

Development Control Committee – 19 November 2009

Minutes of the meeting of the **Development Control Committee** held on **19 November 2009** when there were present:-

Chairman: Cllr S P Smith
Vice-Chairman: Cllr P A Capon

Cllr Mrs P Aves	Cllr C J Lumley
Cllr C I Black	Cllr Mrs J R Lumley
Cllr Mrs L A Butcher	Cllr M Maddocks
Cllr Mrs T J Capon	Cllr J R F Mason
Cllr J P Cottis	Cllr D Merrick
Cllr Mrs L M Cox	Cllr Mrs J A Mockford
Cllr T G Cutmore	Cllr J M Pullen
Cllr Mrs J Dillnutt	Cllr P R Robinson
Cllr K A Gibbs	Cllr C G Seagers
Cllr Mrs H L A Glynn	Cllr D G Stansby
Cllr T E Goodwin	Cllr M G B Starke
Cllr K J Gordon	Cllr M J Steptoe
Cllr J E Grey	Cllr Mrs M J Webster
Cllr K H Hudson	Cllr P F A Webster
Cllr A J Humphries	Cllr Mrs B J Wilkins
Cllr Mrs G A Lucas-Gill	

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs M R Carter, T Livings, R A Oatham and J Thomass.

OFFICERS PRESENT

S Scrutton	- Head of Planning and Transportation
A Bugeja	- Head of Legal Services
J Whitlock	- Planning Manager
K Rodgers	- Senior Planner
S Worthington	- Committee Administrator

PUBLIC SPEAKERS

Cllr D Muslin, Rochford Parish Council	- Schedule item 3
Mrs A Bates, Stambridge Parish Council	- Schedule item 3
Mr J Bowker	- Schedule item 3

302 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 20 October 2009 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

303 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllrs K J Gordon and C I Black each declared a personal interest in item R4 of

the Schedule by virtue of holding a bank account at that branch.

Cllr J P Cottis declared a personal interest in item 3 of the Schedule by virtue of a family member being the tenant farmer on that land and left the Chamber during debate of that item.

Cllr M G B Starke declared a personal interest in item 3 of the Schedule by virtue of being a resident of Stambridge. Cllr Mrs T J Capon also declared a personal interest in this item by virtue of being Chairman of Stambridge Parish Council.

Cllr P A Capon and Cllr Mrs T J Capon each declared a prejudicial interest in item 4 of the Agenda, a planning consultation relating to a proposed runway extension at London Southend Airport, by virtue of having friends living in close proximity to the airport and left the Chamber during debate of that item.

304 LONDON SOUTHEND AIRPORT – RUNWAY EXTENSION AND ASSOCIATED DEVELOPMENT – PLANNING CONSULTATION (SOS/09/01960/FULM)

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning and Transportation providing details of a planning application for an extension to the runway at London Southend Airport and recommending that Southend Council be informed that Rochford has no objection to the application, subject to there being a number of controls applied to the operation of the airport through conditions and a S106 agreement.

During debate Members emphasised that the proposal would make the airport more economically viable, as well as providing additional jobs in the area. Particular reference was made of the potential for more robust controls on night-time flights by means of a new S106 agreement. Members also emphasised that the proposed diversion of Eastwoodbury Lane to Nestuda Way was a better solution as it would take away the current requirement to close the road for aircraft taking off and landing. Members also drew attention to the fact that the proposal for the runway extension did not result in any risk to St Lawrence and All Saints Church.

Responding to a Member enquiry relating to the transport assessment that accompanied the planning application officers advised that there had been discussions between Southend Council and Essex County Council about this application; the transport assessment provided a robust analysis of impact on traffic at key junctions within the District.

Resolved

That Southend Council be informed that:-

- (1) Rochford District Council supports the approval of the application for the runway extension and associated development, subject to there

being appropriate controls applied to the operation of the airport through conditions and a S106 agreement;

- (2) Rochford District Council supports, subject to additional controls or amendments, the controls set out in the appendix to the report, together with the additional items in section 7 as appropriate measures to control the operation of the airport upon grant of consent for the runway extension, with the controls being applied through conditions and a S106 agreement; and
- (3) Rochford District Council accepts in principle the replacement of the existing 1999 S106 Agreement relating to the consent for the terminal and railway station being replaced with a new S106 agreement to incorporate the revised list of controls on the operation of the airport, these new controls to then apply to the development of the railway station and terminal building (Application reference: 97/00526/OUT). (HPT)

305 SCHEDULE OF DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS / ITEMS REFERRED FROM THE WEEKLY LIST

The Committee considered the schedule of development applications, together with item 09/00521/ADV, which had been referred from the Weekly List.

Item 1 – 09/00510/FUL – Public Conveniences, Adjacent 34 – 36 High Street, Great Wakering

Proposal – External alterations, revising door and window openings and internal alterations.

Responding to Member concern relating to the potential for youths to sit or slide on the ramp, officers confirmed that, in order to comply with building regulations, the hand rails had to be completely smooth; the proposed ramp would, however, be set at a very shallow gradient, shallower than that of the existing ramp.

Officers noted a Member's concern relating to two brick-built pillars to the front of the toilets, one of which appeared to be on Council-owned land.

Resolved

That the application be approved, subject to the conditions outlined in the Schedule. (HPT)

Item 2 – 09/00570/PD – London Southend Airport, Rochford

Proposal – New control tower building.

One Member expressed concern about the proposed location of the new control tower; it would be sited in close proximity to residential properties in the Anne Boleyn estate.

Resolved

That details of the new control tower be noted. (HPT)

Item 3 – 09/00528/OUT – Land South of Coombes Farm, Stambridge Road, Rochford

Proposal – Development of up to 326 residential dwellings, associated accesses and community uses.

Members extended their thanks to Katie Rodgers for her hard work in producing such a full and comprehensive report on this outline application.

Resolved

That the application be refused for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed development of up to 326 residential dwellings and associated community uses would not accord with the adopted development plan, the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006) and would also not accord with the emerging Core Strategy submission, which is currently at an advanced stage with submission to the Government scheduled for before the end of the year. There are no material planning considerations that indicate that this proposal should be determined favourably and not in accordance with the adopted development plan.
2. The Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006) shows the site to be within the Metropolitan Green Belt. Within the Green Belt, as defined in Planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts, planning permission will not be given for inappropriate development, except in very special circumstances.

The proposed development, by virtue of the proposed change of use of the land from agriculture to residential and community uses, would amount to inappropriate development in the Green Belt, which is by definition harmful. In addition, further harm to the Green Belt would be caused as a result of the proposed development including the sprawl of a large built up area, the encroachment into the countryside, the loss of an open, attractive landscape close to where people live and the loss of opportunities for outdoor recreation close to an urban area. There is no need to release Green Belt in this location in order to retain an up-to-date five year supply of deliverable sites for residential development.

No very special circumstances exist that would overcome the harm to the Green Belt and consequently the proposed development would be contrary to Planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts.

3. The applicant has failed to submit information that demonstrates that acceptable mitigation can be achieved to prevent adverse impacts by way of increased recreational disturbance to the Crouch and Roach Special Protection Area (SPA) or the Crouch and Roach Estuaries Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The Local Authority cannot therefore ascertain that the proposed development would not adversely affect the integrity of these wildlife sites, contrary to Regulation 48 (5) of the Habitats Regulations 1994 and Planning Policy Statement 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation.
4. The proposed development would result in a change in the use of an area of land that lies within a Public Safety Zone from use for agriculture to use as public open space, which is considered unacceptable because it would result in a significant increase in use of the land by members of the public, especially given the proximity, relationship and association of the public open space within a large new residential development.

INFORMATIVE

The proposed development fails to accord with Stambidge Parish Council policy relating to development within the Parish.

(Note: Cllr T G Cutmore wished it to be recorded that this was a unanimous decision.) (HPT)

Item R4 – 09/00521/ADV – 61 High Street, Rayleigh

Proposal – Replacement of existing signage, 1 no. externally illuminated fascia lettering sign, 1 no. internally illuminated ATM header panel, 1 no. vinyl window sign and 1 no. letterbox coverplate.

One Member observed that, although Rayleigh Town Council had objected to this application, it appeared to be a reasonable request for minor changes to existing signage.

Resolved

That the application be approved, subject to the conditions outlined in the Schedule. (HPT)

Development Control Committee – 19 November 2009

The meeting closed at 9.00 pm.

Chairman

Date

If you would like these minutes in large print, braille or another language please contact 01702 546366.