

Planning Services Committee – 27 July 2004

Minutes of the meeting of the **Planning Services Committee** held on **27 July 2004** when there were present:-

Cllr A J Humphries (Chairman)
Cllr K H Hudson (Vice-Chairman)

Cllr R A Amner	Cllr D Merrick
Cllr C I Black	Cllr G A Mockford
Cllr Mrs R Brown	Cllr R A Oatham
Cllr P A Capon	Cllr J M Pullen
Cllr Mrs T J Capon	Cllr P K Savill
Cllr R G S Choppen	Cllr S P Smith
Cllr T G Cutmore	Cllr Mrs M A Starke
Cllr K A Gibbs	Cllr M G B Starke
Cllr Mrs H L A Glynn	Cllr J Thomass
Cllr T E Goodwin	Cllr Mrs M S Vince
Cllr K J Gordon	Cllr Mrs M J Webster
Cllr J E Grey	Cllr P F A Webster
Cllr Mrs S A Harper	Cllr Mrs C A Weston
Cllr T Livings	Cllr Mrs B J Wilkins
Cllr C J Lumley	

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Mrs L A Butcher, C A Hungate, Mrs L Hungate, Mrs J R Lumley, J R F Mason, P R Robinson, C G Seagers and D G Stansby.

OFFICERS PRESENT

S Scrutton	- Head of Planning Services
A Bugeja	- Head of Legal Services
L Palmer	- Team Leader (South)
M Stranks	- Team Leader (North)
J Bradley	- Trainee Solicitor
S Worthington	- Committee Administrator

REPRESENTING ASHINGDON PARISH COUNCIL

Cllr Mrs P Lonergan

347 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 30 June 2004 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

348 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr R A Oatham declared a personal interest in item 5 of the agenda by virtue

of being a customer of Sainsbury's.

Cllr K J Gordon declared a personal interest in item 7 of the agenda by virtue of being acquainted with the owner.

349 PROPOSED DIAGNOSTIC TREATMENT CENTRE FOSSETTS FARM, SOUTHEND ON SEA

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning Services regarding a consultation on a planning application from Southend on Sea Borough Council for a 'diagnostic and treatment centre' on land at Fossetts Farm, Southend on Sea.

Resolved

That Southend on Sea Borough Council be informed that whilst Rochford District Council supports the principle of the provision of a new diagnostic centre, it has the following concerns:-

- 1 That the design, location and orientation of the proposed building within the site be carefully considered in order to ensure that it has the minimum impact on the adjoining countryside and the Green Belt.
- 2 The increase in activity as a result of this use would be likely to have an adverse impact upon the local highway network.
- 3 The application is not supported by a Green Travel Plan and, given the site's location, remote from a range of other forms of transport, then there will be a heavy reliance upon the use of private motor vehicles, which would be contrary to the principles relating to sustainable development.
- 4 That careful consideration be given to the implications of the proposal for wildlife and conservation and that appropriate surveys and mitigation measures, if required, be agreed.
- 5 That the impact of the development on the adjacent Ancient Monument be fully assessed and that appropriate archaeological investigations be undertaken on the application site. (HPS)

350 EXTENSION TO SAINSBURY'S SUPERMARKET AT STADIUM WAY, BENFLEET, ESSEX, CASTLE POINT BOROUGH COUNCIL

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning Services regarding a consultation received from Castle Point Borough Council in respect of a planning application for a new extension to the Sainsbury's store at Stadium Way, Benfleet.

Resolved

That Castle Point Borough Council be informed that Rochford District Council has no objection to the proposed extensions, alterations and modifications to the store and the site. (HPS)

351 ARTICLE FOUR DIRECTIONS REMOVING PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS (TO ERECT MEANS OF ENCLOSURE AND TO SITE CARAVANS) AT WOODLANDS, THE DRIVE, RAYLEIGH

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning Services regarding the apprehended breach of planning control on woodland at The Drive, Rayleigh.

Resolved

That the Head of Planning Services be authorised to make arrangements for Article 4(1) and 4(2) Directions under the General Permitted Development Order (1995) (as amended) to be served on the land in question to secure the remedying of the apprehended breach of planning control now reported. (HPS)

352 BREACH OF PLANNING CONTROL AT LAND ADJACENT TO FINCHES LODGE, 209 HOCKLEY ROAD, RAYLEIGH (REAR OF THE GATTENS)

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning Services regarding breaches of planning control, namely the change of use of land, formerly used as a nursery, adjacent to the above dwelling to residential use in connection with the above dwelling and the associated structures, swimming pool, swimming pool housing, decking and caravan.

Resolved

That the Head of Planning Services be authorised to take all necessary action to secure the remedying of the breach now reported. (HPS)

353 BREACH OF PLANNING CONTROL AT IVY COTTAGE, SUTTON ROAD, ROCHFORD

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning Services regarding a breach of planning condition requiring the closure of a vehicle crossover, which has not been closed.

Resolved

That the Head of Planning Services be authorised to take all necessary action to secure the remedying of the breach now reported. (HPS)

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

The Committee considered the Schedule of development applications and recommendations, together with application numbers 03/01026/OUT and 04/00503/ADV, which had been referred from the Weekly List.

Item D1 – 04/00326/FUL – Cottis House, Locks Hill, Rochford

Proposal – Alterations and extension to the building in order to facilitate disabled use/access to and through the building.

Mindful of officers' recommendation for approval, Members considered nevertheless that the application should be refused on the grounds that there would be a loss of amenity to properties adjacent to the application site.

Resolved

That the application be refused, for the following reason:-

The proposed extension would have an unreasonable and detrimental impact on the amenities of neighbouring residential properties fronting South Street, particularly through overshadowing and loss of privacy. (HPS)

Item 2 – 04/00457/DP4 – Civic Suite, 2 Hockley Road, Rayleigh

Proposal – Construction of lift shaft and lobby structure extension and accessible WC (to meet the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act – to provide access to the 2 upper levels)

Resolved

That the application be approved, subject to the Conditions set out in the Schedule. (HPS)

Item 3 – 04/00458/LBC – Civic Suite, 2 Hockley Road, Rayleigh

Proposal – Construction of lift shaft and lobby structure extension and accessible WC (to meet the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act – to provide access to the 2 upper levels)

Resolved

That the application be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the Schedule. (HPS)

Item 4 – 04/00545/COU – Ashingdon Hall Nursing Home, Ashingdon Road, Rochford

Proposal – Change of use from residential care home for the elderly to a rehabilitation centre providing residential accommodation and care for people in need of care

(**Note:** Cllr Mrs M J Webster declared a personal interest in this item by virtue of her involvement with the NHS Trust and Parish Cllr Mrs P Lonergan declared a personal interest in this item by virtue of being a Member of Ashingdon Parish Council).

Mindful of officers' recommendation for approval, Members considered nevertheless that the application should be refused on the grounds that the proposal entailed the wrong type of use for a Grade II Listed Building in the middle of a village and would almost certainly result in the closure of the nearby children's pre-school; there would be demonstrable harm to the existing residential amenity of the surrounding area.

Resolved

That the application be refused for the following reasons:-

This proposal in a Grade II Listed Building would result in demonstrable harm being caused to the residential amenities of the neighbourhood and to the operation of the nearby children's pre-school nursery in particular. (HPS)

Item R5 - 03/01026/OUT – Land Rear of 26 South Street, Rochford

Proposal – Residential development on site (outline application) vehicular access to be gained via Back Lane Car Park

Mindful of officers' recommendation for approval, Members considered nevertheless that the application should be refused on the grounds that the proposal would, through additional vehicular movements, cause a danger and obstruction to users of Back Lane car park and would put greater pressure on a sub-standard access onto West Street and also due to the lack of information contained within the proposal, which made it difficult for Members to properly determine the application within a Conservation area.

Resolved

That the application be refused for the following reasons:-

- 1 The proposal would, through the additional vehicular movements, cause a danger and obstruction to all users of Back Lane Car Park and, in addition, would put greater pressure on a sub-standard access onto West Street.

- 2 The application, being in Outline only, does not provide sufficient information to enable the Local Planning Authority to judge the acceptability of the proposal in an important Conservation Area. For this reason, the Local Planning Authority considers that only a full application would enable the detailed implications of development of the site to be fully assessed. (HPS)

Item R6 – 04/00503/ADV – 106 – 108 High Street, Rayleigh

Proposal – Display 1 x internally illuminated (lettering only) fascia sign and 1 x internally illuminated projecting sign

Mindful of officers' recommendation for approval, Members considered nevertheless that the application should be refused on the grounds that the sign, situated as it is within the Rayleigh Conservation Area, does not meet the requirements of Policy SAT8, which does not permit internally illuminated signs.

Resolved

That the application be refused for the following reason:-

The application does not meet the requirements of Policy SAT8 of the Rochford District Local Plan First Review, which does not support the use of internally illuminated fascias and projecting box signs within Conservation Areas. (HPS)

The meeting closed at 9.45 pm.

Chairman

Date