



MINUTES

Meeting: PLANNING COMMITTEE 16th October 2020

Time: 7.00pm

Venue: ELECTRONIC MEETING, HELD BY ZOOM

PRESENT:

Councillors: (10) B Clegg (Chairman), A Buckley, R Spearman, T Blanks*
Mrs S Jackman, A Tyler, A Irvine*, Mrs A Grigg*, G Mulliner, Ms C Coop-Rodia

* For part of meeting

Officers in Attendance (2)

Susan De Luca – Clerk to the Council

Adriana Jones – Principal Administrative Officer (Clerking the meeting)

Members of the Public (0)

Members of the Press (1)

P20.041 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (1)

Mrs D Wood. Cllrs Bedford and Cllr Mrs Hawkins are not part of this committee.

P20.042 OTHER ABSENCES (1)

Cllr Stroud.

P20.043 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Spearman declared a non pecuniary interest in EPF/1889/20 – Elmcroft, confirming he would take part in discussion and voting.

P20.044 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

The Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 5th October 2020 had been circulated, and were **AGREED** as a true record.

P20.045 REPRESENTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

There were no representations from members of the public.

P20.046 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The following comments on Planning Applications were **AGREED**:

No	Application Number	Location	Proposal
1	EPF/1625/20 Alastair Prince	64 Thornhill North Weald Bassett Mr James Ruff	Proposed single storey and two storey side & rear extensions.
The Parish Council OBJECTS to this application on basis of overdevelopment, specifically related to the proposed additions to the side of the property.			
2	EPF/2012/20 Alastair Prince	Brook Cottage 60 Weald Hall Lane Thornwood Mrs Rosemary Mathias	Grade II listed building application for damp proofing works to rising damp affecting concrete plinth.
The Parish Council has NO OBJECTION to this application subject to listed building officer consent.			

3	EPF/1889/20 <i>Caroline Brown</i>	Elmcroft High Road Epping <i>Mr Desmond Lees</i>	Prior approval for change of use of Agricultural building to C3 1 no dwelling.
<p>The Parish Council has CONCERNS as to element C of the Prior Notification requirements (Contamination Risk on Site), and respectfully asks that the following issues are given detailed consideration, especially considering the works have already taken place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An adequate system of drainage (surface water and foul) is installed to deal with the waste from the proposed annexe, and that this is suitably signed off by EFDC Building Regulations (this is the main issue giving cause to the concern regarding contamination) • Be sure that the need for a tack room to support agriculture / horses is no longer needed on the site • If permission is granted, it should be stipulated that this building would be ancillary to the main dwelling, and cannot be used as a separate apartment for use as part of the Elmcroft Guesthouse operation taking place on the site. 			
4	EPF/2044/20 <i>Zara Seelig</i>	Land at A414 Adjacent to A414 / Village Cars Harlow <i>MBNL & H3G</i>	Application to determine if Prior Approval is required for a proposed installation of a new 17 metres high column supporting x6 no. antennas, together with ground base equipment, cabinets & ancillary development thereto.
<p>LAWFUL, subject to EFDC confirming no detrimental effect to the aviation operation of North Weald Airfield.</p>			

b) To **CONSIDER** any other urgent planning applications received since the agenda was prepared. **NIL**

c) Applications received for information only where comments are not normally accepted. **NIL**

P20.047 DECISIONS BY EPPING FOREST DISTRICT

Members **NOTED** there were no decisions received from Epping Forest District Council.

P20.048 EFDC LICENCES & CONSULTATIONS

NIL

P20.049 PLANNING CORRESPONDENCE

v **NIL**

P20.050 HMRC USE OF AIRFIELD SITE CONSULTATION

On 14th October 2020, HMRC wrote to local residents to provide an update on the use of the North Weald Airfield site as an inland border facility as part of the Government's preparations for the end of the transition period with the EU. HMRC is running a 14-day period of local engagement which will run until **Thursday 29 October 2020**. Links to full details of this consultation and the leaflet, together with a copy of the letter was emailed to Councillors prior to the meeting. Councillors noted that this use was being progressed directly by the Government by way of a Special Development Order, a requirement for which included that an application for Planning permission containing specific details must be sent to the Secretary of State for approval for the use of the land and the operations comprised in the development. Councillors noted that no specific planning application for this site would come to this Council, as it would be dealt with directly by the Secretary of State. Councillors were shown a site plan, and advised as to the proposed entrance and exit points of the site, as well as noting that lorries expecting to use the site would be coming from the M11 (north and south) as well as the A10 and A12 via the A414. There would be 60 employees on site, including a dedicated site manager.

Councillors held a full and thorough discussion concerning the proposal, with the following issues being identified:

- In effect this is an already done deal
- How would HMRC ensure lorries using the site would stick to the main roads and not use other less suitable roads, such as Church Lane?
- A large amount of additional directional signage will be needed
- SatNavs will simply direct the lorries to the quickest route to the M25, which may mean through North Weald and Epping, taking vehicles down unsuitable roads.
- No parking / place for vehicle to wait if the site is full – how will HMRC manage this?
- How do HGV drivers know not to attend the site if the site is full, and how are HMRC going to manage this?
- No overnight parking on site for HGV drivers – what does this mean for potential problems?
- No parking wardens or marshals outside the site to manage potential waiting lorries along Merlin Way, Rayley Lane and surrounding roads
- If the site is full, will lorries be turned away, and if so where will they go / wait?
- How will the figure of 53 lorries be managed?
- Traffic flow – impact on A414, especially if there is a problem on the M11 – how will this be managed?
- How are HMRC going to make sure lorries stick to the routes they are given?
- We cannot have lorries going through North Weald or Thornwood, as roads will be gridlocked.
- When imports come in, are they doing a ‘sealed check’ on the containers?
- Will HGVs be made to leave the site straight away after the vehicle checks are complete?
- What happens to the lorries if the site is full, and what happens if lorry drivers are unable to travel to the next inland border site due to timing and Tacho?
- Residents in Hastingwood have not been consulted, yet they will be affected? Who has been consulted?
- How will entrance to Church Lane via Vicarage Lane be physically restricted, thus stopping Church Lane being used as a rat run for these lorries?
- Should a narrower entrance be arranged for Church Lane?
- Articulated lorries already park in Merlin Way and the A414 layby already, and this will be exacerbated?
- Will the A414 become a car park, with untold congestion?
- HMRC are minimising the impact lorries will have on the surrounding roads.
- St Andrews Church and North Weald Cemetery area will be blighted by these lorries.
- How will current airfield users, such as North Weald Market visitors, be affected by these lorries and traffic?
- The Parish Council could assist with advising what signs are needed and where they should be placed in terms of specific ‘no go roads’ for lorry access.
- Should there be an HMRC marshal that stands on the roundabout near the Cemetery actively directing traffic back to the A414 and prohibiting them from using Church Lane and Vicarage Lane?
- How are HMRC going to manage anything in excess of 53 lorries?
- Signage as you enter the site advising how you get in contact with the site, which implies you can literally turn up at the site and call the site whilst you are waiting outside asking to be let in – surely this will cause a problem with lorries waiting on the roads?
- What impact will this have on the village?

It was clear from the meeting that the main concerns were relating to the traffic impact.

Cllr Blanks advised that there were errors on the consultation leaflet sent to residents, and read out his own personal response to the engagement. It was noted that the time taken to process a vehicle

would on average be 2 hours, and that the sites main purpose was a documentary check, however what other checks would be undertaken was unclear.

Part of the planning application to the Secretary of State is to complete and provide an assessment of the traffic impact of the development, and it was felt only right and proper that this Council should see a copy of this assessment. It was **AGREED** the meeting Clerk should contact HMRC and request a copy.

Cllr Clegg advised that pictorial evidence had been received earlier in the day of a low loader using Weald Hall Lane to try and deliver items to the HMRC site, clearly using the SatNav which has resulted in using the wrong road, and this should be raised with HMRC as an example of the problems that will be encountered.

Cllr Tyler advised that when HMRC first starting using the site, the Parish Council had not been advised, nor asked to engage in any consultation, and were effectively left out of the process. The first the Council really knew about it was the notification of £50,000 being made available to the Parish council. Cllr Tyler Suggested a statement should be made on social media to advise that the use of the site was effectively being imposed on the Parish, and that there was nothing that could be done to stop it.

Cllr Clegg asked if any residents had contacted the Parish Council directly concerning the communication dated 14th October 2020 from HMRC, to which the meeting Clerk advised there was one resident who visited the face to face centre earlier in the day, and a couple of comments on social media, however nobody else has raised their concerns directly with the Parish council at this time.

It was **AGREED** that the meeting Clerk would draft a response in conjunction with the Clerk to HMRC based on the points raised during this meeting, and that this would be circulated to Councillors for approval prior to submission to HMRC directly before 29th October. The Clerk **AGREED** she would also raise these issues directly with ECC Cllr Whitbread and ask him to pass these concerns on. Councillors **NOTED** that the Clerk and PFO had taken part in a Zoom meeting late September at which they were advised that the HMRC were intending to complete a period of public engagement over the coming weeks concerning the site, and that during that meeting it was confirmed that a phone number for the site manager would be made available to the Parish Council and the public. It was **AGREED** that the Parish Council should request a formal introductory meeting with the site manager to start an open dialogue. It was also **AGREED** to establish from HMRC exactly who had been consulted with (the number of 1,500 has been stated).

It was **NOTED** that individual Councillors could also respond directly to the consultation.

Meeting Closed: 8.29 PM

Signed Date