

STOCKING PELHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 6th June 2017 at the Village Hall at 7pm

Present: D Nicholls (Chairman) G Mackrell P Lucas M Hutchins
 R Whitefield R Banks J Lucas (Clerk)

Action

| | | |
|-------|--|-------|
| 22:17 | <p>1. Apologies: none</p> <p>2. Minutes of the last meeting: The minutes of the meeting held on 25th April 2017 were signed as correct.</p> | |
| 23:17 | <p>Matters arising</p> <p>3.1 <u>Letter of objection re 3/17/0612/FUL:</u> A letter was sent to East Herts Planning.</p> <p>3.2 <u>Possible purchase of speed warning signs:</u> (see 5. below)</p> <p>3.3 <u>New membership for SPPC:</u> Andy Brown has been contacted.</p> | |
| 24:17 | <p>4. Planning</p> <p>4.1 <u>3/16/1659/FUL application for change of use from vacant pub (A4) to residential (C3) at the Cock Public House.</u></p> <p>Paul Lucas has spoken to Martin Plummer, requesting an up-date on the Planning Officer's response to this application, a proposal which was originally filed in August 2016. Martin Plummer explained that the Planning Department currently has a heavy workload and there has not been time for a full investigation of the financial data submitted by the developer. He added that there is an expectation that Planning Officers must avoid an outcome in which a developer would incur financial loss. Mr Plummer also said that if the application is refused, the developer is likely to appeal and that the appeal process could take a year to be resolved. On behalf of SPPC, Paul expressed his concern at the delay in reaching a decision on the application. In recognition of this, Martin Plummer said that he would meet with Kevin Steptoe on 7th June 2017, to find out if the decision can be brought forward.</p> <p>It was agreed that SPPC will wait for the outcome of this before deciding whether to seek a meeting between SPPC councillors and Planning Officers.</p> <p>4.2 <u>3/17/0612/FUL Erection of two storey detached dwelling adjacent to 3 Mapleside, Ginns Road.</u></p> <p>Planning permission has been granted, even though East Herts Council acknowledge that it represents a departure to LP policy GBC3. According to the Decision Notice, other material considerations have been given such weight that they outweigh the in-principle policy objection.</p> <p>Main consideration is given to the fact that there is a deficiency in the supply of land for housing development to meet a five-year housing supply. This means that there is a presumption in favour of granting planning permission unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.</p> <p>As expected, the site is considered to fall into the category of 'limited infilling', which is permissible according to emerging policy VILL3, as long as a range of design policy criteria are satisfied.</p> <p>Of these, the proposed development is viewed to have either benefits or no adverse impact (neutral) in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting a housing need and providing economic advantages (the erection of a single dwelling is viewed as a <i>benefit</i> in addressing five-year housing land supply issues) • Character and appearance (SPPC objections were noted but not upheld) - <i>neutral</i> • Neighbour amenity impact - <i>neutral</i> • Drainage and flood risk - <i>neutral</i> • Highways and Parking (SPPC objections were noted but not upheld) – <i>neutral</i> <p>However, the site is not considered to be sustainably located in relation to access to the majority of amenities, services and employment. This is an adverse impact which weighs against the proposal.</p> | PL/DN |

| | | |
|-------|--|-------|
| | <p>Reference is made to a proposed single infill dwelling in Brent Pelham (3/15/0132/FP), for which permission was initially refused in April 2015 because it would represent an unsustainable development in the Rural Area and would have a detrimental impact on the rural character of the site and surrounding area. At that time, a single dwelling was considered to make only a limited contribution to the supply of land for housing and the potential benefits of the development did not outweigh the policy objections.</p> <p>However, the decision was reversed in January 2016 following an appeal. In determining the appeal, the Inspector gave weight to paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that, in the light of the Council's deficiency in the supply of land for housing, policies concerned with housing supply, such as GBC3 (LP) should not be considered up-to-date.</p> <p>The Inspector gave weight to paragraph 55 of NPPF which actively promotes housing in rural communities where it would support the local economy, particularly where amenities are shared between clusters of villages. The Inspector also stated that an increase in the level of car dependency is a 'minor harm' which does not outweigh the benefit of an additional dwelling.</p> <p>The outcome of this appeal has been taken into account when balancing the adverse effects against the benefits in the case of the proposed development at 3 Mapleside.</p> <p>It was noted that SPPC members had been unanimous in objecting to the proposal and that no comments were made when the SPPC response to this planning application was discussed at the recent AGM. The main SPPC objection to the application was that it would set a precedent for further 'infill' development. There is concern that the approval of this application will open the 'floodgates' for similar 'infill' applications, which would have a significant impact on the rural character of the area and would be unsustainable in a village that lacks services and amenities. There is also growing concern that the role of local parish councillors is being undermined. The SPPC response to the application was based on the guidelines in the East Herts Local Plan and despite this, councillors have weathered some criticism from the applicant for raising objections to his proposal. As a consequence, the SPPC members are starting to question their value to the community.</p> <p>It was agreed that SPPC will write a letter to East Herts Council Planning Department, to establish how Planning Officers intend to limit the number of 'infill' applications that are granted in future, given that a first has been successful and that the view of local councillors appears to be increasingly irrelevant. SPPC will also see assurances that the need to fulfil housing quotas will not influence the decision regarding 'change of use to residential' with respect to the Cock Public House. Geoff Williamson will be sent a copy of this letter.</p> <p><u>4.3 3/17/1071: Single Storey rear extension at 2 Pelham Grove</u> This is a re-application, slightly scaled down, of a previous application, which was subsequently approved. SPPC agreed to make no comment on this application.</p> | PL/DN |
| 25:17 | <p>5. Highways Ruth Banks has received a reply from Herts Highways, stating that they will not authorise the installation of an independent speed warning sign but that they may consider installing a Council speed warning sign where there is a need. Ruth has asked for details on how to apply for a sign, quoting evidence such as the lack of pavement, the number of large lorries and the level of traffic associated with the preschool. There has been no reply as yet.</p> | RB |
| 26:17 | <p>6. Finance A financial statement for 1st April to 31st May 2017 was circulated. It was noted that funds are currently showing an increase and that SPPC is looking to spend approximately £2000 on a village project. As speed warning signs may now be available from the County, SPPC members were asked to consider other ideas that will be of benefit to the village.</p> | |

| | | |
|-------|---|--|
| 27:17 | 7. General Parish Business 7.1 Neighbourhood Watch are seeking recruits in this area. | |
| 28:17 | 9. AOB/Date and Time of next meeting The next SPPC meeting will take place in July, on a date as yet unconfirmed. | |