

MINUTES

of the

PLANNING COMMITTEE

held on 1 December 2020 at 6:00pm

Present:

Councillor J A Sosin (Chair)

Councillors L Ashley, H Ayres, S Dobson, J Frasca, P Hughes, R Hyland, R Lee, G H J Pooley, R J Poulter, T E Roper, E Sampson, C Shaw, R J Shepherd and I Wright

Also present: Councillor J A Potter

1. Chair's Announcements

For the benefit of the public, the Chair explained the arrangements for the meeting.

2. Attendance and Apologies for Absence

The attendance of those present was confirmed. There were no apologies for absence.

3. Declarations of Interest

All Members are reminded that they must disclose any interests they knew they had in items of business on the meeting's agenda and that they must do so at this point on the agenda or as soon as they became aware of the interest. If the interest was a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest they were also obliged to notify the Monitoring Officer within 28 days of the meeting. Any declarations are recorded in the relevant minute below.

4. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting on 3 November 2020 were confirmed as a correct record.

5. Public Question Time

Members of the public made statements on items 6, 7 and 8 on the agenda. Details are recorded under the relevant minute number below.

A question was also asked about a planning permission granted by the Committee in 2003 for a new sports pavilion at Springfield Hall Park. At the time, the Committee had asked that every effort be made to ensure that the timing of football matches at the park was staggered to avoid disruption and on-street parking problems to local residents. The questioner said that since 2015 Sunday morning on-street parking had been a regular event and nuisance to residents as a consequence of the uncoordinated timing of football matches. The Committee was asked reaffirm its instruction to ensure the co-ordination of match times and take enforcement action if that was not done.

The Committee was informed that the request that matches be co-ordinated was not a condition of the 2003 permission and therefore enforcement action could not be taken. The use of the park and parking in surrounding roads were matters for the Parks Service and the South Essex Parking Partnership, not the Planning Committee.

6. Site at 98 The Street, Little Waltham, Chelmsford – 20/00964/FUL

The Committee considered an application for the conversion of the existing outbuilding at 98 The Street, Little Waltham into a two-bedroom dwelling and the provision of associated hard surface off-street car parking.

A statement from a member of the public opposing the application was referred to at the meeting. A representative of Little Waltham Parish Council also attended to speak against the application, arguing that it would:

- result in a loss of visual amenity in a conservation area and was not of a high quality design. The boundary should comprise a hedge rather than a brick wall or panel fencing;
- exacerbate the already heavy volume of traffic on The Street and that access and egress for vehicles using the site would be neither safe nor practical; and
- fail to provide adequate parking provision on the site and lacked visitor parking.

The Committee was informed that the Council's Heritage Officer was satisfied that the conversion would respect the character of the street scene and the conservation area and that the subdivision would be suitable. The creation of an opening at the front of the converted building would restore what had been there in the past.

With regard to highway concerns, the development was expected to generate six vehicle movements a day, which was very small in the context of the number of vehicles travelling through the village. The provision of two parking spaces for the existing and proposed dwellings met the required standard and there was no obligation to provide visitor parking. The Highway Authority was satisfied with the arrangements for vehicles safely and easily to

enter and leave the site. The access from Chapel Drive was a historic one and the occupiers of 98 The Street had the right to use it. However, there was no indication that they intended to do so and as its use was not part of the planning application, no condition could be imposed to prohibit it. A suitable boundary treatment would be required as part of condition 5 on any consent; a secure area would be provided for cycle storage; and an electric vehicle charging point would be installed.

The Committee was satisfied with all aspects of the application and saw no reason to refuse it.

RESOLVED that application 20/00964/FUL in respect of 98 The Street, Little Waltham, Chelmsford be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the report to the meeting.

(6.11pm to 6.43pm)

7. Land Adjacent to 4 James Croft, Galleywood, Chelmsford – 20/01249/FUL

An application had been submitted for the construction of a single detached house on land adjacent to 4 James Croft, Galleywood. Councillor R Hyland declared a non-pecuniary interest in this item and took no part on its consideration.

A statement in support of the application was made by the developer of the site. Statements were made by four members of the public, Galleywood Parish Council and a ward councillor who opposed the development on the following grounds:

- the development would have an overbearing effect on 4 James Croft and result in a loss of light to it;
- the proposed house would be out of keeping with the size, character and appearance of other properties in the area;
- access for vehicles was inadequate and would make access to and from a neighbouring property difficult;
- there was inadequate off-street parking; and
- there was insufficient space at the side of the property to enable bins and cycles to be easily moved between the front and rear.

The officers said that, in their opinion, the development would respect the character and appearance of the area. Whilst the dwelling would be narrower than others in the road it shared design references with them and the design and architecture would be acceptable in the setting of the cul-de-sac. The relationship with neighbouring properties was not so unacceptable as to justify refusal. The proposed parking met minimum requirements and whilst the space for vehicle manoeuvres was tight, it was acceptable. There was sufficient space along the side of the new house to move storage bins and cycles.

The Committee had concerns about certain aspects of the application, including its suitability in and impact on the street scene, its effect on neighbouring properties, the

parking arrangements and the space available to enable bin and cycle storage. It agreed that it would be appropriate to hold a site visit to assess those and other aspects of the application before making a decision.

RESOLVED that application 20/01249/FUL in respect of land adjacent to 4 James Croft, Galleywood, Chelmsford be deferred for a site visit.

(6.43pm to 7.25pm)

8. Land at The Eagle Public House, Stock Road, Galleywood, Chelmsford – 20/01100/FUL

The Committee considered an application for the erection of two detached dwellings, with associated vehicular parking, on land to the rear of The Eagle Public House in Stock Road, Galleywood. The application included the creation of two new accesses, off Stock Road and The Street, reconfiguration of the public house car park and beer garden, associated hard- and soft-landscaping, and the installation of bin and bike stores.

One member of the public attended the meeting to speak in support of the application. The Committee also received statements from Galleywood Parish Council and a local ward councillor who opposed the application, arguing that:

- the design of the new properties was not of a high standard and would be out of keeping with the street scene; their relationship with other properties would not be satisfactory; it would be a cramped development; and there were concerns about the amenity both of the new houses and existing adjacent properties;
- there was inadequate access for vehicles both to and from the site and within it; and
- the development lacked adequate bin and cycle storage.

Officers informed the Committee that the Village Design Statement for Galleywood dated back to 2005 and therefore little weight could be attached to it in considering this application. They were of the view that:

- the development would sit well in the street scene;
- bin and cycle storage would be adequate;
- whilst the back-to-back distance between the two properties did not meet policy requirements, the design provided sufficient privacy measures;
- the proposals would enhance the public house and its setting and there were no safety concerns about the seating area adjacent to Stock Road;
- parking would exceed policy requirements, there would be sufficient turning space for vehicles in plot 1, and parking for those with disabilities would be provided ;
- the relationship of the new properties with the public house and its car park and the aspect the occupiers would have would be mitigated by the proposed landscaping; and

- there would be no harm to the viability of the public house and a General Management Plan would be agreed for deliveries to it.

Members were satisfied that the design of the development would not be harmful to the street scene; that the back-to-back relationship between the proposed dwellings was similar to that of other properties in Stock Road and The Street; that vehicular access was satisfactory; and that cycle and bin storage was adequate. The Committee was therefore content to approve the application.

RESOLVED that application 20/01100/FUL in respect of land at the rear of The Eagle Public House, Stock Road, Galleywood, Chelmsford be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the report to the meeting.

(7.25pm to 8.03pm)

9. Planning Appeals

RESOLVED that the information on appeal decisions between 15 October to 17 November 2020 be noted.

The meeting closed at 8.03pm

Chair