the public, Cllr Sutton closed the public forum.

## **21/70 To consider PLANNING APPLICATION UTT/21/2338/FUL**

Cllr Sutton invited Cllrs to debate and consider the Parish Council response. The Parish Council appreciated the additional information and work that has been provided with this application compared with the previous one. The key points from their discussion are summarised as follows,

- a. The application fails to show any landscaping on the north and east boundary. Given this is such an open location the Parish Council would want to see some thought given to landscaping in this scheme.
- b. Heritage assessment concludes there is an impact on the listed buildings and conservation area, but at the same time concludes there will be no harm. With an impact identified the conclusion should be there is some harm which must be balanced against the public benefits of the scheme. With no affordable housing proposed there are no public benefits to outweigh the harm to the heritage.
- c. Cllrs noted School Lane is a protected lane and development at this location would have an impact.
- d. The site will be highly visible when approaching from the north, the first proposed dwelling is 'a monster' 5-bedroom property and with no landscaping proposed will have a significant impact on the character of the lane.
- e. Cllrs were not convinced the visibility splay could be fully met and were unsure if sufficient parking is provided given the size of the proposed properties.
- f. Cllrs noted the disruption that developing the site would cause to residents during any construction.
- g. Poor water pressure and the additional demand the new homes would create.
- h. Vehicles exiting the site at night with lights on would shine directly into the bungalows opposite.

In conclusion Cllr Sutton proposed that the Parish Council objects to this application based on five principal issues,

1. Unsustainable site as the village has a lack of services and occupants of the new properties would have to rely on a car for everything.
2. Adverse impact on the setting of the heritage assets and conservation area.
3. Although recognising several points raised in the last application have been addressed, concerns remain on highway visibility splays.
4. Lack of landscaping plan particularly in relation to the north and east.
5. Scale of proposed properties all of which are two storey full height, these will appear large and out of scale with the smaller traditional buildings in the conservation area and opposite the site.

This proposal was seconded by Cllr Robinson with all in agreement. The Clerk will also include additional points raised during the meeting in the Parish Councils response.

## **21/71 To consider whether to call in PLANNING APPLICATION UTT/21/2338/FUL**

Cllr Boreham proposed that the Parish Council asks that the application is called to planning committee for decision if the officers recommend approval for the reasons set out in the Parish Councils objection above. This was seconded by Cllr Windley with all in agreement.

*Residents, the agent, and applicant representative left the meeting.*

**21/72 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

Application No UTT/21/2221/FUL  
 Location Blakes Farmhouse, Blakes Lane  
 Development Proposed change of use from paddock to equine manege and lunge arena, construction of manege and lunge arena, erection of stables and horse walker and improvement to existing crossover

Cllr Sutton proposed no objection to this application, this was seconded by Cllr Windley with all in agreement..

Application No UTT/21/2230/HHF  
 Location 4 Bishops Green Villas, Bishops Green  
 Development First floor extension with pitched roof

Cllrs continue to have concerns on the scale of development at this site given the previous extension to the host dwelling, and the additional outbuildings.

Cllr Sutton proposed that the Parish Council comments on this application noting these concerns and adding that in its view the proposed development would significantly alter the street view when approached from the north. This was seconded by Cllr Windley with all in agreement.

Application No UTT/21/2325/HHF  
 Location The Mill House, The Street  
 Development Proposed cart lodge

Cllr Sutton proposed no objection to this application, this was seconded by Cllr Windley with all in agreement..

Cllr Davis declared a pecuniary interest in the following application as a joint owner of the property. However as this is an application for a certificate of lawfulness and is not open to general comment, the Parish Council did not discuss or consider any response.

Application No UTT/21/2167/CLP  
 Development Replacement of existing double glazed timber windows with new PVC-U  
 Location Hectors House, The Street

TIME AND CLOSE OF MEETING – 8.27pm