

## GREAT CHESTERFORD PARISH COUNCIL

### *MINUTES OF AN EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF THE GREAT CHESTERFORD PARISH COUNCIL HELD ON WEDNESDAY 17<sup>TH</sup> AUGUST 2011 AT 7.30PM IN THE COMMUNITY CENTRE, GREAT CHESTERFORD*

**Present:** Howard Rolfe  
 Tim Fowell  
 Julie Redfern  
 Wazz Mughal  
 Sorrel Gordon-Foxwell  
 David Hall

Elaine Culling – Clerk

#### Action

#### 11/93. To elect a Chairman

*With the Chairman unable to attend to elect a Chairman to preside over this meeting*

Howard Rolfe was nominated as Chairman.

**Proposed:** Cllr Hall. **Seconded:** Cllr Fowell.

There were no other nominations.

Howard Rolfe was unanimously elected Chairman to preside over this meeting

#### 11/94. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received and accepted from **Cllr Francis** and **Cllr Tricerri**.

#### 11/95. Declaration of Interests

*To receive any 'personal' or 'personal and prejudicial' interests relating to items on the agenda.*

**Cllr Rolfe** and **Cllr Redfern** declared themselves as District Councillors.

#### 11/96. Minutes of the Last Meeting

With the following words added to **11/75. Declaration of Interests**

- **“Cllr Hall** declared a personal interest in item **11/81. Thomas Hyll and other Charities”**

the **Chairman** signed the minutes of the meeting held on 20th July 2011 as a correct record of events.

#### 11/97. Public Forum

*There will be 15 minutes available for Public Forum, if required, and the opportunity for members of the public to register with the Chairman should they wish to speak on a particular agenda item.*

No members of the public present.

**11/98. Planning*****Appeal Submitted*****APP/C1570/A/10/215687/NWF****UTT/2109/10/FUL.**

Demolition of dwelling and erection of 3 No. dwellings as approved with revised scheme of parking to the earlier refused scheme ref UTT/0593/10/FUL.

**Location.** 5 London Road, Great Chesterford.

*To consider whether to withdraw or modify our earlier comments in any way or submit any further comments.*

**Comments originally submitted were as follows:**

**Object** – In the spirit that application UTT/2109/10/FUL was submitted, we would like to resubmit our comments for application UTT/0593/10/FUL which are added to the end of this reply.

We find this a waste of time having to reconsider the same old, poorly designed application. This design is flawed and unsuitable for a modern development and has been rejected in its many guises before.

We would like to add a few additional comments.

The Government Directive regarding the number of parking spaces per dwelling, that the agent continually refers to, is for Urban areas. London Road is not Urban but semi rural. The village shop which only offers limited facilities is ½ mile by road and is not guaranteed to remain open. There is only an infrequent bus service. There is no on road parking. **One parking space per dwelling is totally inadequate.**

The B1383 is not a well policed 30 mph zone as stated.

The “revised” design and access statement does not read correctly with section 5 appearing in the middle of section 3. The applicant and their agent have not even been bothered to read through their submitted plans to check for errors. Other errors in the application are the stated fact that the parish council requested retaining car parking spaces within Station Road, this is untrue. In the Sustainable Construction Pre-Application Checklist the tick boxes for cycle storage and recycling storage have been ticked, but we can see no evidence of these on the plans. How many other boxes are just ticked for completeness?

We feel that the applicant and their agent are just trying to push through by default a design that fails on access to the rear plot and parking. We again urge that this application is rejected.

The history of this site and its various planning applications and appeals was considered. At 7.45pm it was agreed to suspend the discussion in order to enable **Cllr Fowell** to leave the meeting to retrieve some additional plans.

Whilst absent, and with his agreement, it was decided to consider item **11/99. Community Centre Grant Application** as permitted by Standing Order No. 8

**Cllr Fowell** returned at 7.55pm and following further discussion it was agreed to submit the following additional comments:

**TF**

1. Planning permission for Plot 3 was acquired under a separate planning application to Plots 1 and 2, with the access from Station Approach. Having failed to secure the access or agreement for access before applying for planning, the developer has now contrived an access running alongside Plot 2, with all parking in front of Plot 1. This access is a footpath only and at approximately 35m long will be an unacceptable inconvenience to wheelchair users, the elderly and the infirm. Such a footpath does not allow for direct access for any emergency vehicles and will be an inconvenience for those making delivery and service visits. The previous appeal considered that the layout would appear contrived and incongruous, and it would generally result in unacceptable inconvenience for the prospective occupiers of the dwelling as well as for those making delivery and service visits (**APP/C1570/A/2140331** para 9).
2. The parking spaces shown are smaller than required under the 2009 Essex Parking Standards. Undersized car park spaces are only acceptable under exceptional circumstances. We do not consider this site to be exceptional. Also to make the car parking spaces the size that is shown on the application a 1 metre wide path in front of Plot 1 has been done away with from the previous rejected application. Even with this 1 metre wide path the previous appeal failed due to “the presence of a parked vehicle so close to the window would intrude disagreeably into the outlook from this window” (**APP/C1570/A/2140331** para 13).
3. One parking space per 2 bed dwelling is not sufficient and will lead to on-street parking. The B1383 is a key road and as such any on-street parking will compromise road safety. Great Chesterford is a rural community, public transport is infrequent and access to it and to the village centre is along a busy road. The directive for one car park space per dwelling is specifically for urban areas.
4. We are unable to assess from the drawings what impact a vehicle parked will have on access to Plot 1's front door. This door has been deleted from this application. As the rear of Plot 1 and its garden are inaccessible except through the house, all access will be through this invisible door.
5. The layout shows no storage for either wheelie bins or cycles and it is unclear how space can be provided that will be convenient to residents whilst not impinging on the already inadequate parking spaces, or access to them. This will be especially problematic for Plot 1 as all bins (large wheelie bins in Uttlesford) will need to be stored in the rear garden with the limited access as mentioned above in para 4.
6. This is the 3rd appeal on a similar issue which we feel is a gross misuse of the planning system. The only difference we can see is a slight increase in the size of the parking spaces to the detriment of Plot 1; all other issues raised in the appeal decision of 14th March 2011 (**APP/C1570/A/2140331**) have failed to be addressed.

**11/99. Community Centre Grant Application**

*The Parish Council has been asked to provide a letter of support in relation to a Community Centre grant application for funds to enable badminton court lines to be painted in the main hall.*

It was unanimously agreed to provide the letter as requested.

**Clerk**

**11/100. Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Parish Council is to be held on Wednesday 7th September 2011 commencing at 7.30pm in the Community Centre.

**Meeting Closed at 8.40pm**

**Signed (Chairman).....**

**Date: 7th September 2011**