

Planning Services Committee – 30 June 2004

Minutes of the meeting of the **Planning Services Committee** held on **30 June 2004** when there were present:-

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

Cllr R A Amner	Cllr J R Mason
Cllr C I Black	Cllr D Merrick
Cllr Mrs L A Butcher	Cllr G A Mockford
Cllr P A Capon	Cllr R A Oatham
Cllr Mrs T J Capon	Cllr J M Pullen
Cllr T G Cutmore	Cllr P K Savill
Cllr Mrs H L A Glynn	Cllr C G Seagers
Cllr T E Goodwin	Cllr S P Smith
Cllr K J Gordon	Cllr D G Stansby
Cllr J E Grey	Cllr Mrs M A Starke
Cllr Mrs S A Harper	Cllr M G B Starke
Cllr C A Hungate	Cllr Mrs M S Vince
Cllr Mrs L Hungate	Cllr Mrs M J Webster
Cllr T Livings	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, R G S Choppen, Mrs J R Lumley, P R Robinson, J Thomass and Mrs C A Weston.

OFFICERS PRESENT

S Scrutton	- Head of Planning Services
A Bugeja	- Head of Legal Services
J Whitlock	- Planning Manager
M Stranks	- Team Leader (North)
N Khan	- Solicitor
S Worthington	- Committee Administrator
F Munson	- Administrative Assistant

273 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 20 May 2004 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

274 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr T Livings declared a personal interest in item R5 of the Schedule by virtue of having been approached by the applicant about the property some two years ago and by virtue of being a Member of Rayleigh Town Council.

Cllr T E Goodwin declared a personal interest in item 3 of the Schedule by virtue of being acquainted with the applicant.

Cllr P A Capon declared a personal interest in item R2 of the Schedule by virtue of being acquainted with the residents of a neighbouring property.

Cllrs T E Goodwin, C G Seagers and Mrs B J Wilkins declared a personal interest in item 3 of the Schedule by virtue of being Members of Great Wakering Parish Council.

Cllr Mrs H L A Glynn declared a personal interest in item R2 of the Schedule by virtue of being a Member of Hawkwell Parish Council.

Cllrs J E Grey, A J Humphries and J M Pullen each declared a personal interest in item R5 of the Schedule by virtue of being Members of Rayleigh Town Council.

Cllr Mrs S A Harper declared a personal interest in item R1 of the Schedule by virtue of being a Member of Rochford Parish Council.

275 CONSULTATION FROM BASILDON DISTRICT COUNCIL – ANNWOOD LODGE, ARTERIAL ROAD, RAYLEIGH

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning Services regarding a consultation on a planning application, namely the change of use of part of the site to a recycling and treatment plant, at Annwood Lodge, Arterial Road, Rayleigh.

Members were advised that the application had now been withdrawn by Basildon District Council because the appropriate Authority to determine the application was Essex County Council.

Resolved

That authority be delegated to the Head of Planning Services to respond in due course to Essex County Council confirming that this Council objects to the application, as it constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt. (HPS)

276 BREACH OF PLANNING CONTROL AT LIMEHOUSE, THE DRIVE, RAYLEIGH, ESSEX

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning Services on a breach of planning control, namely the use of the land for repair of vehicles and tyre fitting using a mobile tyre compressor at Limehouse, The Drive, Rayleigh, Essex.

Resolved

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

277 PARK SCHOOL, RAYLEIGH – MASTER PLAN

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning Services seeking Members' agreement to the details of the master plan for the Park School site, which has been submitted in accordance with the requirements of the legal agreement accompanying the outline planning consent for the development of the site (re: 01/00762/OUT).

During debate, the following points were noted:-

- That the layout information shown within the neighbourhood part of the site was not part of the master plan and was in no way binding on the Planning Authority.
- That care should be taken in designing the main access to the school.
- That officers should explore options for convenient pedestrian access to the school.

Resolved

That the master plan for the development of the Park School site be approved, subject to the above comments from Members. (HPS)

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

The Committee considered the Schedule of development applications and recommendations, together with application number 04/00418/FUL, which had been referred from the Weekly List.

Item R1 – 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.

Officers confirmed that it would be possible to defer this item until the next Committee meeting to enable a site visit to take place.

Resolved

That the application be deferred until the next Committee meeting, after a site visit. (HPS)

Item R2 – 04/00361/FUL – 8 Albert Road, Ashingdon

Proposal – Demolish existing semi-detached chalet and replace with new detached bungalow.

Mindful of officers' recommendation for approval, Members considered nevertheless that the application should be refused on the grounds that the visual bulk of the proposed building was out of scale to existing properties in the locality, that it constituted an unacceptable form of backland development and would create a precedent in the area, that there was substantially less than the recommended 1 metre separation between the proposed development and 6 Albert Road, and that there would be a loss of amenity to the occupiers of 6 Albert Road.

Resolved

That the application be refused for the following reasons:-

1. The proposal, by way of the increased height and increased width for a greater part of the plan of the building proposed in contrast to the relatively narrow and low height and appearance of the existing building, would result in a building of unacceptable bulk and scale in relation to adjacent dwellings, which it is positioned behind. If permitted, it would be detrimental to the level of amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers thereof.
2. The proposal would result in a replacement dwelling sited directly behind another, reinforcing and consolidating an existing poor relationship between the existing semi-detached pair of dwellings, 6 and 8 Albert Road, and as such would result in an unacceptable form of backland development that could in turn establish a precedent against established policies of the Local Planning Authority.
3. The proposal fails to achieve a satisfactory isolation space between the building proposed and that to be retained. If allowed, the proposed replacement dwelling would result in an unacceptable coalescence of built form between the existing neighbouring building, 6 Albert Road, and the larger replacement dwelling proposed that would in turn prove detrimental to the character and overall appearance of the new dwelling within the street.
4. The proposal, by way of the clearance of long established planting and screening to the site frontage and its potential use for vehicular activity and off-street parking, would give rise to a loss of privacy to residents of 6 Albert Road from within their dwelling, which has 3 windows facing and immediately adjacent to this area; this would be detrimental to the level of amenity enjoyed by those residents.

Item 3 – 04/00062/FUL – Service Garage Ltd, Southend Road, Great Wakering.

Proposal – Demolish existing petrol service station and associated outbuildings. Construct 21 one and two bed flats and retail units in two blocks.

Resolved

That the application be refused, for the reasons outlined in the Schedule. (HPS)

Item 4 – 04/00342/COU – Land Opposite Witherdens Farm, Chelmsford Road, Rawreth

Proposal – Continuation of the use of the site for the stationing of 8 touring caravans, 5 mobile homes that have been sub-divided into 6 residential plots, for a further 2 years.

Resolved

That permission be refused for the reasons outlined in the Schedule. (HPS)

Item R5 – 04/00418/FUL – Land Rear of 4 – 6 Eastwood Road, Rayleigh.

Proposal – Erection of building to accommodate 5 X 2-bed and 3 X 1-bed self contained flats on three floors.

Mindful of officers' recommendation for approval, Members considered nevertheless that the application should be refused on the grounds that the configuration of the proposed turning area and lack of stopping area for loading/unloading or to drop off/pick up people was not considered acceptable.

Resolved

That the application be refused for the following reasons:-

1. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, whilst the absence of parking spaces to serve the proposed development is considered consistent with the town centre location of the site, the absence of an on-site turning area and stopping area for loading/unloading or to drop off/pick up people, clear of the adjoining alleyway, is not considered acceptable. The development is proposed on a backland site accessed via a narrow alley. The alley is wide enough for vehicular traffic; indeed, parking is provided at the head of the alley for the occupants of premises adjoining

the application site. The alley also provides pedestrian access between Castle Road Car Park and Eastwood Road and is well used in this regard. The Local Planning Authority considers that the use of the proposed turning area by residents of the flats, their visitors, deliverymen and other callers, would lead to a deterioration in the level of safety enjoyed by pedestrian users of this alleyway. Given that part of the turning area is not within the application site under the separate control of the applicant and that no independent stopping area for loading/unloading has been provided when the turning area is in use by a vehicle, particularly other than actually turning, it will prevent any other vehicles from turning. Any vehicles entering the alley to reach the flats in these circumstances would be unlikely to be able to turn and would, therefore, need to leave the alley in reverse gear.

2. In the Local Planning Authority's view, such a manoeuvre would likely be prejudicial to the safety of pedestrians on the pavement at the junction of the alley with Eastwood Road and pedestrians walking up/down the alley itself. Such a manoeuvre could also result in a conflict with other vehicles driving into the alley and be a source of highway danger for vehicles leaving/entering Eastwood Road. The means of access to the proposed flats is, therefore, considered unsatisfactory and inadequate and contrary to Policies H20 and TP15 of the Rochford District Local Plan First Review.

The meeting closed at 9.42 pm.

Chairman

Date