

**MINUTES OF AN EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF LITTLE EASTON PARISH  
COUNCIL  
HELD AT 8.10PM ON TUESDAY, 21<sup>ST</sup> JULY 2015  
AT THE MEMORIAL HALL, LITTLE EASTON**

Present: Cllrs. Chris Audritt – Chairman, Doug Wyatt – Vice Chairman, Sue Gilbert, Chris Hindley, Eileen McKendry-Gray, Jessica Rush  
Also present: District Cllr. Martin Foley, Mrs C.Fuller (Locum Clerk) and approx. 103 members of the public.

**1. Appointment of Temporary Parish Clerk for the meeting** - The Chairman welcomed those present and introduced Mrs C Fuller, Clerk to Great Dunmow Town Council, who would be standing in for Mrs J Deane who was on holiday. He explained that this is an Extraordinary Meeting of the Parish Council which he had called as a planning application for 65 new dwellings (UTT/15/2069/OP) had been received and the deadline for comments was 30<sup>th</sup> July. He had negotiated an extension until 6<sup>th</sup> August but to wait until the next scheduled Council meeting in September would be too late.

**2. Apologies for Absence** - District Councillor John Freeman had been invited but was unable to attend.

**3. Declarations of Interest on agenda items** - None.

**4. Public Forum** - The Chairman invited comments from members of the public.

One resident (landlord of The Stag Public House for 12 years) spoke in support of the application making the following points:

- He has never objected to any development in the village.
- Non-residents are his main customers.
- There is a shortage of housing and this is alleviated by new-builds.
- He supports development to support the pub.
- He stated that the refusal of the Land Securities development had been successfully appealed. This was refuted by the Chairman as Mrs Fuller had informed him that the decision has not yet been made by the Secretary of State.
- He stated that the Parish Council had requested a boundary change to place the future Sector 4 dwellers into Great Dunmow. This was refuted by Cllr. Gilbert who informed those present that it will be for the people who ultimately live there to decide if there is to be any boundary change.

15 members of the public spoke in opposition to the application and their objections are listed below:

- Increased risk of flooding. The Mill, B184 and Duck Street have been flooded on several occasions. Waste water has come up into properties in Duck Street and this was exacerbated by flood water. There should be no housing in the bottom area. Problems will be worse in winter with snow and ice. Cells shown on the plans are inaccurate – everyone knows about the flooding. Village gets cut off during flooding.

- Increased risk of electricity power cuts. These are experienced already and more housing will place a further drain on electricity.
- Increased traffic. There was an accident on 6<sup>th</sup> July and a car was written off. An average of two vehicles per property will result in a further 130 vehicles on the road, plus construction vehicles. Job opportunities in the village are small and most new residents will probably commute to work. This will lead to chaos in the village, not a 'small extra queue' as stated in the supporting documents.
- No public transport links.
- Is emergency vehicle access adequate? There is only one road in and one road out of the proposed development.
- Outside of development limits. If development limits are to change this should happen over a slow transition period. Building outside of development limits would set a precedent.
- 65 dwellings are too many. 4 or 5 would be acceptable. No sense of balance.
- Evolution of the village is acceptable – not revolution.
- People are selling off their land and then leaving. It's all about money. They don't care about the village.
- We are a village and not a town.
- Loss of views.
- Pumping station. The pumping station has been getting blocked. There is a right of way to it but it is not possible to get a lorry to it. The track is only large enough for a transit. How will repairs be carried out? The pumping station has not been designed for all these houses.
- Proposed trees will take moisture from the ground and cause subsidence to existing properties. Inappropriate screening proposals.
- Road safety. There are no pavements along Duck Street and this will be dangerous for children going to school. Parents will not allow their children to walk to school – more traffic.
- Schools. The site is well placed for HRS and local primary schools but both are at capacity.
- No community benefit. People have chosen to live in the village as it is quiet and peaceful – that choice is now being taken away.
- Unsympathetic design – more suited to an urban setting.
- Not enough time for residents to respond – cynical about making the application during school holiday period.
- Other infrastructure. Doctors' surgeries are already full – very hard to get an appointment – after school clubs are already full.

A resident asked those present to raise their hands if they objected to the planning application. Almost everyone raised their hand. He asked those present to raise their hands if they supported the application. Three people raised their hand.

Opinions in the room were divided on whether there should be any development on the site at all. Some residents felt that 4 or 5 dwellings would be acceptable. Others felt that there should be no development at all and to allow even a few dwellings would set a precedent and could encourage land owners to sell to developers and

move away. It won't be a village any more; no one will care. Some residents were angered by this suggestion as they would not consider such a thing.

The owner of Stag Cottage reminded those present that an application at Stag Cottage was rejected three times on appeal. He objects to this proposal and invited members of the public to join his Facebook campaign and display posters at their properties.

Cllr. Foley gave advice to members of the public on how to make their views known on the application by contacting UDC via its website or by writing a letter, to be received by the deadline is best, although all comments will be considered up to the time of the decision. All correspondence must quote the application reference number and the respondent's name and address. Cllr. Foley confirmed that the application has been 'called in' so will be determined by the UDC Planning Committee rather than by officers. Members of the public may attend the meeting and speak.

The Chairman urged members of the public to submit their comments to UDC as soon as possible either via email or letter.

In response to a question the Chairman stated that the planning authority must have a rolling five-year housing supply and is meeting this target so far.

**5. Councillor consideration of planning application UTT/15/2069/OP for 65 new dwellings on land to the east of the Stag PH** - The Chairman invited each Parish Councillor to comment on the application:

Cllr. McKendry-Gray did not support the application:

- Flooding at Mill End. Storm cells appear inadequate.
- Increase in traffic.
- Only one entrance/exit.
- Further strain on after-school provision.

Cllr. Hindley did not support the application:

- Duty to represent the views of residents.
- Where are the benefits to the village?
- The village will still evolve without these new houses.
- Increase in traffic.
- Flooding.
- Road safety – narrow or non-existent pavements.
- Schools all full.
- People moved here because it is a beautiful tranquil village.

Cllr. Wyatt did not support the application:

- Traffic – access is on a hill and particularly narrow.
- Access is within the 60mph speed limit zone – accident waiting to happen.
- Strain on infrastructure – doctors, schools, no shop.
- Junction with the B184 is already difficult.

Cllr. Gilbert did not support the application:

- Agreed with all that had been said.
- NPPF requires consideration of landscape impact. This is an important part of the Chelmer Valley and the development would have a large impact on the landscape.
- Effect on Grade II properties nearby, especially Old Stag Cottage.
- Light pollution.
- Access will be difficult onto Duck Street.
- Junction with the B184 – without significant improvements there is an increased risk of accidents.

Cllr. Rush did not support the application:

- People like living here – it is peaceful and quiet.
- There are no benefits in having the extra houses.
- Road safety – children walking to school.
- The development will spoil the whole village.

The Chairman did not support the application:

- The site was considered in 2005 for SHLAA and was turned down.
- All planning applications for new properties near The Stag were refused for causing serious incursion into the countryside and into attractive undeveloped land.
- It will be a blot on the landscape despite screening. Very visible up the hill towards the church.
- It will totally change the character of the village.
- It is an urban housing estate of 65 houses bolted onto the village.
- The road is 4.2m wide with no footpath.
- No parents will allow their children to walk to school – they will undoubtedly drive them.
- Increased traffic through the village.
- Flooding

The Chairman proposed that the Parish Council **OBJECTS** to the application. The proposal was seconded by Cllr. Gilbert and a vote taken: Unanimously in favour. A formal letter of objection will be written and submitted to UDC.

The Chairman thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting at 9.25pm.