

Lawford Parish Council



Clerk to the Council: Bridget Tighe

Lawford Parish Community Hub, Unit 1, The Avenue, Lawford CO11 2FR, Tel: 01206 395898

Email: clerk@lawfordparishcouncil.gov.uk

Minutes of an Extraordinary meeting of the Parish Council held in the Rose Room, Lawford Parish Community Hub, The Avenue, CO11 2FR on Thursday 7 May 2026 at 6.30pm

Present:

Cllr V Guglielmi	Cllr C Guglielmi
Cllr T Barrett	Cllr K Symon
Cllr W Saint James	Cllr L Castell
Cllr M Naylor	Cllr B Chester
Cllr M Kinsmore	

001/2026 Apologies for Absence were received and approved from Cllr D Thurlow.

002/2026 To receive members declarations of interest on items that appear on the agenda. Cllr C Guglielmi declared that he had attended a meeting of the Lawford Tye Action Group but his decision was not predetermined.

003/2026 Public Participation There were many members of the public in attendance including John Hall and Sam Harty from the Lawford Tye Action Group (LTAG).

The Chair, Cllr Val Guglielmi, welcomed all to the meeting and made an introductory speech explaining the reasons for calling the extraordinary meeting were because of the short timescale for submitting objections/comments to the planning department at Tendring District Council which was 20 May 2026. She explained that a previous planning application for this site was dismissed in October 2019 for the following reasons and these reasons were still relevant:

- Harm to the heritage setting of a Scheduled Ancient Monument
- Major adverse impacts on the landscape and character
- Significant concerns for the on-site biodiversity
- the main reason for dismissal was the harm to protected bird habitats because the site lies within the zone of influence of the Stour and Orwell estuaries SPA/Ramsar Sites, therefore a European Protected Site

Cllr C Guglielmi (Chair of the Planning Policies and Local Plan Committee) then gave a summary of where the application sits with regards to Tendring's Local Plan. He explained that there is currently a loophole which developers can use to submit speculative planning applications. The loophole has arisen because of the Government's agenda to promote significant new housing development and Tendring not yet having adopted its Local Plan which would set out the sites where the new housing would go. Therefore, developers can submit planning applications outside those Tendring District Council preferred sites. Once the Local Plan has been adopted this loophole will be closed.

John Hall of the Lawford Tye Action Group (LTAG) explained good planning reasons to put in objections and said it was important to choose the reasons that were important to you rather than just copy those on the leaflet he was giving out.

The three main reasons which stopped the housing proposal in 2018 were as follows:

:

1. Loss of Rural character

When the Planning inspector refused the Appeal for the last speculative developer 8 years ago, she selected this as one of her three main reasons. She said, “this proposal to build houses would fail to maintain and enhance the landscape quality and local distinctiveness of the area and would detract from the key character of the existing settlement, the rural character of the area, and the rural character of Grange Road. These harms give substantial weight against the proposal.

2. Threats to Biodiversity

The Inspector concluded, I quote “the evidence is not sufficient to demonstrate that the biodiversity interest of the site will be satisfactory conserved nor adequately mitigated for by the conditions and designs proposed. This includes species which receive protection under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act. This harm gives moderate weight against the proposal.”

This refers to Skylarks, which you can hear singing today on Tye Field

Barn Owls which you can see quartering there this evening

Bats - at least three species will be flitting around there tonight

and in more detail, there are more than 200 moth species recorded from Tye Field - six of which are of priority importance – the best known is the Lunar Yellow Underwing.

In addition to this, Welbeck claim that they could ensure an increase of Biodiversity on the site – this is called Biodiversity Net Gain. However, Tye Field is 16.4 acres, Welbeck plan to build 95 houses on 8.9 acres, more than half the site, and leave 7.5 acres of green space. They say they will improve the 7.5 acres so that it has more biodiversity than is at present on 16.4 acres. John confirmed that the LTAG had engaged a botanist would be checking their calculations. It looks like they are saying there is very little value on the existing Tye Field – so they can make big improvements to the area that is not built on, however, it is wrong to say there is little value in the existing grassland.

3. Harm to Tye Henge

The Planning Inspector said, I quote “a combination of effects of the proposal could result in minor to moderate irreparable harm to the setting and the significance of the Scheduled Ancient Monument that is Tye Henge. This attracts moderate weight against the proposal”.

Tye Henge is important because it was probably a timber henge built about 4500 years ago, the same age as Stonehenge. There were no large stones around hence the Henge was built from large timbers.

This was a neolithic settlement which developed into a ceremonial Henge associated with the winter solstice probably because it was the highest point in Tendring. There are a few other others like it in East Anglia: Sea Henge and Arminghall Henge in Norfolk, Flag Fen near Peterborough and the Woodbridge site near Ipswich.

Tye Henge is a unique reminder that our community has an unbroken history back to our Stone Age ancestors and there are 1000s of artefacts from Tye Henge in Colchester Museum.

With this new proposal there are several other important reasons to object. Please see below:

7. Inadequate sewage capacity

Anglian Water have objected to these 95 houses because it cannot cope with any more sewage; it cannot offer a connection to Manningtree Sewage Works.

All the sewage from this side of Lawford, including Lawford Green, goes by pipe to a pump at the dip in Wignall Street. It is then pumped down to Manningtree Sewage Works which is next to the Recycling Centre in Lawford.

This pump already gets overloaded many times each year and that’s why there is a sewage tanker there pumping out.

Anglian Water does not have funds to improve this. It has to apply for funds and will not be able to do so until after 2030.

7. Increased traffic

95 homes – each would have one or two cars and estimates are that this will add about 50 Car movements per hour at busy times. Welbeck say that they will encourage walking, cycling, the use of public transport but it is likely that cars will be the main transport. Grange Road and School Lane are not built for this increased traffic – particularly when these roads have to take large agricultural vehicles to farms – sugar beet lorries, wheat trailers, combines etc.

Increasing traffic will only add to the chaos at Manningtree Station Crossing.

We don't want any increase in traffic until this chaos is sorted out.

Essex Highways have said they did not object to the last proposal 8 years ago, so they will probably not object to this one – they have higher priorities. Therefore, this is not a priority reason for objecting.

6. Loss of valued Green Space

Tye Field is currently enjoyed by hundreds of people each and every day. Families, ramblers, runners, dog walkers etc. These people come here for access to green space and the open countryside – not to walk through a housing estate – this is a vital part of Lawford's rural character.

7. The housing density of the proposed new estate is too high

It is about 12 houses per acre – much higher than the neighbouring bungalows along Grange Road and School Lane which are about 5 houses per acre; higher than Lawford Green which is about 9 houses per acre.

So, this is a high density housing estate, out of character and inappropriate for the edge of our village.

8. Outside the development boundary

This proposed development is outside the existing settlement boundary as defined in the Local Plan by Tendring District Council. Usually, a proposal in this location would be rejected, but a Planning loophole exists at the moment because Tendring Council has been told it must double its housing allocation from 550 houses per year to 1063. Tendring Council Planners are working hard to find these locations – they do not include Tye Field. However, until the new Local Plan is agreed – there is a window of opportunity for a speculative developer.

A resident also made the point that the cumulative impact of traffic associated with this development along with works on three substations would be too much for the local road network.

John and Cllr C Guglielmi also responded to questions with the following answers:

- everyone in the household can object – it is not limited to just one person
- people who do not live in the area can also object
- it is better to write a personal objection in your own words
- by objecting we are giving planners the support to refuse planning permission
- there is no time limit on appeal so the developer could submit another application
- it is vital that we get as many objections to the development as possible as planners will consider the strength of local feeling

Sam Harty explained the ways to send in an objection to Tendring District Council were as follows:

- email Tendring District Council at dcadmin.planning@tendringdc.gov.uk and make sure you include your name, address and planning application number 26/00627/OUT
- through the planning portal at <https://www.tendringdc.gov.uk/content/view-planning-applications-and-comment> click public access link. You will need to register. Copy and paste your comments in case you get timed out.

At this point the Chair thanked everyone for their contributions and invited them to stay for the parish council extraordinary meeting.

004/2026 To consider a response to Outline Planning Application 26/00627/OUT

The Chair invited each parish councillor to have their say on the application and the following comments were made.

- a) Cllr C Guglielmi said, after hearing views from the Lawford Tye Action Group and the public, he was willing to write an objection to the application on behalf of the parish council which would include the objections raised at the meeting. This was agreed by all parish councillors.
- b) Cllr Chester said, in view of his experience in planning and transport, was willing to write a section of the parish council's response covering Highway matters especially regard a safe walking route to schools. This was agreed by all parish councillors.
- c) Cllr Saint James said she objected to this development because of the loss of the rural character of the village. This was noted and would be included in the parish council's response.
- d) Cllr Castell mentioned the positive impact on mental health of being able to walk in the green space and hear the wildlife. She said she objected to this development also because of the loss of the rural character of the village. This was noted and agreed.
- e) Cllr Symon said he objected to this application because he, like many others, frequently walked in the area which has a huge health benefit, and he did not want to lose this. His objections included, loss of the rural character, increased traffic on roads and the inadequate sewage capacity.
- f) Cllr Kinsmore said he agreed the objections which had been discussed previously in the evening and would support an objection from the parish council written by Cllr C Guglielmi
- g) Cllr Barrett said he would also support an objection from the parish council written by Cllr C Guglielmi, however, would like the objections prioritised in line with those suggested by the Lawford Tye Action Group on their leaflet
- h) Cllr Naylor said he would also support an objection from the parish council written by Cllr C Guglielmi
- i) The Chair said she would support an objection from the parish council written by Cllr C Guglielmi
- j) It was agreed that a minute of the meeting would be put on the parish council's website so residents could see what had been discussed. Clerk to action.

The Chair then thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting.

Signature (Chair):

Date: 11.5.26