

GREAT CANFIELD PARISH COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY MEETING OF THE PARISH COUNCIL
 held in the Village Hall Monday 12th March 2018

Present: Cllrs Ginny Barlow, Chris Easter, Jenny Jewell, Robert Mackley (Chair), Declan Tiernan and the Clerk Allison Ward

District Councillor Keith Artus (leaving after agenda item 5.4)

5 residents (4 leaving after agenda item 5.4, 1 leaving after agenda item 6)

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE were received from Cllr Stuart Hepburn and Cllr Michael Knight and accepted by the Parish Council
2. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS FOR THIS MEETING - None
3. PUBLIC FORUM

The Chairman stated, 'in accordance with Great Canfield Parish Council Standing Orders 48.1 and given there are a number of significant planning applications, I will adjourn the meeting at the start of each planning application in agenda item 5.1 and at agenda item 5.3, 5.4 and 6 to allow members of the public to speak. At an appropriate point during each application or item I will then reconvene the Parish Council meeting at which point members of the public are no longer permitted to speak in order that the Cllrs can conclude the debate and the Parish Council make its decision.

There were no comments from the public relating to non-agenda items.

4. In accordance with Great Canfield Parish Council Standing Orders 11.2a, the Chairman proposed that the order of business as set out in the Standing Orders is varied to the order set out on the agenda; there were no objections.
5. PLANNING

5.1. Applications

Application No	UTT/18/0318/OP
Development	Outline planning permission for the erection of up to 135 dwellings with public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access point from Great Canfield Road. All matters reserved except for means of access.
Location	Land West of Canfield Road

The Chairman adjourned the meeting and invited comments from the public.

Residents present raised their objections to the proposal. Of significance were the concerns that such a large, urban style development would have on the rural parish of Great Canfield, a village with no facilities, and the resultant pressure this development would have on the limited facilities in Takeley. If the application was permitted it would double the size of the village and effectively join the parishes of Takeley and Great Canfield. There was discussion on the emerging Local Plan and the fact this site was not recommended for approval in the recent Call for Sites due to its unsustainability. Residents viewed the plans for the proposed changes to the highway width which differ from previous applications and include the addition of a footpath from the site to the B1256; they were unconvinced the plan proposed was achievable without securing additional land from adjoining landowners and noted even in its current proposed form it would significantly change the rural character of Canfield Road. There were concerns on the increased traffic that would result during peak times on the already congested B1256 at both the Four Ashes and M11 junctions. The applicant suggests the site is sustainable with any occupants being able to walk to the Four Ashes local shops, bus routes and the primary school; residents noted that in reality this is highly unlikely given the distances involved, the limited bus services and the fact all key services, i.e. NHS, secondary and further education, are only accessible by car. The applicant suggests The Fritch Way is a suitable pedestrian access route, however residents disagree with this view and stated it is a bridleway for recreational purposes, it does not have a suitable surface and is unlit.

Signed
 Robert Mackley (Chairman Parish Council)

At the conclusion of the public discussion, the Chairman reconvened the meeting for the Parish Council to discuss and agree its response. The Clerk confirmed Uttlesford has agreed to extend the deadline for responding to 16th April. Cllr Jewell confirmed contact has been made with the National Trust to discuss the impact of the development on Hatfield Forest, contact has also been made with the local ramblers and equestrian users. The Clerk was asked to verify the status of Canfield Road as Cllrs were of the view it is a protected lane, however it is unclear from which point this status applies. The Parish Council had been in discussion with Takeley Parish Council and Cllr Jewell and the Clerk will attend their Planning Committee meeting later this week. Takeley Parish Council has agreed to work with this Parish Council and have proposed the engagement of planning and highway consultants to review the application and prepare a joint objection, with costs split one third Great Canfield and two thirds Takeley. Cllr Jewell proposed that Great Canfield works with Takeley as outlined and commits to the Great Canfield share of consultancy costs c.£850 for the initial objections, this was seconded by Cllr Tiernan with all in agreement. The Parish Council went on to discuss the importance of the consultant's commitment to the full process should the application proceed and the importance of engaging and working with Uttlesford District Council through any appeals process.

Cllr Mackley proposed that the Parish Council objects to the application and submits an additional note of objection endorsing the consultant's report and highlighting the key local issues as raised by residents. This was seconded by Cllr Barlow with all in agreement.

The Clerk was asked to circulate information to residents asking them to consider reviewing the documentation and responding as local opinion is very important.

Application No	UTT/18/0507/OP
Development	Outline application with all matters reserved, except for access, for 7 no. dwelling houses
Location	Land South of Canfield Park Cottage

The Chairman adjourned the meeting and invited comments from the public.

Residents viewed a site plan of the proposal and raised their concerns with this application in particular the appearance and density the proposal would have on what is currently a narrow rural lane, with existing properties forming a ribbon development on large plots. Many of the arguments relevant to the Gladman site discussed previously were felt to apply to this site, including the lack of suitable pedestrian access and the dependency on cars to access all facilities.

At the conclusion of the public discussion, the Chairman reconvened the meeting for the Parish Council to discuss and agree its response. The Clerk confirmed Uttlesford has agreed to extend the deadline for responding to 16th April. It was noted this site was in the Call for Sites and the review by Uttlesford suggested it could be used for small scale development. Cllr Mackley proposed that the Parish Council objects to development on this site due to include its impact on the countryside, its unsustainability, its appearance and density in this location and the access issues on the rural lane. This was seconded by Cllr Barlow with all in agreement.

The Clerk was asked to circulate information to residents asking them to consider reviewing the documentation and responding as local opinion is very important.

Application No	UTT/18/0370/HHF
Development	Raising of roof to main dwelling and garage outbuilding to create first floors, new external cladding and windows to both buildings. Two storey front and single storey side extensions to main dwelling (amended scheme to that approved under planning permission UTT/17/2408/HHF)
Location	Twin Pines, Canfield Drive

Cllr Barlow proposed that the Parish Council makes no comment on this application, this was seconded by Cllr Easter with all in agreement.

5.2 Decisions

Application No	UTT/17/3600/FUL & UTT/17/3601/LB
Development	Change of use of holiday let accommodation to 1 no. residential dwelling
Location	Bury Farm, Church End
Decision	Conditional Approval

5.3 Application UTT/17/2903/FUL for use of land for one additional pitch at existing gypsy caravan site Tandans, Canfield Drive was approved by a majority at the Planning Committee on Wednesday 14th February. The Chairman adjourned the meeting and invited comments from the public.

A resident began the discussion by confirming despite the efforts of residents, the Parish Council and District Cllr Keith Artus who all spoke in objection to this application, it was approved by the Planning Committee. During the debate the committee were told there were no planning objections for additional development which would increase the size of the development to 6 pitches, however previous applications in the vicinity and a refusal for housing on this site have all confirmed they are unsustainable for this scale of development. The resident asked, why are planning rules not relevant for gypsy and traveller site applications? Furthermore, the conditions for previous gypsy pitch developments on this site have not been fulfilled, e.g. landscaping, why did Uttlesford not enforce these before approving additional pitches? There are concerns that Uttlesford appears not to have a process for verifying that the occupants of private traveller sites have gypsy status.

District Cllr Artus confirmed his frustration with the decision and that the issue with conditions not being met must be challenged. He went on to suggest that confirmation be formally sort in writing to the comment made in the Planning Committee that there should be no more development on this site in any form.

At the conclusion of the public debate, the Chairman reconvened the meeting for the Parish Council to discuss and agree its response. The Parish Council were of the view a formal complaint about the process and comments made both during and in advance of the meeting would not be pursued at this stage, but suggested that the resident take up an offer made by District Cllr Artus to pursue this. Cllr Easter proposed that the Parish Council writes to Uttlesford asking that the conditions in relation to landscaping and planting are enforced, this was seconded by Cllr Jewell with all in agreement. Cllr Jewell proposed that a letter be sent to Uttlesford asking for confirmation that no further development in any form would be considered on this site, this was seconded by Cllr Mackley with all in agreement.

5.4 Manchester Airports Group the owners of Stansted Airport has submitted an application to Uttlesford District Council to increase annual passenger numbers. The current closing date for responding is 3rd April, however a number of parties have asked that an extension be given. In response to questions on highways impact, Cllr Artus contributed to the discussion suggesting that there is no proper transport study to look at the combined impact of the Local Plan Development and the increase in transport that will result from the application to increase passenger numbers. The Parish Councils primary concern was in regards to the increase in traffic and the impact this will have on the village roads as well as problems resulting from unauthorised airport parking and pollution. Cllr Mackley proposed that the Parish Council objects to the application primarily on the highway issues and further considers any localised issues identified by the Stop Stansted Expansions review of the application, this was seconded by Cllr Jewell with all in agreement.

District Cllr Artus and 4 residents leave the meeting.

6. BOUNDARY IVORY HOUSE, BULLOCKS LANE AND THE VILLAGE GREEN

The Parish Council has been asked to consider whether there has been an infringement onto Parish Council land following the removal of a boundary hedge and replacement with a fence.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting and invited comments from the public.

A resident opened the discussion by confirming that the original boundary hedge between two properties had been removed following agreement with the neighbours and due to its poor condition and encroachment onto the driveway. The hedge has been replaced with a fence which does not extend as far as the hedge that was removed.

At the conclusion of the public debate, the Chairman reconvened the meeting for the Parish Council to discuss and agree its response. Cllr Mackley confirmed that Cllrs had visited the site, had called on local knowledge and looked at historic photographs in an attempt to determine the boundary between the property and the village green. In summary the Parish Council was of the view that the fence was forward of the property boundary and thereby encroached onto the village green by c.1.5 fence panels. In conclusion and as a compromise the resident agreed to consider removing one fence panel.

1 resident leaves the meeting.

7. The MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY PARISH COUNCIL MEETING 12th February 2018, were proposed by Cllr Mackley as a true record, this was seconded by Cllr Barlow with all in agreement.

8. PROGRESS UPDATE

8.1. It was agreed to c/fwd the update on village broadband and future options.

9. CORRESPONDENCE TO NOTE

9.1. Uttlesford has confirmed the waste vehicle accessing Bullocks Lane is for commercial waste and they do not have smaller vehicles able to collect commercial waste.

9.2. There is a meeting of Stop Stansted Expansion Town and Parish Council Liaison on Thursday 22nd March at 8pm at High Easter village hall, the main discussion point is the current Stansted application for increase in passenger numbers.

9.3. The National Association of Local Councils has issued further guidance on the General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) and requirements for Parish Councils due to come into force on 25th May. The Clerk is preparing an action plan and will update the meeting in April.

9.4. Ashfields are offering to organise and host First Aid training for the village on either on either Monday 26th or Tuesday 27th March from 7pm to 9pm. The Parish Council discussed this proposal and were very grateful to Ashfields for their offer, however the Parish Council expressed their disappointment with the response to tonight's meeting given the significant planning applications and were concerned that efforts to organise would not be supported. The Clerk was asked to seek positive interest from residents before confirming with Ashfields.

10. VILLAGE LITTER PICK

Following the cancellation of the arranged litter pick due to the weather, Cllrs agreed to hold a litter pick on Saturday 24th March meeting at the village hall at 10am.

11. REPRESENTATIVES REPORTS

11.1. Footpaths, Byways, Bridleways and Greens – Nothing to report.

11.2. Highways/Road Safety- Nothing to report.

11.3. Crime Prevention/Neighbourhood Watch – A number of residents have confirmed they have been victims of attempts to open financial accounts in their name. The Police have suggested the common link is properties with post boxes on their boundaries; residents are advised to ensure these are of a lockable form.

11.4. Tree Warden - Nothing to report.

12. FINANCE

12.1. Cheques for Approval

<i>PAYMENT TO</i>	<i>VALUE</i>
Allison Ward - Parish Clerk February 2018	£ 172.08
Great Canfield Community Trust – Hall hire January to March 2018	£ 81.00

13. ITEMS FOR THE NEXT AGENDA

13.1. Contract for Grounds Maintenance

13.2. Annual Accounts

14. DATE OF NEXT MEETING – It is unlikely the Parish Council will be able to form a quorum for the scheduled meeting on Monday 9th April and the Clerk is also unavailable. Cllr Mackley proposed that the meeting is moved to Monday 16th April, this was seconded by Cllr Barlow with all in agreement.

15. TIME AND CLOSE OF MEETING 9.50pm

Signed
Robert Mackley (Chairman Parish Council)