

## Development Committee – 23 February 2012

---

Minutes of the meeting of the **Development Committee** held on **23 February 2012** when there were present:-

Chairman: Cllr P A Capon  
Vice-Chairman: Cllr D Merrick

Cllr Mrs P Aves	Cllr J R F Mason
Cllr C I Black	Cllr Mrs J A Mockford
Cllr Mrs T J Capon	Cllr T E Mountain
Cllr J P Cottis	Cllr R A Oatham
Cllr T G Cutmore	Cllr R D Pointer
Cllr J E Grey	Cllr A C Priest
Cllr Mrs A V Hale	Cllr Mrs C E Roe
Cllr Mrs D Hoy	Cllr C G Seagers
Cllr M Hoy	Cllr M J Steptoe
Cllr K H Hudson	Cllr I H Ward
Cllr C J Lumley	Cllr Mrs M J Webster
Cllr Mrs J R Lumley	Cllr P F A Webster
Cllr M Maddocks	Cllr Mrs B J Wilkins
Cllr Mrs C M Mason	

### **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs M R Carter, Mrs H L A Glynn, T E Goodwin, K J Gordon, Mrs G A Lucas-Gill, Mrs J E McPherson, S P Smith, and J Thomass.

### **OFFICERS PRESENT**

S Scrutton	- Head of Planning and Transportation
J Whitlock	- Planning Manager
M Stranks	- Team Leader (Area Team North)
N Khan	- Principal Solicitor
S Worthington	- Committee Administrator

### **PUBLIC SPEAKERS**

Mr J Dagg	- for schedule item 1.
Mr N Taggart	- for schedule item 2.

### **30 MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 26 January 2012 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### **31 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr M Maddocks declared a personal interest in item 2 of the schedule by virtue of being a personal friend of the landowner.

Cllr M Hoy declared a personal interest in item 2 of the schedule by virtue of membership of the Rotary Club, whose concert in the park has been sponsored by Weston Homes.

Cllr C I Black declared a personal interest in item 1 of the schedule by virtue of having been to school with the builder, although he hadn't seen him for some years.

### **32 SCHEDULE OF DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS / ITEMS REFERRED FROM THE WEEKLY LIST**

The Committee considered the schedule of development applications.

#### **Item 1 – 11/00733/FUL – The Yard, Trenders Avenue, Rayleigh**

**Proposal** – Further sub-divide site and construct one detached four-bedroom house with detached garage to front of site.

#### **Resolved**

That the application be refused for the following reason:-

The Rochford District Replacement Local Plan 2006 shows the site to be within the Metropolitan Green Belt. Within the Green Belt, planning permission will not be given, except in very special circumstances, for the construction of new buildings (other than reasonable extensions to existing buildings, as defined in policies R2 and R5 of the Local Plan), for purposes other than agriculture, mineral extraction or forestry, small scale facilities for outdoor participatory sports and recreation, cemeteries or similar uses that are open in character. Any development that is permitted shall be of a scale, design and siting such that the appearance of the countryside is not impaired.

The proposal for the development of this site does not fall into any of the above categories and it is the opinion of the Local Planning Authority that no evidence has been presented to sufficiently justify overriding the strong presumptions against the construction of new dwellings in the Green Belt. The proposal would therefore be inappropriate and would further urbanise the site on a piecemeal basis detrimental to the openness, visual amenity and character of this part of the Green Belt. (HPT)

#### **Item 2 – 11/00492/FUL – Elizabeth Fitzroy Homes, London Road, Rayleigh**

**Proposal** – Demolish care home and construct new care home (use class C2) and 43 no. dwellings comprising 19 no. two-bedroomed and 24 no. three-bedroomed houses and parking. Re-construct existing access from London Road.

### Resolved

That the application be refused for the following reasons:-

- 1 The site is partly located within an area of Metropolitan Green Belt, as defined in the Council's saved Local Plan (2006). Within the Green Belt permission will not be given except in very special circumstances for the construction of new buildings, other than the reasonable replacement of existing dwellings, as defined in policies R2 and R6, or necessary for agriculture or limited recreation that would keep land open. The proposal represents inappropriate development and no very special circumstances have been demonstrated by the applicant that would outweigh the harm to openness and other harm caused by the piecemeal ad hoc development of small parcels of land on the fringe of the settlement in a resulting unsustainable form, lacking pedestrian and cycle integration with neighbouring and proposed adjoining development. If approved, the proposal would fail to ensure the comprehensive treatment of the greater land release and would fail to bring forward the proportionate contribution such release ought to make to community infrastructure provision contrary to policy H2 and appendix H1 to the Rochford District Council adopted Core Strategy (2011) and policy CLT1.
- 2 The proposal fails to demonstrate conclusively that affordable housing cannot be provided and is contrary to policy H4 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy (2011). If allowed, the development would lose the opportunity of providing affordable housing in the Rochford District and which is one of the key priorities of the Local Planning Authority to maximise the provision of affordable housing through the planning system.
- 3 The proposal fails to provide pedestrian and cycle connectivity to integrate the proposed layout with existing and proposed neighbouring development. The proposal would therefore fail to achieve a sustainable form of development allowing free movement of pedestrians and cyclists and convenient link with public transport as an alternative use of the car. Such need for connectivity between sites is fundamental to good planning and good design and the achievement of sustainable development. If allowed, the proposed layout would prove contrary to PPS1 and policy CP1 to the Council's adopted Core Strategy.
- 4 The proposed detailed design of spaces and buildings fails to provide a high quality design for the site, as expected by PPS1 and the Core Strategy policy CP1. In particular, the central public open space is undermined by its use for parking; the housing has instances of poor window to void relationships, over large first floor windows and poor relationship and dominance of the narrow 3-storey house type. The care home has instances of poor symmetry to the gables, lacks in variation of eaves and ridge heights and is also lacking as to the principal entrance to the building and confusing multiple external doors.

- 5 The tree report submitted as part of the application fails to provide an assessment of the existing trees to be removed and the existing trees to be retained based upon the proposed layout. Furthermore, there is no tree protection plan based upon the proposed layout to show how retained trees will be protected during the development. There are many trees on the site and adjoining the site, some protected by Tree Preservation Orders. Other trees have acknowledged value of some importance. Without this information it has not been possible to assess the impact on the development fully upon existing trees and their longevity and contribution to visual amenity. (HPT)

The meeting closed at 8.55 pm.

Chairman .....

Date .....

If you would like these minutes in large print, Braille or another language please contact 01702 318111.