



Notes of the Feering Parish Council Planning Working Group
held virtually on Thursday 30 November 2023 at 7.30 pm
via Teams (Meeting ID 314 539 085 729)

In Attendance: Cllr Katherine Evans Cllr Pam Carlaw
Cllr Paul Lees
Lisa Collins – Clerk
Members of the Public: 0

1) **DISCUSSION OF THE FOLLOWING APPLICATIONS**

a) **Essex Planning Officers Association – Parking Guidance Consultation for Essex**

Comments by Councillors: Difficult to respond because it asks you to comment on particular paragraphs and you have to keep referring back to the document. In view of the parking guidance which has recently gone through government, this guidance should be reviewed against that. Unless they make the car parking sizes big enough and future proof then the whole thing is pointless. Electric cars tend to be bigger because of the battery. Unless they have the space then the cars that people have won't be able to park. It would be counter-productive not to acknowledge that a large proportion of people will have larger cars and if they do not have valid spaces the car parking will be to the detriment of the community. We need the spaces to be big enough. Section 7 table 7-1. Concerned about presumptions about the 15-minute walk. Would like to see a distance because someone who is commuting would be quicker than someone who is with a toddler or older person.

Delegated response: Feering Parish Council have reviewed the Parking Guidance Consultation for Essex. We felt that it would be easier to reply via email than through the survey. The survey is very cumbersome to respond to because it asks you to comment on particular paragraphs and you have to keep referring back to the document, which is not an easy task for some people.

Our comments regarding the consultation are that we believe that the car parking sizes should be increased and need to be big enough to accommodate larger vehicles and must be future proofed for the size of cars of the next generation.

On reviewing the 2009 guidance and the current consultation document, we are alarmed to see that the preferred bay size for cars has not changed. Cars are getting bigger, particularly electric vehicles which need to carry batteries and therefore to ensure that people can park their cars on their own properties this needs to be addressed now, the sizing in this guidance consultation does not seem to meet modern cars. We have reviewed some of the larger cars current in manufacture and a Tesla model 3 electric car, including wing mirrors, measures approximately 2,088 mm and a BMW X5 including wing mirrors measures 2,218 mm. Both of these cars would struggle to get into a preferred parking bay and be able to exit the vehicle. It is counter-productive not to acknowledge that a large proportion of people will have larger cars, particularly given the climate emergency and the Government's ambitions to phase out the use of petrol and diesel cars by 2035. If the spaces are not big enough in this round of consultation, it will be to the detriment of the community. The guidelines which have been set in this consultation are actually smaller than the 2009

guidelines for parking areas that have end bays adjacent to solid structures, eg fence or wall). In 2009 the guidance was to allow an extra 1 m for improved manoeuvrability and entry/exit of people from the vehicle whereas the current guidelines allow an additional 0.5 m.

We agree that parking provision for vans in residential areas should also be accounted for. With regard to the Zonal approach, section 2.22, Feering is on the edge of the Colchester Map and is too broad brush to be useful. Accessibility can easily change for the worse when bus and train companies reduce services and road improvement schemes do not take place.

With regard to the accessibility framework, we would question what walking speed is assumed for a 15-minute walk? This is also relevant for the cycling provision and we also question what cycling speed is assumed for a 15-minute cycle?

Question 5 regarding EV infrastructure – section 4.7 states that “Each dwelling **must** have a wall charging unit with a suitable wattage installed and connected to a suitable household consumer unit”, but section 4.20 states “it is **expected** that for new residential dwellings with off-street parking adjacent to the property, wall mounted chargers with a direct connection to the resident consumer unit will be installed. Is this a must or an expectation? What will happen where there is no adjacent off-street parking, eg frontage parking and flats?

b) **Earls Colne Neighbourhood Plan – Pre-Submission Consultation (Regulation 14)**

Comments by Councillors: Haven't include the Earls Colne to Marks Hall Business Park, and Coggeshall and Kelvedon or the Earls Colne to Halstead cycle route along the line of the old railway line. This should be included. Section 7 movement. Section 8 on economy only talks about the high street but does not include the Earls Colne business park as it is an employment centre and a leisure centre. We feel that where appropriate potentially allows a developer too much flexibility. Native species is not a valid comment because of the climate crisis and could rule out the plants used to dry conditions or very cold and very hot considers.

Delegated response: Feering Parish Council have reviewed the Regulation 14 documents. We have noted that there is no inclusion of the Earls Colne to Marks Hall Business Park and Coggeshall cycle route, this is currently being promoted as the Greenway Cycle route and is supported by Earls Colne Parish Council. There is also Earls Colne to Halstead cycle route along the line of the old railway line which has not been included.

We have also noted that section 8, economy only mentions the Earls Colne High Street but does not include the Earls Colne Business Park, which is still part of the village even though it is on the outskirts of the village. This is an employment centre and leisure facility.

Some of the language within the document potentially allows a developer too much flexibility, particularly where it is written that “developers will be required, where appropriate, to invest in new blue and green infrastructure”. Who would decide what is appropriate?

We have also noted that any planting would only use native species and given the current climate emergency, this is not practicable. If you only have native species it will rule out plants that are more acclimatised to dry conditions or very cold and very hot conditions.

- c) **23/02686/ELD** – 40 Hunt Close, Feering CO5 9LN

Comments by Councillors: Cannot see any issue with this as it is already being used and does not affect the current view of the property either visually or from an amenity point of view as far as can tell.

Delegated response: Feering Parish Council have no comment to make on this application.

2)

UPDATE ON APPLICATIONS APPROVED

The clerk updated that the following applications had been approved:

1. 23/02332/HH – 37 Feering Hill
2. 23/02462/HH – Findon, Worlds End Lane

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Date of the next meeting is to be confirmed subject to applications.