



**GREAT HORKESLEY PARISH COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY PARISH COUNCIL MEETING**  
**HELD ON TUESDAY 30<sup>TH</sup> JULY 2024**  
**IN GREAT HORKESLEY NEW VILLAGE HALL AT 7.00PM**

**Those present:**

Cllr Arnold (Chairman)	Cllr Baker
Cllr Burns Langton (Vice Chairman)	Cllr Jarvis
Cllr Mead	Cllr Sudbery
Cllr Tempest	

**24/047 Chairman's Welcome**

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting.

**24/048 Apologies and Reasons for Absence**

It was agreed that Cllr Banks' absence was unavoidable and therefore acceptable.

**24/049 Declaration of Interests**

No member declared an interest with respect to any item on the agenda.

**24/050 Planning & Highways**

The following Planning Applications were discussed.

<b>241490</b>	<b>Nevard House, Nevard Lane</b>	<b>(expires 13/08/2024)</b>
	<i>Proposed greenhouse and cricket net</i>	

It was unanimously agreed to not comment on this proposal.

<b>241382</b>	<b>Honeysuckle Cottage, 4 Holly Lane</b>	<b>(expires 31/07/2024)</b>
	<i>Single storey porch roof, two-storey rear and side extensions, refurbishment of entire dwelling. Permission for temporary siting of a static caravan for the duration of the works.</i>	

Councillors considered the detail of the proposal with care. It was noted that

- unlike the extensions to numbers 2 and 3 Holly Lane, which ran away from the road, leaving the original easy to discern, the proposal extensions for no. 4 would run parallel to the road, effectively more than doubling its width;
- the extended dwelling would be closer to the road than the original, leaving no scope for landscaping;
- the flank walls were double the depth of the original but featureless and therefore unattractive;
- the ridge height of the extensions appeared to be greater than the height of the original;

- the overall effect of the proposal would be to conceal a simple country cottage within a rather bulky house of no particular style which would be out of place in the countryside;
- the location is particularly sensitive since Holly Lane carries the Essex Way long distance path.

It was **unanimously agreed** to recommend that the proposal be rejected.

It was **further agreed** that a proposal to extend no. 4 in the manner in which nos. 2 and 3 had been extended could be acceptable: it was not the general size of the currently-proposed building that was problematic but the style.