

FELSTED PARISH COUNCIL
Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting
Tuesday 17th March 2026 at 6pm

Attending: Councillors, Richard Freeman (Chairman), Graham Harvey and Clive Perrins.
In attendance Clare Schorah - Assistant Clerk

1. Apologies for Absence

There were apologies for absence from Cllrs Hywel Jones, John Moore and Roy Ramm.

2. Declarations of Interest

Cllr Richard Freeman declared a prejudicial interest in application UTT/26/0475/OP-Millbanks Chelmsford Road and stated that he would remove himself from the meeting when the matter was discussed.

3. Public Forum

There were no members of the public present.

4. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the 17th February meeting were formally approved. They will be signed at the next Full Parish Council Meeting.

5. New Applications to be considered

[UTT/26/0385/FUL](#)

Rosemary Cottage Causeway End Road

Construction of new dwelling and new access.

Comment: *Felsted Parish Council objects to this application for the following multiple reasons.*

This application is a virtual resubmission of application UTT/25/1900/FUL which was refused by the UDC Planning Committee in January 2026. The application was refused, stating that “the proposed scale, form and bulk of the proposed dwelling fails to respond to the context of the site and would appear unduly large”.

The proposed dwelling in this further application has precisely the same “footprint” as the refused dwelling with a minor redesign and revision to the internal layout to deliver three bedrooms rather than the original four with the two main bedrooms simply being larger and one bedroom moved to the previous downstairs study area.

With the previous refusal due to the “proposed scale, form and bulk of the proposed dwelling” the applicant, in their Planning, Design, Access and Transport Statement claim that this resubmission is a “more modest proposal”. However, other than reducing the roof ridgeline height by 20cm, with the footprint remaining unchanged, the overall scale of the building is almost identical to the refused dwelling and consequently, the “proposed scale, form and bulk of the proposed dwelling” continues to “fail to respond to the context of the site” and must be refused.

The proposal of a “backland”, tandem development is also inconsistent with the linear vernacular build character of Causeway End Road. As Felsted Parish Council identified when objecting to the previous (UTT/25/1900/FUL) application, this is similarly in conflict with a number of Policies in the extant UDC Local Plan, the UDC Emerging Local Plan (ELP) and Policies in the Felsted Neighbourhood Plan, currently at an advanced Regulation 14 Review stage, completing public consultation on March 23rd.

Note: It is highly relevant that UDC received a letter dated 16 January 2026 from PINS confirming that the Emerging Local Plan was found sound and the Full UDC Council will meet on 25 March to consider adoption of the Local Plan.

UDC Policies:

Policy H4 of the adopted 2005 Local Plan (Backland Development) states that such backland development “will only be permitted where there would be no material overlooking or overshadowing of nearby properties, development would not have an overbearing effect on neighbouring properties and access would not cause disturbance to nearby properties”.

UDC ELP

Significantly, Core Policy 41 of the emerging Uttlesford District Council (UDC) Local Plan, replaces “Village Development Limits” (VDL’s) with a Policy restricting inappropriate development outside existing residential build boundaries, characterising such areas as being in “open countryside”, stating:

Core Policy 41- States Development proposals should preserve the character and appearance of valued landscape

Proposals will not be permitted if they would:

- 1. Cause an unacceptable visual intrusion into the Open Countryside*
- 2. Be inconsistent with local character*

The proposal is both in what is classified as “open countryside” and is a “backland, tandem” development in a road of vernacular linear buildings, being “inconsistent with local character”.

The application also conflicts with Felsted Neighbourhood Plan Policy FEL/HN5 - Residential Development Outside Development Limits which does support certain developments outside VDL’s, but only where they meet specific criteria, which are:

- Rural Exception Housing, subject to the types of dwellings being provided being consistent with the needs identified in an up to date professionally assessed housing needs survey for the parish and subject to homes being allocated in perpetuity to those with a strong connection on a hierarchical cascade basis to Felsted Parish*
- Limited market housing required to enable the delivery of rural exception Affordable housing*
- Replacement dwellings where the size of replacement dwellings is dealt with on a site by site basis in line with Local Plan policy (See Adopted Plan 2005 Policy H7 – Replacement Dwellings and Emerging Local Plan (Reg 19) Policy H4)*
- Supplemental residential dwellings in line with Policy FEL/HN6*
- Development allowed in exceptional circumstances on the edge of the VDLs by other policies in this plan (SC4 and SC6) where the community has been actively engaged, via the provision of a development brief and where exceptional benefits to the*

community (including delivery of infrastructure requirements identified in this Plan) can be clearly demonstrated; or

- *Sites allocated in this plan (HN2, HN3).*

The application does not meet any of these criteria.

The applicant also makes frequent reference to the “allowed” Appeal for a single dwelling on land on the opposite side of the road (Land adjacent to Oaklea).

However, whilst it is correct that this Appeal was eventually “allowed”, we would point out that UDC had themselves previously objected on numerous previous occasions to applications to build on that site due to it being outside of the VDL, in “open countryside”, with the following comments:

Application Number: UTT/24/1445/FUL

UDC comment: *There is no substantive justification for the proposal specifically relating to the developments needs to take place there or being appropriate in the countryside. The proposals would significantly harm the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside resulting in landscape and visual effects from a number of publicly accessible viewpoints and failing to perform the environmental role of sustainability, contrary to policy S7 of the Uttlesford District Local Plan 2005 (as Adopted), policies FEL/ICH1, FEL/HN5 of the Felsted Neighbourhood Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.*

Application Number: UTT/22/2743/FUL

UDC comment: *The proposal would cause harm to the open character and appearance of this rural site and the surrounding area, as a consequence of failing to protect or enhance the character Page 2 of 4 of the countryside in which the proposal would be set. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy S7 of the Uttlesford Local Plan (2005), Policy HN5 of the Felsted Neighbourhood Plan (2020) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2023). The proposal is not a sustainable development in that it would be unsustainable location, not within a settlement or other site boundary. The creation of a residential property at this site would require future occupiers to travel by car to services and facilities. As such, the proposed development would be contrary Policy S7 of the Uttlesford Local Plan (2005) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).*

Application Number: UTT/21/0193/FUL

UDC comment: *The site is outside of development limits and would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the countryside, contrary to Policy S7 of the adopted Uttlesford Local Plan 2005, and Policy FEL/HN5 of the "Made" Felsted Neighbourhood Plan 2020. It is also relevant that when allowing the Appeal for the site immediately opposite, because of the very narrow road with nearby bends prohibiting any safe “on road” parking coupled with the absence of any suitable “off road” land to facilitate either the safe parking of construction workers vehicles or even the temporary stoppage of large delivery vehicles a construction management plan was required in order to minimise the detrimental effects to the living conditions of neighbouring residents and to ensure highway safety during the construction phase.*

This requirement has not been enforced with recent traffic and parking conditions being a

complete and utter disaster resulting in unrestricted “on road” parking and total road blockages (with complaints to the Parish Council), proving that development at this site location is wholly inappropriate.

In view of the above reasons, for UDC to allow this application for a backland, tandem development in this location in “open countryside” following UDC’s previous repeated refusals for the land opposite would be wholly inconsistent and in light of UDC’s recent refusal of UTT/25/1900/FUL which was for an almost identical proposal, would be totally bizarre.

Felsted Parish Council also has concerns over the ability to meet the normal and standard requirements for visibility sight lines without creating a further significant impact on the existing “rural characteristic” of the site.

There is currently a very well-established and mature laurel hedge across the full frontage of the site and additionally an existing boundary hedge adjoining the neighbouring Kew Cottage.

The normal specification for the introduction of any new access onto the public highway insisted on by ECC Highways, includes the following requirement:

“There shall be no obstruction above 0.6m in height within a 2.4m wide parallel band visibility splay required across the entire site frontage as measured from the edge of the carriageway. Such vehicular visibility spays shall be provided before the access is first used by vehicular traffic and retained, free of any obstruction at all times”.

We question how this requirement can be achieved from a visibility point 2.4 meters back from the site boundary without the need for the total removal of the existing mature hedges which would seriously impact the rural nature and negatively impacting the street scene, causing harm to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area, failing to protect or enhance the character of the countryside in which the proposal would be set and failing to respect the prevailing pattern and form of development of the part of Felsted that it directly adjoins.

There is also an existing telegraph / electrical supply pole at the access point which must restrict visibility which is not mentioned in the application. Felsted Parish Council therefore assume that for ECC Highways to raise no objection to the claimed visibility sight lines, they must have undertaken a “desktop” assessment rather than conduct an “on site” evaluation.

For the multiple justified reasons and conflicts with Policies in the Extant 2005 UDC Local Plan, the UDC Emerging Local Plan and Felsted Neighbourhood plan Policies, Felsted Parish Council objects to this application.

[UTT/26/0420/AV](#)

The Chequers Inn Braintree Road

New external signage and lighting.

Comment: Felsted Parish Council supports this application because the proposed new signage and lighting will be a positive addition to the building.

[UTT/26/0249/HHF](#)

Rose Cottage Braintree Road

3.2m x 1.97m garden building.

No Comment.

[UTT/26/0442/LB](#) / [UTT/26/0441/HHF](#)

Bury Chase Cottage Bury Chase

Proposed alterations to existing rear attached garage and conversion to form part of habitable space with related internal alterations. External alterations to enlarged garden area to form private parking area.

Comment: Felsted Parish Council supports this application because it believes that the proposed changes will make a positive improvement to maintain this listed building.

[UTT/26/0473/HHF](#)

1 The Hawthorns

Single storey side extension.

No Comment.

[UTT/26/0475/OP](#)

Millbanks Chelmsford Road

Outline application with all matters reserved for the erection of 3 no. dwellings.

Clerks Note: Cllr Freeman removed himself from the meeting at the discussion of this application due to a prejudicial interest. This resulted in the meeting not being quorate so the application could not be discussed. It was decided to agree upon a response with the rest of the committee by email in order to meet the submission deadline.

Comment: This application for 3 no. dwellings is in a particularly sensitive site being in the existing gardens of Millbanks, a significant grade two listed farm house. Adjacent to its southern boundary is a site where a planning application for 5 Gypsy families with two caravans each and five utility buildings has been approved on appeal by the planning inspectorate Ref:APP/C1570/W/24/3348002 following refusal by Uttlesford District Planning Ref:UTT/23/2526/Ful and not supported by Felsted Parish Council.

It is also, as acknowledged in the applicants planning statement, located outside the current settlement boundary.

New construction is often a very contentious and emotive subject in many communities particularly so in a tight knit historic community as is Felsted. FPC with its early adoption of a neighbourhood plan and UDC have attempted to find a way to achieve challenging targets for new homes. By supporting some controlled development, the Felsted community has achieved a significant part of its housing targets. By including windfall sites, the target left to achieve is now near 75 no dwellings.

Currently there are live applications for some 200 no. dwellings for Felsted. Of these FPC has given qualified support to some 92no. dwellings, thus exceeding the challenging targets set if permission is granted. (FELREV/HN1)

This application is not supported by Felsted Parish council for many significant reasons including:

1) *Infill*

Place Services Historic Buildings and Conservation advice make reference to this concern quoting the allowed appeal (APP/C1570/W/24/3348002) for a proposed development (UTT/23/2526/Full) in the field to the south of Milbanks garden

“Paragraph 58 of the decision notice also emphasises the physical separation provided by the garden. The appeal decision thus identifies the importance of the garden at Millbanks in providing a degree of separation from the new development to the south. I would not interpret this to mean that residential infill development should be considered acceptable with regards setting and significance of the listed building”

2) *Whilst we do not challenge the applicants submitted planning statement 5.32 (see below) on volume of traffic, we do however feel it significantly avoids recognising the additional risk generated by additional vehicular entrance and egress from the site onto a very busy road without any additional risk mitigation.*

“5.32. Chelmsford Road is a single-lane carriageway and is subject to a 60mph speed limit in the vicinity of the site frontage. Approximately 370m to the north of the site, the speed limit reduces to 30mph on entering Causeway End, Felsted. It is considered that the additional traffic movements likely to be generated by three additional dwellings would not be significant within the context of the volume of traffic already using Chelmsford Road.”

3) *Location outside settlement boundary*

We have significant concerns. The current transition from countryside to the hamlet of Causeway End on the outer fringes of Felsted village is appropriate and gradual. The modern development will devalue this and detract from the significance of Millbrook Farmhouse. Whilst we acknowledge the proposed development is of one and a half storey dwellings they will still be very visible from the road.

For these reasons we respectfully request this application is refused and as much weight as possible given to the extant and emerging Felsted Neighbourhood Plan and the emerging UDC local plan. A refusal will certainly give the Felsted community even more confidence in the value of a neighbourhood plan and justify the difficult and at times controversial need of acceptance in front loading support of other sites included in the emerging Felsted neighbourhood plan which is in the public domain at Regulation 14 stage.

6. Decisions received since 17th February

[UTT/25/3377/FUL](#)

Land At Molehill Green Road

Construct a single storey, 3 bedroom self-build residential log cabin.

Permission Refused - 24th February 2026 *'The application site lies outside the defined settlement development limits of any village or town...The proposal would by reason of its introduction of inappropriate built form would amount and contribute to a development that would appear dominant and visually intrusive that would have a harmful impact upon the rural character and appearance of the area.*

The proposals would significantly harm the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside resulting in landscape and visual effects and failing to perform the environmental role of sustainability

The application site is located to the North-East of Grade II listed building known as 'Lower Rays Farm' and to the North-West of 2no Grade II listed buildings at Willows Farm...Due to

proposed replacement dwellings inappropriate size, scale, materials and siting, the proposals would detract from and fail to preserve the setting which is significant in its own rights as well as the experience of the designated heritage asset of the listed building and thereby resulting in less than substantial harm to the setting and significance of the heritage asset.

The proposal would introduce a new dwelling in the countryside where development is resisted unless it is sustainable and is located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities... The proposed development would not be a suitable location for housing having regard to the accessibility of services and facilities.

Due to the rural location, the undeveloped nature of the site and the location within an Amber Zone for risk to Great Crested Newts in particular, there is a real likelihood that protected species and habitats may be present in the site. The application presents no information to convince the authority as to the presence or absence of protected wildlife nor that the development could avoid harm to protected species and their habitats.'

7. Enforcement Update

The Assistant Clerk provided an Enforcement update.

8. Hedgehog Grove Solar Farm

Felsted Parish Council is waiting for a formal planning application for this proposed solar farm.

9. Braintree Local Plan (Regulation 18) Consultation

No Comment.

10. Draft Local Plans - Uttlesford DC, Braintree DC

No Comment.

11. Other Urgent Planning Business and Future Dates

a. Cllr Richard Freeman has commented on the Uttlesford District Council Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) survey and the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government Consultation on significant revisions to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on behalf of Felsted Parish Council .

b. It was noted that the following application has made an Appeal to to the Secretary of State against the decision of Uttlesford District Council to refuse planning application:

[UTT/25/3150/LB](#)

Three Horse Shoes Bannister Green

Replacement of 2 no. doors and 13 no. windows.

Felsted Parish Council's response to Uttlesford District Council will be taken into consideration at the Appeal.

Next Meeting is 21st April 2026 online using Zoom.

..... 6th May 2026 Chairman

Planning Information for Residents

Residents wishing to make comments on Planning Applications or view other comments can go to the Uttlesford District Council Website: <https://publicaccess.submitted.uttlesford.gov.uk/online-applications>.

To find out more about Appeals please go to the Planning Inspectorate Website: <https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

More information about the Planning Process is available here: <https://felsted-pc.gov.uk/planning/>

To find out more about Felsted's Neighbourhood Plan please visit our webpage here: <https://felsted-pc.gov.uk/felsted-neighbourhood-plan>