

**MINUTES**  
of the  
**PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
held on 7 September 2021 at 7:00pm

Present:

Councillor J A Sosin (Chair)

Councillors L Ashley, S Dobson, R J Hyland, J Lardge, R Lee,  
G H J Pooley, R J Poulter, T E Roper, E Sampson, C Shaw and I Wright

#### 1. Chair's Announcements

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

#### 2. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors P Hughes.

#### 3. Declarations of Interest

All Members were 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 22 June 2021 were confirmed as a correct record.

#### 5. Public Question Time

Questions were asked and statements made on Items 6, 7 and 9. Details are recorded under the relevant minute number below.

## 6. Marsh Farm Visitor Attraction, Marsh Farm Road, South Woodham Ferrers, Chelmsford – 21/00218/FUL

The Committee considered a retrospective application for the change of use of the visitor reception/café at the Marsh Farm Visitor Attraction, Marsh Farm Road, South Woodham Ferrers to a farm shop. Permission was also sought for the surfacing of land adjacent to the farm shop used for activities associated with the Farm Park, and the partial surfacing of the existing overspill parking area. A Green Sheet of alterations and additions was circulated at the meeting which updated the information in the report on the application.

Two members of the public attended the meeting to speak in support of the application and two to speak against. A ward councillor spoke against the proposal. Four other statements either supporting or opposing the application had also been received from the public and ward councillors and all had been circulated to the Committee before the meeting.

Those who opposed the application did so primarily because they questioned the need for the proposed shop, given the number of food retail outlets in the area; felt that the proposal would give rise to additional traffic, noise nuisance and pollution; believed that the proposed hardstanding would exacerbate flooding; and were concerned that the South Woodham Ferrers Neighbourhood Plan had not been taken into account.

The officers advised that as the shop was small, no retail impact assessment was required as part of the application. The Environment Agency had expressed no concerns about the effect of the hardstanding on flooding, and as water did not discharge from the car park to the highway, no drainage was required. In response to a comment that the road planings used to surface the car park were unsightly and not environmentally friendly, the Committee was informed that the car park was lawful and the use of road planings as a surface material in rural car parks was not unusual.

The majority of members of the Committee were of the view that as the proposal was compliant with Policy DM10, that the shop was unlikely to affect the custom of other shops in South Woodham Ferrers and would help the viability of Marsh Farm, and that the Highway Authority and Environment Agency were satisfied with the application, there was no reason to refuse it.

RESOLVED that application 21/00218/FUL in respect of the Marsh Farm Visitor Attraction, Marsh Farm Road, South Woodham Ferrers be approved subject to the conditions detailed in the report to the meeting and revised Condition 3 set out in the Green Sheet.

(7.10pm to 7.50pm)

## 7. Kinnear House, Margaret Woods Road, Great Waltham, Chelmsford – 21/00570/FUL

An application had been received for the demolition of the existing dwelling and outbuildings at Kinnear House, Margaret Woods Road, Great Waltham and the construction of a replacement dwelling and garage. A Green Sheet of alterations and additions was circulated at the meeting which updated the information in the report on the application.

Four members of the public attended the meeting to speak against the application. The Committee also heard from a representative of the applicants and had received comments from the two ward councillors. Those who opposed the application did so on the grounds that demolishing and replacing a building rather than renovating it was not an environmentally friendly approach and contrary to current thinking in some quarters about the environmental benefits of retaining and restoring buildings. They also believed that it would be contrary to Policies DM8 and DM23 in that the new dwelling would adversely impact the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and would harm its appearance. There were also concerns about light spill from the glazed ends of the property and that the existing building should not be demolished as it had heritage value.

The officers said that the design and appearance of the proposed replacement dwelling was similar to that of other properties in the locality and the wider Chelmsford rural area. A condition on the materials to be used would help ensure that its appearance would be in keeping with the area and other buildings. Whilst there was no policy on EPC ratings for glass, light spill from the glazed ends of the new dwelling would be controlled by a condition on the reflective nature of the glazing. The existing building was not deemed to be a heritage asset and there were therefore no policy grounds on which to oppose its demolition. Noting the arguments about the environmental concerns associated with demolishing and replacing a building, the officers pointed out that several of the conditions associated with a grant of planning permission would ensure that the new building's environmental credentials would be greater than those of a renovated building.

The Committee accepted that the question of whether the appearance of the new building would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area was a subjective one and there would be differing opinions. On balance, members believed that no harm would be caused in this respect and that there were no other grounds on which to refuse the application.

RESOLVED that application 21/00570/FUL in respect Kinnear House, Margaret Woods Road, Great Waltham be approved subject to the conditions detailed in the report to the meeting.

(7.50pm to 8.40pm)

#### 8. 50 Oak Lodge Tye, Springfield, Chelmsford – 21/01112/FUL

The Committee considered a retrospective application for a rear garden fence at 50 Oak Lodge Tye, Springfield. A Green Sheet of alterations and additions was circulated at the meeting which proposed a condition associated with the grant of any planning permission.

RESOLVED that application 21/01112/FUL in respect of 50 Oak Lodge Tye, Springfield be approved, subject to the condition detailed on the Green Sheet.

(8.40pm to 8.44pm)

#### 9. 34 Moss Path, Galleywood, Chelmsford – 21/01161/FUL

The Committee considered an application for the construction of a two-storey side extension to 34 Moss Path, Galleywood, Chelmsford and the extension of the vehicle crossover.

Councillor R J Hyland declared a non-pecuniary interest in the application and withdrew from the meeting during discussion of and voting on it.

The agent for the applicant attended the meeting to speak in support of the application and two local residents spoke against it. The objectors opposed the application on the grounds that it would be contrary to the open plan design of the development, that it would be out of character with the rest of the houses in the area, and would not follow the building line of the road in which it stood.

The Committee did not accept that the proposed extension would be out of keeping with or harmful to the area and saw no reason to refuse the application.

RESOLVED that application 21/01161/FUL in respect of 34 Moss Path, Galleywood, Chelmsford be approved, subject to the conditions detailed in the report to the meeting.

(8.44pm to 9.09pm)

## 10. Planning Appeals

RESOLVED that the information on appeal decisions between 7 June and 25 August 2021 be noted.

(9.09pm to 9.10pm)

The meeting closed at 9.10pm

Chair