

Development Control Committee – 22 May 2008

Minutes of the meeting of the **Development Control Committee** held on **22 May 2008** when there were present:-

Chairman: Cllr S P Smith
Vice-Chairman: Cllr D Merrick

Cllr Mrs P Aves	Cllr Mrs J R Lumley
Cllr C I Black	Cllr M Maddocks
Cllr Mrs L A Butcher	Cllr J R F Mason
Cllr P A Capon	Cllr Mrs J A Mockford
Cllr Mrs T J Capon	Cllr R A Oatham
Cllr T G Cutmore	Cllr J M Pullen
Cllr Mrs J Dillnutt	Cllr P R Robinson
Cllr Mrs H L A Glynn	Cllr C G Seagers
Cllr K J Gordon	Cllr M G B Starke
Cllr K H Hudson	Cllr M J Steptoe
Cllr A J Humphries	Cllr J Thomass
Cllr T Livings	Cllr Mrs M J Webster
Cllr Mrs G A Lucas-Gill	Cllr P F A Webster
Cllr C J Lumley	Cllr Mrs B J Wilkins

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Mrs R Brown, J P Cottis, Mrs L M Cox, J E Grey and D G Stansby.

OFFICERS PRESENT

S Scrutton	- Head of Planning and Transportation
A Bugeja	- Head of Legal Services
J Whitlock	- Planning Manager
M Stranks	- Team Leader (North)
S Worthington	- Committee Administrator

PUBLIC SPEAKING

Mr M Bowman – Schedule item R1
Mr M Bull – Schedule item 3
Cllr J Bond – Schedule item R6

180 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 22 April 2008 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

181 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllrs Mrs H L A Glynn and K J Gordon each declared a personal interest in items 2, 3 and R6 of the Schedule by virtue of membership of Rochford Parish Council.

Cllr C G Seagers declared a prejudicial interest in item 5 of the Schedule by virtue of being the applicant, and left the Chamber during discussion of that item.

Cllr Mrs B J Wilkins declared a personal interest in item R1 of the Schedule by virtue of membership of Great Wakering Parish Council.

Cllr Mrs L A Butcher declared a personal interest in item 3 of the Schedule by virtue of one of her family members having a close association with a relative of the applicant.

Cllr Mrs M J Webster declared a personal interest in item 3 of the Schedule by virtue of being the County Council's Lead Member on Disability.

Cllr Mrs G A Lucas-Gill declared a prejudicial interest in item R6 of the Schedule by virtue of owning a retail business in Rochford town centre and left the Chamber during discussion of that item.

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

The Committee considered the schedule of development applications, together with items 08/00244/FUL and 08/00279/FUL, which had been referred from the Weekly List.

Item R1 – 08/00244/FUL – 254 High Street, Great Wakering

Proposal – Construct three storey building containing 4 no. two bedroomed and 2 no. one bedroomed flats with parking, amenity area, cycle and bin store.

Mindful of officers' recommendation for approval, Members nevertheless considered that the application should be refused on the grounds that the proposed roof was too bulky, the design was poor, the application would be over-dominant in the street scene, and the car parking provision was inadequate in an area poorly served by public transport.

Resolved

That the application be refused for the following reasons:-

- 1 The proposed building, by virtue of the poorly design roof scape and dormer, would be bulky in appearance and over-dominant in the street scene to the detriment of the character of the area.
- 2 The local planning authority considers the car parking provision, whilst in excess of the Council's minimum car parking standard of at least 1 space per unit, is inadequate for Great Wakering and likely to lead to on street parking to the detriment of the free flow of traffic and highway safety. A

higher level of provision is appropriate, given that the village is poorly served by bus services at off-peak times, resulting in residents relying on private transport. Furthermore, the level of cycle provision is similarly inadequate and below the standard for such a location. (HPT)

Item 2 – 08/00287/FUL – Land Rear of 26 South Street, Rochford

Proposal – Two storey pitched roofed building with rooms in the roof space, incorporating pitched roofed dormers to provide nine two bedroomed flats with access off Locks Hill and parking area.

Mindful of officers' recommendation for approval, Members nevertheless considered that the application should be refused on the grounds of over-development, mass and sizing, out of keeping within the Conservation Area and that the distance between the development and the boundary with no. 26 South Street was inadequate.

Resolved

That the application be refused for the following reasons:-

- 1 The development is considered excessive in size and mass and out of scale with existing buildings within South Street and with the Rochford Conservation Area and at 64 units per hectare is considered to represent an over-development of the site out of keeping with the Rochford Conservation Area.
- 2 The windows in the eastern end elevation backing onto dwellings fronting South Street would not achieve satisfactory distance required to safeguard privacy with no. 26 South Street, giving rise to unreasonable conditions of overlooking and loss of privacy to the occupiers thereof. (HPT)

Item 3 – 08/00241/FUL – Land Rear of 28 – 32 Rocheway, Rochford

Proposal – Revised application for single storey pitched roofed building to provide administration and training centre for Disability Essex, construct driveway and parking areas, widen pedestrian and vehicular access.

Resolved

That the application be approved, subject to the inclusion of this application as an alternative development covered by the existing agreement/obligation the subject of application no. 07/00483/FUL to provide a financial contribution of £40,000 towards the provision of changing facilities at Rochford Adult Community College for the playing field users on the adjoining playing field site and to the conditions outlined in the schedule. (HPT)

Item 4 – 08/00198/FUL – 299 Ferry Road, Hullbridge

Proposal – Demolish existing dwelling and construct three storey building comprising 9 no. age restricted flats with associated parking, amenity areas and bin store.

Mindful of officers' recommendation for approval, Members nevertheless considered that the application should be refused on the grounds that it constituted an over-development of the site, was out of character with the existing street scene and provided insufficient car parking spaces.

Resolved

That the application be refused for the following reasons:-

- 1 The proposal, given the characteristics of the locality, represents an over-development of the site to a density of 75 units per hectare in conflict with the Council's policy HP3 and Planning Policy Statement 3 – Housing. If permitted, this would result in a building of a size and design out of character with the area and prevailing street scene, particularly given its close proximity to the nature reserve and the intrusive appearance of the wall/railings along the long northern site boundary.
- 2 The provision of 7 car parking spaces is considered inadequate to serve the 9 flats proposed, having 15 bedrooms, and would, if allowed, result in increased on street parking in adjacent streets to the detriment of visual amenity and the free flow of traffic and highway safety. (HPT)

Item 5 – 08/00323/FUL – 2 Wedds Way, Great Wakering

Proposal – Single storey front extension with pitched roof and oak framed porch.

Resolved

That authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Transportation to approve the application upon the expiration of the consultation period, subject to the conditions outlined in the Schedule. (HPT)

Item R6 – 08/00279/FUL – 76–78 West Street, Rochford

Proposal – Construct part two storey, part three storey building to provide shop to ground floor with 6 no. two bedroomed flats above. Form new access and provide parking areas.

Mindful of officers' recommendation for approval, Members nevertheless

considered that the application should be refused on the grounds that the development was out of keeping with the Conservation Area and that the servicing arrangements were unsatisfactory to the detriment of the safety of motorists and pedestrians.

Resolved

That the application be refused for the following reasons:-

- 1 The proposal, by way of the siting of the proposed building set back from the road frontage with car parking and servicing to the front of the site, would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the Rochford Conservation Area and with existing Listed Buildings in West Street.
- 2 The proposed servicing arrangements are considered unsatisfactory as there is no dedicated access or service area for delivery lorries. The arrangements to allow delivery lorries to exit from the site in forward gear will be detrimental to the safety of other vehicle users and to pedestrians. (HPT)

183 VIEW OF OUTSTANDING ENFORCEMENT CASES

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning and Transportation providing information on a review of the outstanding enforcement cases and details of cases that have been closed as a result of the review.

Resolved

That the results of the annual review of enforcement caseload be noted. (HPT)

184 REVIEW OF THE DUTY OFFICER SYSTEM

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning and Transportation providing details of a review of the duty officer system operated in the planning reception in the Council's Reception offices.

Resolved

That the review of the duty officer service be noted. (HPT)

The meeting closed at 9.40 pm.

Chairman

Date

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