

Minutes
of the extraordinary meeting of
MAYLAND PARISH COUNCIL
held in the Lawling Park Hall
on Tuesday 24th March 2015
at 7.04 p.m.

Present

Cllr Evans (Chairman)
Cllr Duncan
Cllr Hawkes
Cllr Robinson

Cllr Oatham
Cllr Pettitt
Cllr Spires
Mrs Massenhove (Clerk)

D Cllr Mrs Penny Channer
6 residents

The Chairman informed all present that, for ease, the larger planning application would be addressed first. Decisions are minuted in their original place on the agenda.

188. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Cllr Massenhove.

189. Declaration of Interests

No interests were declared.

190. Public Discussion

The Chairman closed the meeting at 7.05 p.m. for public discussion.

Residents raised a number of concerns relating to planning application number OUT/MAL/15/00179: -

- Traffic
 - It was felt that there are a number of inaccuracies in the application regarding traffic flow.
 - The survey does not take into account the extra traffic in Wembley Avenue and Princes Avenue accessing the amenities.
 - The 'true' rush hour for the area has not been taken into account.
 - Travel to work only is considered – travel to school, the shops and other amenities has not been taken into account.
 - There is already a considerable traffic flow on the one access road (Nipsells Chase), plus there is a significant amount of parking on that road and it is also a bus route.
 - Construction traffic would cause great difficulty.
- The walk along the existing footpath, which is owned by residents, would be spoiled.
- There are too many houses for the area.
- The open spaces are too small.
- There is no northern escape route, in the event of an emergency, the only way out would be via Nipsells Chase.
- Concern for wildlife.
- The proposed development does not fit with the Neighbourhood Plan: -
 - 150 extra houses would restrict what can be done with the NP.
 - More houses are needed, but this should be a steady flow of houses available for local people.

Cllr Spires responded with his views on the planning application: -

- He referred to the Localism Act 2011. Allocation of land outside the present Mayland/sea development boundary needs to be part of a balanced plan encompassing all community needs including housing and be compliant with all levels of planning policy. It must be done in consultation with neighbouring parishes – for example Althorne and Steeple share the limited sewerage treatment works capacity with Mayland.
- A development of this size would represent a considerable increase to the size of the village. It is essential that all community requirements are considered.
 - It is a requirement that the children's play area must be sized and situated to accommodate all children within half a mile radius of the proposal. Land allocated to any rainwater mitigation scheme should not form part of the sports/play area calculation.
 - There is no proposal for fibre broadband provision – a requirement identified by Mayland Parish survey.
- Road widths and turning circles must accommodate emergency vehicles.
- The 30% affordable housing within this application does not meet the 40% requirement for developments exceeding 50 dwellings.

Cllr Oatham expressed concern that 450 additional bedrooms would cause a lot more additional traffic as families grow older. If there was a major incident in the Dengie, all evacuation would be via Latchingdon or Burnham Road. Buses are inadequate and travel by car is necessary to reach a train station. He added that he hoped the District Councillors would support us.

Cllr Robinson reiterated the need to consider the cumulative impact of proposed development, in this and nearby villages, on the wider traffic network. She questioned the accuracy and relevance of information provided in the Transport Assessment: -

- Para 2.4 states that parking on Nipsells Chase is sporadic; however, this is not the case, in particular the stretch from Wembley Avenue to the junction with Steeple Road.
- At para 2.8 to 2.12, the information is totally misleading. 2.8 states that traffic surveys were carried out at the Nipsells Chase/Steeple Road priority junction. However, the figures shown are not for this traffic survey and this does not appear in the report or the appendices. The Figures quoted in 2.11 are actually for a point 112m north of Orchard Drive. A survey should be undertaken at the junction of Nipsells Chase and Steeple Road.
- Para 2.12 states that the average speed is 13.6 to 15.2 mph. This is also at a point 112m north of Orchard Drive. This is at a point where the road changes from surfaced to unsurfaced, it is narrow, and there is a bend obstructing the view. These figures are therefore meaningless.
- Para 2.15 states that pedestrian routes link to a range of local facilities. The route referred to includes an unsurfaced, narrow track – which, residents pointed out during the discussion, belongs to residents. Access via the roads is around 1.8km, a distance that very few people will walk, meaning that short journeys will be by car.
- Para 2.19 states that there is good bus access for employment opportunities in Chelmsford. There are very few people whose working hours would allow use of the very small number of direct buses, or the time needed to change routes, to go to work in Chelmsford by bus.
- Para 4.3 Maldon's parking standards are not high enough. Many households in the village have more than two cars. Parking provision should be higher, at least providing a garage plus two spaces for two bedroomed houses, with an additional space for each additional bedroom.

- Para 5.17 states that the effect on the highway network would be negligible. Along with para 6.7 this is misleading as it only addresses journeys to work. Journeys to schools, shops and other amenities must also be considered.

Cllr Robinson commented further on other aspects of the application: -

- Para 4.2.4 of the Planning Statement refers to substantial benefits but fails to outline what they are.
- The reference to the Clitheroe case is not relevant to Mayland, this is not an extension to the existing settlement. In the Clitheroe case, the development is 2 km walk to a railway station and within 800 m of a town centre. Neither is true for Mayland.
- The five year supply cannot be used as an argument for development until the outcome of the recent examination of the Local Plan is known.
- The site itself is not at risk of flooding, but part of Nipsells Chase is, which could affect safe exit from the site or impede emergency attendance.
- Contrary to the Planning Statement para 4.7.3, there are areas of poorer quality land which could be used for development.
- The public open space provided does not benefit us as a village, but is only of benefit to the development itself

Cllr Pettitt questioned whether a development of this size might exceed the rural development figures of the Local Plan to the preclusion of future development. She also expressed concern for adequate parking in relation to the Essex Planning Officers Association Standard and for the limited exit route from the site and the major effects of increased traffic.

Residents asked questions relating to the relative timing of neighbourhood plans, the district plan and speculative development applications. Concern was expressed that appeal inspectors tend to come from outside the area. D Cllr Channer stated that planning applications such as this one are considered by the *full* council at MDC. She stressed that all applications must be judged according to the Town and Country Planning Act, planning policies and their planning merits, that decisions have to be backed by sound material planning reasons. She outlined the current status of Maldon's Local Development Plan, noting that Maldon would like its plan in place as soon as possible so that applications can be regulated.

The Chairman closed the public session and re-opened the meeting at 7.50 p.m.

191. Planning

The following applications were considered and comment to the Planning Authority agreed: -

HOUSE/MAL/15/00144

Proposed garage extension to front of property

267 Esplanade Mayland Essex CM3 6AL

7 no objection. No objection for the following reason - This is considered an improvement on the previous submission and is now a good balanced design. However, the Parish Council requests the condition that the garage must remain as a garage and not become living accommodation.

HOUSE/MAL/15/00164

New detached garage

Puffins 104 The Drive Mayland Essex

7 no objection. However, the Parish Council requests the condition that the garage must remain as a garage.

OUT/MAL/15/00179

Outline Planning Permission for a residential development comprising up

to 150 residential dwellings (Including 30% affordable housing), structural planting and landscaping, informal public open space and childrens play area, surface water attenuation and associated ancillary works, with all matters reserved for future determination with the exception of access.

Nipsells Farm Lodge Nipsells Chase Mayland Essex

Cllr Spires proposed relating the comments made during the discussion to the policies within MDC's pre-submission document as the basis for the Parish Council's response to the Planning Authority. The Chairman seconded the proposal. All in favour.

Cllr Robinson proposed objecting to the application. Cllr Pettitt seconded the proposal. All in favour. The decision to object to this application was unanimous. Clerk to submit a summary and extracts of the points raised, together with relevant policy codes, as reasons for the objection.

For information only: -

AGR/MAL/15/00206

Prior approval notification for a new general farm storage building

Bovill Uplands Mayland Hill Mayland Essex

This was noted.

The meeting closed at 8.15 p.m.

Date of next meeting, Tuesday 14th April 2015