

PLANNING POLICY SUB-COMMITTEE – 31 October 2001

Minutes of the meeting of the **Planning Policy Sub-Committee** held on **31 October 2001** when there were present:

Cllr Mrs J M Giles (Chairman)

Cllr C I Black
Cllr T G Cutmore
Cllr A Hosking
Cllr C C Langlands
Cllr C R Morgan

Cllr R A Pearson
Cllr R E Vingoe
Cllr Mrs M J Webster
Cllr D A Weir
Cllr Mrs M A Weir

NON-MEMBERS ATTENDING

Cllrs Mrs J E Ford, Mrs J Helson and Mrs M S Vince

OFFICERS PRESENT

A Bugeja	Head of Legal Services
S Scrutton	Head of Planning Services
Mrs M Martin	Committee Administrator

ALSO PRESENT

C Baranowski	Southend Building Preservation Trust
V Wilkinson	Southend Building Preservation Trust

121 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Mrs J E Ford, Mrs J M Giles, A Hosking, Mrs M S Vince and R E Vingoe declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 6 by virtue of their position as Governors of various schools within the District.

122 PRESENTATION

Following the resolution of the meeting of Council on 23 October 2001 (Minute 381/01), the Sub-Committee received a presentation relating to the future of 50-54 West Street, Rochford from Mr Baranowski, Southend Building Preservation Trust's Architect. A copy of the Feasibility Study into the Reuse of Existing Buildings at this site had been previously circulated to all Members.

During the presentation and subsequent discussion, the following points were noted:-

- Whilst the buildings were not listed, they were included in the adopted Rochford District Local Plan.

PLANNING POLICY SUB-COMMITTEE – 31 October 2001

- Whilst the viability of restoring the buildings is not a material planning consideration, the Southend Building Preservation Trust were presenting what they considered to be a viable project.
- Whilst the site had been made secure, the buildings would continue to deteriorate whilst they remained unoccupied.
- In the Trust's view, the overriding consideration would be to ensure that these buildings were utilised.
- This Sub-Committee could not consider the principles of compulsory purchase of 50-54 West Street, Rochford.
- The conversion of the properties into residential accommodation achieves the most feasible option for securing the future of the buildings and Members would address this particular issue under Item 8 on this Agenda.
- The Feasibility Study proposed creating a new courtyard development of four one-bedroom properties and two two-bedroom properties.
- The Trust could provide no figure for the percentage of 50-52 that would be retained, but it was confirmed that the majority of 50-52 West Street would need to be demolished.
- The Trust's conservative estimate of the cost of the project would be in the region of £1/2 million.
- The Trust estimated that the programme of works for renovation and new build would last 15 months.

On a Motion moved by Councillor Mrs M J Webster and seconded by Councillor T G Cutmore it was:-

Recommended

That consideration be given to the compulsory purchase of 50-54 West Street, Rochford at the next meeting of the Finance & General Purposes Committee to be held on 6 December 2001. (HPS)

123 ROCHFORD DISTRICT REPLACEMENT LOCAL PLAN INNER GREEN BELT BOUNDARY STUDY

The Sub-Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning Services which appraised Members of the conclusions of the Council's Inner Green Belt Boundary Study. The results of this study would complement those of the Urban Capacity Study and both would be fed into the review of the Local Plan.

The Study had demonstrated sufficient land within the district's urban areas to accommodate new housing up to 2011. The key objective of the study had been to assess the appropriateness of the existing Green Belt boundaries and, where necessary, to amend them to ensure that they are defensible. The second part of the Study sought to establish the suitability of all sites for housing and/or employment purposes.

An appendix listing the various criteria to be used to evaluate sites had been appended to the report detailing the progress of the Study, which had been

PLANNING POLICY SUB-COMMITTEE – 31 October 2001

presented to the meeting of the Planning Policy Sub-Committee held on 4 January 2001.

During the course of the Study, a number of these tests had been refined and others had been introduced. Appended to the report were a list of the criteria used to consider sites, together with brief explanations showing how the tests were carried out.

Following Member consideration of this item the following amendments were agreed:-

Site Details

Adjoining Land Uses – include commercial or industrial

Infrastructure Tests

Include the capacity of doctors' surgeries.

Schools – Request that an assessment should be carried out and published by the County Council.

Other Constraints/Factors

Land drainage – the wording needs to be strengthened.

Habitat/Wildlife test – If a study exists this would be useful reinforcement.

Recommended

That, subject to the inclusion of the comments listed above, the revised criteria for assessing Green Belt sites be approved. (HPS)

123 ROCHFORD DISTRICT REPLACEMENT LOCAL PLAN – FURTHER DRAFT POLICIES

The Sub-Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning Services which sought Members approval for a number of policies to be included in the First Deposit Draft of the Replacement Plan.

The replacement Plan would provide planning policies for the District up 2011. Detailed on the appendix to the report were a number of policies dealing mainly with housing issues.

During discussion, Members agreed that Policy HP23 be strengthened to include an additional criterion, namely:-

e. The impact on the character of the area.

PLANNING POLICY SUB-COMMITTEE – 31 October 2001

Recommended

That, together with the addition detailed above, the policies appended to the report be included in the Replacement Rochford District Local Plan First Deposit Draft. (HPS)

124 50-54 WEST STREET, ROCHFORD

The Sub-Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning Services which updated Members on progress towards achieving a suitable renovation and redevelopment scheme on this site. Members had received a presentation relating to a current proposal earlier in the meeting (Minute 122 refers).

During discussion, Members noted the following points:-

- This Authority had previously refused consent for a redevelopment scheme and the subsequent Appeal had been dismissed by the Secretary of State.
- The Head of Planning Services confirmed that a further meeting between Officers of the District Council and the owners of the site had been arranged to take place in November.
- The owners had appointed an Architect and a further planning application might be submitted soon.
- The owners had indicated continuing willingness to renovate 54 West Street.
- The demolition or renovation of part of 50-52 West Street is the main issue for consideration.
- Any planning application involving backland development would be determined according to whether it meets the necessary criteria.
- The complexities and length of time involved in pursuing the compulsory purchase of these properties.
- The importance of working with the developers, regardless of whether the plan is for an original build or new build.
- The Head of Planning Services would report back to the owners on the discussions that had taken place at this meeting.

Recommended

That, subject to a planning application, in principle acceptance be given to the change of use of the shops at 50-52 West Street to residential.

125 ROCHFORD DISTRICT REPLACEMENT LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATIONS TO GREEN BELT BOUNDARIES

The Sub-Committee considered the exempt report of the Head of Planning Services which considers a number of cases where minor alterations to existing Green Belt boundaries might be made to remove anomalies and produce boundaries that would be logical and defensible in the long term.

**PLANNING POLICY SUB-COMMITTEE –
31 October 2001**

Recommended

- (1) That the Green Belt boundary for land at Park Gardens, Hawkwell; Canewdon View Road, Ashingdon; Ashingdon Hall, Church Lane, Ashingdon and Ashingdon Heights, Ashingdon be modified as outlined in the report.

- (2) That the remainder of the report be noted. (HPS)

The meeting commenced at 7 pm and closed at 10.05 pm.

Chairman

Date