

## GREENSTEAD GREEN AND HALSTEAD RURAL PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Ordinary Parish Council Meeting of Greenstead Green and Halstead Rural Parish Council held on Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> October 2022 at 7.15pm in Greenstead Green Village Hall. **These are draft minutes and yet to be approved by the Parish Council**

**Present:**

**Cllr. Paul Foster. Chairman. Via Teams.**

**Cllr. Derek Hambling**

**Cllr. Derek Mason. Vice Chairman**

**Cllr. Ian Pleasance**

**Cllr. Jeremy Siggers**

**Cllr. Pat Wickes**

**Amanda Degnan – Clerk to the Parish Council**

**District Cllr. Peter Schwier**

**County Cllr. Chris Siddall (Arrived 8pm)**

**6 members of the public**

The meeting was opened by Cllr. Mason who sat as Chair due to the Chairman, Cllr. Foster being in virtual attendance via Teams. This meeting was the delayed September meeting which was cancelled due to the death of the Queen.

**81/22 Apologies for absence.** Apologies for absence were received and noted from Cllr. Butler who was on holiday

**82/22 Co-option of new Parish Councillor.** Cllr. Mason welcomed the two applicants for the vacant post of councillor for Star Stile. He invited them to introduce themselves to the meeting. Deborah Wass, a Greenstead Green resident, had parish council experience as a clerk in her previous village and participated in various groups in Greenstead Green. Jeremy Siggers, a Star Stile resident, had Local Government and Civil Service experience. The councillors were then asked to vote on co-opting one of the applicants to the post of councillor for Star Stile. The vote was as follows Deborah Wass = 0, Jeremy Siggers = 5. Therefore, Jeremy Siggers was duly co-opted as the new representative for Star Stile. Deborah Wass was thanked for her interest in the post and was encouraged to apply in May 2023 when the next Local Elections are held.

Cllr. Siggers was then congratulated and invited up to the table to join the other councillors in taking part in the meeting.

**Action:** Cllr. Pleasance to create an email for Cllr. Siggers, remove Cllr. Dixey from the parish council website and add Cllr. Siggers.

**83/22 Declarations of interest. To declare any pecuniary or non-pecuniary interests in accordance with the Code of Conduct.** There were no declarations of interest.

**84/22 Item 1: To approve the minutes of the July ordinary meeting.** Proposed: Cllr. Hambling, Seconded Cllr. Wickes. Approved. **Item 2: Matters arising from the minutes of the previous meetings.** 72/22 Highways: Item 1: Parish Councillors reports- Bourne Brook, Gladfen Road, foul smelling water. The source of this cannot be traced. Cllr. Butler is aware and is investigating. Hedges – Burtons Green bridge. The hedges by this had been cut but not this area. The Clerk reported that Essex County Council (ECC) Highways had been informed and it is registered on their portal as a 'defect to be considered for repair as part of planned maintenance.' All other items were on the agenda.

**85/22 Public comment.** A question was asked about Greenstead Hall. On the agenda.

**86/22 County Councillor's report.** ECC County Cllr. Chris Siddal provided an update on the following relevant matters:

- Cycleway has moved on to the next stage with £20,000 approved for the Earls Colne to Coggleshall section.
- Bournebridge Hill – Cllr. Siddal visited the area with the cabinet member for Highways in June to show them how dangerous it is. Repair works were due to begin in September, but further investigations are required. A start of the works is not known.
- Sloe Hill repairs have been delayed. Cllr. Siddall believed it was due to the work being more complicated than first thought.
- Pothole repair scheme – please send any pothole locations to him to be added to this scheme.
- Community Grant –money is still available at the moment.

Cllr Hambling raised the issue of roads being closed for no reason. Cllr. Siddall asked for emails on this matter. He also asked for emails about any leftover road work signs and road repairs not being removed after being reported to ECC Highways.

There being no further questions Cllr. Mason thanked County Cllr. Siddall for his report.

**87/22 District Councillor's report.** Braintree District Cllr. Peter Schwier provided an update on the following:

- Victory Square, Braintree complete.
- Discretionary Fund for Energy for Band E -G. Up to £150. Contact Braintree District Council (BDC) for advice.
- Avian Flu- contact Defra if any wild birds are found dead
- Bournebridge Hill Planning Appeal - BDC not defending this due to the lack of a 5-year supply of housing.
- Halstead Public Gardens won Gold at Anglia in Bloom Awards.

- Big Switch – analogue telephone system is being switched off in 2024.
- BDC Planning Committee have approved the new National Grid Sub-station at Twestead after all of BDC's concerns regarding siting, light pollution, and biodiversity were satisfied.

Cllr. Mason asked a question about how the 5-year supply had fallen to 4.86. Cllr Schwier said that this was due to approved sites not coming forward as expected. The Government had also changed how numbers for housing supply are calculated. If Bournebridge Hill is approved, District Cllr. Schwier encouraged the Parish Council to write to BDC to gain access to the S106 funding.

There being no further questions Cllr. Mason thanked District Cllr. Schwier for his report. District Cllr Schwier than left the meeting at 7.53 pm.

**88/22 Finance: Item 1: To agree the accounts for payment.** Proposed Cllr. Wickes, Seconded Cllr. Hambling. The accounts for payment were duly approved.

BACS/Cheque no		Payee	Amount	Reason
BACs	office Ex	Amazon (paid by A. Degnan)	£40.00	Ink Yellow, Magenta 12/8/22
BACs	office Ex	Amazon (paid by A. Degnan)	£3.99	Black ribbon 9/9/22
BACs	office Ex	Amazon (paid by A. Degnan)	£19.45	Ink Cyan 9/9/22
BACs		Village Hall	£32.00	19/10 and 16/11/ 22 meetings
SO		Mrs A Degnan	£333.34	August Salary pd 15/8/22
SO		Mrs A Degnan	£333.34	Sept Salary pd 15/9/22
SO		Mrs A Degnan	£333.34	Oct Salary pd 15/10/22
BACs		Mrs A Degnan	£29.55	Expenses
		<b>Total payments for October 2022</b>	<b>£1,125.01</b>	

**Item 2: To approve the yearly payment of £59.99 for Office 365 due 1<sup>st</sup> November.** Proposed Cllr. Pleasance, Seconded Cllr. Hambling. Approved.

### **89/22 Planning and Braintree District Council Planning applications.**

**Item 1: Planning Applications.** APPLICATION NO :22/02415/HH DESCRIPTION Single-storey side and first-floor rear extension, and erection of three-bay detached garage. LOCATION: The Cottage, Oak Road, Halstead. The Parish Council raised 'No Objection' to this application.

**Item 2: Planning enforcement:** Greenstead Hall – new entrance opening on the Halstead Road. Reported by Clerk and Cllr. Mason. No information yet from Planning Enforcement Cllr. Mason reported that a new Enforcement Officer was now looking at this. Cllr. Mason encouraged everyone to put in a complaint to BDC Planning Enforcement about the entrance. County Cllr. Siddall suggested sending the details on to him and he will forward it to BDC District Cllr. Spray, the Head of BDC's Planning Committee.

Silver Birch – Burtons Green – New menage and building works reported by Clerk to Planning Enforcement. Planning Enforcement have visited, and the owners intend to put in for planning permission.

**Item 3: Update on Bournebridge Planning Appeal – ref**

**APP/Z1510/W/22/3299178. See Appendix A for Parish Council statement.** The Chairman, Cllr. Foster provided an update on the appeal. The virtual public appeal had opened via Teams on Tuesday 11<sup>th</sup> October 2022 and closed Wednesday 12<sup>th</sup> October 2022. The Planning Inspector had visited the site. There was no opposition from BDC who were represented by a legal representative and Neil Jones from Planning. The only opposition was from Greenstead Green and Halstead Rural Parish Council and the statement found at Appendix A was read out to the inquiry by Amanda Degnan, Parish Clerk. The clerk was asked two questions regarding when the parish boundary was moved and how the parish fitted around Halstead. The Planning Inspector was now considering her decision.

Cllr. Foster has since spoken to Cllr. Jackie Pell Leader of Halstead Town Council and had proposed having the inquiry recovered by the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities. Cllr. Foster had drafted the request (see below), and this had been unanimously approved by Halstead Town Council with one abstention due to conflict of interest. It was also noted that 30-40 Bloor Homes residents in the neighbouring Oakwood Estate have also asked for the Bournebridge Hill appeal to be recovered.

Cllr. Foster proposed the following:

**Amendment to Agenda item 89/22 Item 3 Bournebridge Hill.**

**To consider approaching The Right Hon. James Cleverly MP. Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs and request he sends the following statement on behalf of the Parish Council to the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities.**

**Request to have planning appeal reference APP/Z1510/W/22/3299178 recovered by the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities**

We, Greenstead Green and Halstead Rural Parish Council, wish to request that the Secretary of State (SoS) for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities uses his powers to recover appeal reference **APP/Z1510/W/22/3299178** (Bournebridge Hill, Greenstead Green, Halstead).

The Written Ministerial Statement of 30<sup>th</sup> June 2008 sets out the criteria governing the SoS's policy on recovering appeals. This includes:

- Proposals which raise important or novel issues of development control; and
- Any proposal for residential development of over 150 units or on sites of five hectares, which would significantly impact on the Government's objective to secure a better balance between housing demand and supply and create high quality, sustainable, mixed, and inclusive communities.

There may be other cases which merit recovery because of particular circumstances.

We consider that both criteria have been met in respect of this appeal. The appeal arose from the refusal by Braintree District Council on 18<sup>th</sup> March 2022 to grant outline planning permission for up to 200 residential dwellings at land off Bournebridge Hill, Greenstead Green, Halstead. The appeal was dealt with as a virtual online Inquiry and was heard by a Planning Inspector on 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> October 2022.

Both Halstead Town Council and Greenstead Green and Halstead Rural Parish Council have consistently objected to the scheme. The Parish Council participated in the inquiry and read out a statement, setting out the reasons why the appeal should be dismissed, and planning permission refused.

The planning appeal satisfies the criteria for the following reasons:

1. Braintree District Council adopted Part 2 of its Local Development Plan on 25<sup>th</sup> July 2022. The District Council therefore has an up-to-date local plan which includes provision for housing in the district.
2. At the date of the refusal of planning permission, BDC had a five-year housing land supply, confirmed in appeal reference APP/Z1510/W/21/3281232, dated 20<sup>th</sup> January 2022).
3. Two months after the Local Plan was adopted, BDC concluded that the district could no longer demonstrate a five-year housing land supply.

Councils are strongly encouraged to have an up-to-date local plan in order to provide certainty to developers and local communities about where new development is likely to be permitted and where it will be contrary to local plan policies. The Written Ministerial Statement of 19<sup>th</sup> January 2021 states:

*“This Government’s ambition is to deliver 300,000 homes per year by the mid-2020s and one million homes over this Parliament. Increasing the number of up-to-date Local Plans across England is central to achieving that goal. Local Plans not only unlock land for development and ensure that the right number of new homes are being built in the right places, they also provide local communities with an opportunity to have their say on how their local areas will change over the coming years, and how the local environment can be protected and enhanced.”*

Both Halstead Town Council and Greenstead Green and Halstead Rural Parish Council consider that the proposed development is contrary to policy in that it is not in a sustainable location and that it will have a significant adverse landscape and visual impact on the Bournebridge Valley.

Recovery can occur at any stage of the appeal, even after the site visit and an inquiry has taken place.

We therefore respectfully ask that you request that this appeal is recovered by the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities for him to make the decision rather than the Planning Inspector.

**Proposed Cllr. Foster, Seconded Cllr. Hambling and Cllr. Mason. All agreed.  
Action: Clerk to send request for recovery To The Right Honourable James Cleverly MP.**

**Planning updates:** Land at Russell Road – detached dwelling – Objection. Still awaiting decision from Planning.

The Coach House, Russell Road- Granny annex- the PC had raised no objection but asked BDC to attach a condition that it remained ancillary to the main building and not be sold off separately. The BDC Planning officer agreed with the following conditions attached at Condition 3: to remain ancillary to the main building and could not be sold separately without planning permission.

**90/22 Item 70/22 deferred from July 2022 meeting: Playing Field. Item 1: To consider items raised from the RoSPA report.** Swings - Clerk to send quote from Wickstead out to the Councillors regarding replacement seats. Clerk to contact District Cllr. Schwier and see if the grant for the electric can be used for the swings. **Item 2: To consider installation of small new gate and fence for Playing Field.** Cllr. Mason will obtain a quote for these and is happy to install once approved. **Item 3: Update on new information signs.** These are now in place. **Cllr. Mason.**

**91/22 Highways: Item 1: Parish Councillors reports.** Nothing to report. **Item 2: To consider applying for 'Quiet Lane' status for Russell Road, White Ash Green.** Cllr. Pleasance had approached County Cllr. Siddall with this and it is being considered. **Update. Item 3: Flooding in Crocklands and broken pavement-continuing issues.** ECC Highways do not regard this as serious. Cllr. Hambling reported that the new drains, which had been installed in the village, were working except they were draining into a blocked ditch on the Burtons Green Road flooding a resident's garage. The blockage had been reported but nothing had been done.

**92/22 Item 73/22 deferred from July 2022 meeting Item 1: To consider quote from local tree nursery to purchase trees to replace the dead tree in the Playing Field and the one at Plaistow Green. Item 2: To consider applying to County Cllr. Siddall's Locality Grant for funding for said trees.** These were taken together. After a brief discussion it was decided to approach King and Co and order 12/14 cm girth trees preferably a Horse Chestnut and Sweet Chestnut. County Cllr. Siddall was happy to provide funding for these from his Community Grant scheme. Cllr. Mason will provide a quote for wire fencing and poles. **Action:** Clerk and Cllr. Mason.

**93/22 Item 75/22 deferred from July 2022 meeting: To consider approaching Oswicks for an updated revaluation of the village hall. Action:** Clerk to email Cllr. Butler for a copy of the revaluation.

**94/22 To consider purchasing a picture frame for the parish map which will be placed in the village hall.** The Clerk had circulated quotes for picture frames prior to the meeting. it was agreed to purchase Frame 1 – metal frame from Amazon. **Action:** Clerk.

**95/22 To discuss the replacement of the Chairman in May 2023.** Cllr. Mason had raised this as he wished to understand Chairman Cllr. Foster's reasons for standing down in May 2023. Cllr. Foster explained that he wished to stand down to allow someone else the opportunity to be Chairman. There was a brief discussion and Cllr. Foster agreed to stand for another year if no one wished to take over in May 2023,

on the understanding that this was the wish of the PC. Cllr. Mason was happy to remain as Vice- Chair and take meetings on behalf of the Chairman. Everyone was happy to provide support to the Chairman. Cllr. Mason on behalf of the Councillors expressed their thanks to Cllr. Foster for all his work as Chairman.

**96/22 To receive reports from outside bodies, training courses, Village Representatives, Parish Council Committees and Advisory Groups.** There was nothing to report.

**97/22 To note any items of correspondence.** Circulated.

**98/22 Future agenda items. Planning Meetings, £600 District Councillor grant for electric in Playing Field, email addresses, meeting dates 2023.**

There being no further items to discuss the meeting closed at 8.58pm.

**Next meeting Parish Council Meeting 16<sup>th</sup> November 2022. 7.15pm Village Hall.**

Signed.....

**Chairman – Greenstead Green and Halstead Rural Parish Council.**

Date.....

*Amanda Degnan*

<p><b>Amanda Degnan – Clerk to the Parish Council, C/O Greenstead Green Post Office, Greenstead Green Farm, Greenstead Green, CO9 1QY. 01787 274992. <a href="mailto:greensteadgreenclerk@outlook.com">greensteadgreenclerk@outlook.com</a>. WWW. <a href="http://greensteadgreenpc.org.uk">greensteadgreenpc.org.uk</a></b></p>
--

## **Appendix A**

**Planning Appeal Ref: APP/Z1510/W/22/3299178**

### **Land off Bournebridge Hill, Halstead**

#### **Statement by Greenstead Green and Halstead Rural Parish Council – 11<sup>th</sup> October 2022**

Greenstead Green and Halstead Rural PC has consistently objected to this proposed development since it was originally submitted to BDC more than three years ago. We support Braintree District Council's decision to refuse planning permission. The Parish Council wishes to make the following representation.

#### **Background**

The entire appeal site lies within the parish of Greenstead Green and Halstead Rural. The parish is largely rural in nature with a number of small villages and hamlets, interspersed by gently undulating countryside. The parish wraps around the town of Halstead on three sides – on the north, south and west. The district council has been unable to identify a robust and sustained five-year housing land supply for some time. Consequently, we have seen a number of speculative residential planning applications being proposed within our parish over the past few years.

Immediately adjoining the appeal site to the north is the Oakwood Hill and St Andrew's Gate developments by Bloor Homes and David Wilson Homes, respectively. The land now occupied by these developments, comprising around 292 dwellings in total, was within our parish before recent boundary changes incorporated it into Halstead. The southern edge of these two developments provides a defensible and well-defined boundary between countryside and town.

The appeal site effectively seeks to extend the southernmost urban edge of Halstead deeper into the countryside. The landscape character, in the opinion of the parish council, begins to change albeit, subtly, as the topography of the land falls away to the south

In the view of the parish council, there will be significant adverse landscape and visual impacts arising from the proposed development from the south side of the Bourne Brook Valley. The development would extend the peripheral southern extension of Halstead in the form of a large housing estate. It would thereby exacerbate and extend development in a suburban style, out of keeping with a landscape character which is highly sensitive to change. This is judged to be a significant adverse impact.

#### **Public Consultation**

The Appellant's Statement of Community Involvement, dated March 2019, makes a reference a closed meeting with representatives of the parish council on 10th December 2018. Since

that initial meeting, the Appellant has made no attempt to engage with the parish council, either to explain the changes to the scheme since the application was submitted to BDC in March 2019 or to offer any mitigation or community benefits via section 106 monies.

Section 4 of the Statement of Community Involvement states that the Appellant has encouraged suggestions to how the local community could benefit from the proposed development. It goes onto say that significant community benefits will be provided. Unfortunately, the draft section 106 agreement makes no reference to any benefits for the local community in the parish where the development is proposed.

The Appellant states in the Statement that the scope of community consultation has met with and gone beyond the recommendations of local and national planning policies and legislation. However, this is contrary to BDC's Statement of Community Involvement, dated 2021. Paragraph 8.10 of the SCI states that the level of engagement needs to be proportionate to the nature and scale of a proposed development. The more complex or contentious the proposal, the broader the range of consultation methods should be, to allow as many people as possible to engage with the process.

This is a contentious application, even more so with the adoption in July this year of Part Two of the Braintree Local Plan. The proposed development at Bournebridge Hill has attracted sustained opposition from this parish council, as well as members of the local community, yet the Appellant has conspicuously failed to proactively engage. In that aspect, it has not adhered to the Council's own Statement of Community Involvement. There is no evidence that it has met with and gone beyond national and local policies.

### **The Principle of Development**

The site has never been allocated for development. BDC could have allocated the site for residential use during the preparation of the draft plan but chose not to do so. As a result, the parish council strongly believes that policy LLP1 (Development Boundaries) should be given exceptional weight in determining this application which lies outside the development boundary of Halstead.

This policy states that *"Development outside development boundaries will be confined to uses appropriate to the countryside whilst also protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils to protect the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside."*

Paragraph 3.15 of the Local Plan is of particular relevance when determining whether a development is sustainable. *"Outside of the development boundaries, it is considered that new development would not normally be able to meet the 2012 NPPF core planning principles and that the test of sustainable development would be unable to be met. Areas outside of a development boundary are considered 'Countryside'."*

The proposed development is contrary to this LLP1.

### **Sustainability**

One measure to judge whether a site is sustainable is to look at the proposed layout of the site and determine whether pedestrians will be able to make sensible and logical decisions to walk or cycle instead of using cars to access services.

Policy LPP42 (Sustainable Transport) is very relevant.

*“Development proposals should provide appropriate provision for all the following transport modes: Pedestrians (including disabled persons and those with impaired mobility), through safe, accessible, direct and convenient design and layout of routes within the new development and wider pedestrian network.”*

The southern part of the proposed development will be nearly 2.4km from the only secondary school in Halstead. The Appellant has failed to demonstrate how secondary school children will be expected to walk to school each day, bearing in mind the topography of the site.

The proposed location of this development which is some distance outside the urban area of Halstead will instead lead to a greater proportion of trips by car, many having to negotiate an already congested town.

### **The Partial Construction of the Halstead Bypass**

The benefits of the first section of the delivery of the Halstead bypass should only be given little weight in the planning balance. What is being delivered is a 600m length of road built to a standard width of 7.3m that would constitute the first stage of a relief road plus some land for a roundabout. The remainder of the bypass may never be constructed; indeed, there is very little certainty that it will be. The proposed development will deliver only a fraction (7.5%) of the 8km corridor shown in Part 1 of the local plan. With public finances under severe pressure, the reality is that the remaining 7.4km could only be funded on the back of future unallocated housing development. Until the completion of the rest of the bypass to Colchester Road, we will have significantly more vehicles travelling through Halstead and adding to the congestion at the pinch point at the junction of Head Street, Hedingham Road and Colchester Road which is already at full capacity already.

### **Landscape and Visual Impact**

The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment makes reference to the Braintree Landscape Character Assessment (LCA). The application site falls within the Gosfield Wooded Farmland character area (F1). The parish council agrees with the LCA's assessment. It states: the characteristic features are that the landform gently undulates, that it has an open character with widespread arable agriculture. The key characteristics are that it has relatively high sensitivity to change and potential new development. It goes onto say that new development should be small-scale.

The LCA immediately to the south of the application site is the Colne River Valley (A4a). This comprises shallow river valleys with relatively steep valley sides. The land use up the valley sides is mainly large arable fields. Generally, there are open views across fields framed by small patches of woodland and hedges with trees. The key planning issues within this LCA are that potential residential expansion of settlements into the surrounding valley sides would be conspicuous on the skyline. Views to the valley sides from adjacent LCAs are sensitive to

potential new development. The skyline of the valley slopes is visually sensitive to potential new development which may be visible within open and framed views across and along the valley.

The Appellant's LVIA shows that there are medium and long-distance views of the appeal site from the valley floor at Bournebrook Bridge (photograph 7.3) and from the southern valley sides (photographs 10.2 and 10.3). Appendix E of the LVIA refers to Braintree District Fringes Evaluation of Landscape Analysis Study of Habitats, dated June 2015. The appeal site lies in parcel 5c, in the upper valley slopes of Bourne Brook. However, very little reference is made to views from parcel 5b, immediately to the south which comprises the steeper slopes of the northern bank of Bourne Brook. This has a medium to low capacity to accommodate development. The Study states that "there are numerous listed buildings set within farmsteads in the gently undulating ground in parcels 5a and 5b which reduces the capacity of the landscape to absorb new built development."

### **Landscape Value**

There is clear evidence in the LCA and in the June 2015 Fringes Evaluation Study that the landscape south of Halstead within the Bourne Brook valley is not ordinary countryside of no value but is high sensitivity and is locally valued. The appeal site displays many of the characteristics of the F1 Gosfield Wooded Farmland Character Area. It is arable farmland on the gently undulating valley side. It is highly visible from Russell's Road (photo viewpoint 6.1) and from Bournebridge Hill looking north (photo viewpoint 7.1). We believe that it contributes positively to the setting of Halstead within the Colne Valley, notwithstanding that the new Oakwood Hill development may have some limited adverse impact.

The development would result in a loss of open landscape character. It would also result in a restriction of views perceived by neighbouring residents, people using Bournebridge Hill, be they recreational cyclists or commuters travelling by car and walkers on the public rights of way. All would experience some negative effects from the loss of longer views and a change in landscape character. Panoramic cross-valley views would be restricted and there would be loss of outward views from Bournebridge Hill and from the valley floor at Bournebrook Bridge. The buildings would break the skyline in views from the valley floor. The development would appear urban and intrusive, and the proposed new landscaping would take time to establish. It would only partially mitigate the effects in the longer term by softening rather than screening the edge of the development.

The LCA preferences 'small-scale development within the Gosfield Wooded Farmland LCA. This proposal cannot be described as small scale. Paragraph 127 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history. Paragraph 170 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should contribute and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes and recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. As demonstrated above, the LCA provides an assessment of the particular qualities of this part of the countryside within this part of the Colne Valley. It sets out the landscape setting where development may be considered and provides detailed guidelines and practical advice about

the effect of development upon the setting. The need to protect and enhance 'valued' landscapes, referred to in paragraph 170 of the NPPF, is not limited to landscapes that have either a statutory designation or a local designation in the development plan.

This assessment means that the proposal is contrary to Policy LPP66 of the Local Plan.

*"Proposals for new development should be informed by, and be sympathetic to, the character of the landscape as identified in the District Council's Landscape Character Assessments. Proposals which may impact on the landscape such as settlement edge, countryside or large schemes will be required to include an assessment of their impact on the landscape and should not be detrimental to the distinctive landscape features of the area such as trees, hedges, woodlands, grasslands, ponds, and rivers. Development which would not successfully integrate into the local landscape will not be permitted."*

It is the parish council's opinion that this proposal will adversely impact on the landscape at this settlement edge. It will be detrimental to the distinctive landscape features of the area.

### **Summary**

The parish council considers that, notwithstanding the absence of a five-year housing land supply, there are strong reasons why the appeal should be dismissed. These are:

1. Contrary to principles of sustainability, referred to Policy LPP1 and in the NPPF; and
2. Significant adverse impact on the landscape character of the Bournebridge Valley, contrary to policy