

MINUTES
of the
PLANNING COMMITTEE
held on 18 April 2023 at 7:00pm

Present:

Councillor J A Sosin (Chair)

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

Also Present:

Councillors Mackrory, Rajesh, Scott and Tron

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 were received from Councillor 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 7 February 2023 were confirmed as a correct record with one amendment to Item 6. This referenced the S106 agreement being looked at by officers, specifically the amount held in the bond for possible highway alterations and revisions to the period of land ownership that would be reserved for education.

5. Public Question Time

Public questions and statements were asked on Items 6, 8 and 9 and are detailed under the relevant items. [The statements can be viewed via this link.](#)

6. 22/00311/OUT – Land North of South Woodham Ferrers Burnham Road, South Woodham Ferrers, Chelmsford

The Committee considered an outline application with all matters reserved (except for access) for up to 200 residential dwellings, open space, pedestrian and cycle routes; vehicle access; internal roads; and associated infrastructure. The Committee were informed that it was on an allocated site and the relevant masterplan had been approved by the Cabinet in March 2021. The Committee heard that the recent application for the other part of the site, which had been approved by them in February, had not been called in by the secretary of state. The Committee were informed that the application mitigated its own impacts and the movement parameter plan would facilitate sustainable transport, it was also noted that it was fully compatible with the nearby Countryside scheme. The Committee were reminded that the highway impact of the scheme had in effect, already been considered by them when approving the Countryside application in February 2023. The Committee also noted that there were no objections from highways and the s106 agreement would include obligations for education, trees, healthcare and green spaces. The Committee were informed that the application would be a well connected site that mitigated its own impacts alongside generating significant s106 contributions.

The Committee heard a statement from the applicant, which highlighted the principle of development already being established and the key work the applicant and their consultant team had carried out with Council officers and other key stakeholders. The Committee heard that the scheme included significant green infrastructure, 35% affordable homes, with all homes built to Future Homes Standards. It was also noted that together with Countryside's application, this one would complete the vision for the strategic growth site and ensure the delivery of much needed homes. The Committee also heard that City and County Council officers had endorsed the application by recommending it for approval.

A local ward Councillor attended the meeting and asked various questions about the application. In response officers confirmed that all infrastructure works were being provided by the developer, the new school site was secured via S106 with an option to be exercised by the education authority. It was also noted that all roads would be adopted by the Highways authority, and that the majority of green spaces would be managed by a land trust, with buyers being made aware of those costs before purchase, however green space such as rugby pitches and the allotments would be managed by the City or Town Council. It was also confirmed that there would be no gas boilers used on the site.

In response to questions from the Committee, officers informed them that;

- The initial response from Essex Fire and Rescue service had been early in the process and any concerns had now been overcome, it was also noted that the reserved matters stage would ensure compliance.
- The developer could only be required to mitigate the impact of their own development, not other ones.
- The S106 agreement would secure step in rights for the Council for the management of green spaces by the land trust if required.
- The figure for healthcare provisions was from the NHS consultation response.

The Committee voted on the application being deferred to consider a robust traffic assessment, taking into account the Maldon and Bradwell developments and the impact of the B1418 through Woodham Ferrers. The proposal was voted on but not carried.

Members of the Committee noted that this application did mitigate its own impact through its planned contributions.

RESOLVED that subject to a S106 Agreement (as indicated in the report presented to the Committee) being entered into pursuant to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 the Director of Sustainable Communities be authorised to grant the application subject to the conditions set out in the report to the meeting.

(7.02pm to 7.49pm)

7. 22/02091/FUL – Mushroom Cottage, Parsonage Lane, Little Baddow, Chelmsford, Essex, CM3 4SU

The Committee considered an application for the raising of an existing garage roof to create a first floor habitable level for use ancillary to the existing dwelling with the addition of three dormer windows. The Committee heard that the site lied in the rural area of Little Baddow and the proposal would add first floor accommodation over the entire footprint of the detached garage apart from a small rear projection. It was noted that internally it would provide a carer's flat on the first floor but that two similar proposals had both been refused previously and both had been dismissed at appeal. It was noted that the current proposal was almost identical in scale and bulk to the previous ones and that the application was recommended for refusal.

A Local ward member spoke in support of the application, highlighting the needs of the resident for a live in carer and that the development would allow this to happen. It was noted that the property was in effect back to front and therefore, the proposal would be lower as it would be slanted.

In response to questions from members, officers confirmed that pre application advice provided by them had not been taken on board by the applicant, hence the recommendation for refusal. It was also noted that a condition could not be placed on the property for the extension to be removed when it was no longer required.

RESOLVED that planning application 22/02091/FUL be refused for the reasons detailed in the officer report.

(7.50pm to 8.08pm)

8. 22/02196/FUL – Car Park, Glebe Road, Chelmsford, Essex

Declarations of interest: Cllr Pooley declared a non-pecuniary interest in this item.

The Committee considered an application to redevelop the car park to provide 12 affordable residential apartments, amendments to access, parking and landscaping. The Committee were informed that the application was before them, due to it being made by the City Council. The Committee heard that the site was part of the West end conservation area and

that the car park operated to around 80% capacity on average, it was noted that the car park was already scheduled for closure, regardless of the outcome of the application. The Committee heard that the apartments would be retained as local housing stock and that six car park spaces and 18 cycle spaces would be available, this was in line with a City Centre location. The Committee were informed that there had been objections by local residents to the proposal and issues had been raised such as loss of light, distance between the development and existing houses and anti-social behaviour in the area. The Committee were informed that the application was being recommended for approval subject to the conditions in the report.

The Committee heard an objection from a member of public on behalf of three properties near to the application site. Concerns were raised regarding the loss of light due to the proposals, a failure to respect the amenity of the existing homes due to overlooking, an overbearing impact and the possibility of crime in the area. It was also noted that there would be a loss of privacy from the development being only 12 meters away, alongside anti-social behaviour nearby. It was noted that the open aspect of the car park provided views and increased security. The Committee also heard the proposal did not comply with policy DM23 so should be refused or amended to better protect the amenity of existing residents.

A local ward member spoke in support of local residents who had raised concerns about the application. They stated that residents were supportive of the need for new homes, but the proposals would limit sunlight and intrude on privacy, whilst providing no compensation for the loss of open space. They requested that the front elevation of the plans should be reconsidered.

In response to the points raised, officers informed the Committee that the distances between the properties were acceptable and met standards. It was noted that there were multiple examples in the City of shorter distances.

In response to questions from the Committee, it was noted that the scheme was 100% affordable and therefore would not include any rights to buy. It was also noted that health care facilities were very close to the proposals and that parking arrangements would be resolved by the landlord on a case by case basis for each tenant.

RESOLVED that planning application 22/02196/FUL be approved subject to the conditions detailed in the officer report.

(8.09pm to 8.40pm)

9. 22/01874/FUL - Ferrers Dental Laboratory, Nabbots, Pump Lane, Springfield, Chelmsford, Essex, CM1 6TB

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a single storey side extension and two storey rear extension. The Committee heard that the site was located within the Urban Area of Springfield and the dentist surgery had been located there since 1994. It was noted that the proposal would provide two additional consulting rooms and ancillary space and expand the specialist services of the practice, including an increased capacity for NHS appointments. The Committee were informed that the scheme was for the same extensions as previously but was supported by a block plan which rearranged the existing parking plan to accommodate a new parking layout. It was noted that this would improve the size of the spaces and manoeuvrability to help increase capacity of the car park. The Committee were also informed that in terms of neighbouring relationships, conditions were proposed to obscure glaze and restrict opening of first floor windows and limiting the hours of window opening,

resulting in an acceptable relationship to neighbouring properties. The Committee were informed that the application was being recommended for approval.

The Committee heard from the applicants, who stated that there had been extensive discussions with the highways authority, leading to the proposal to take away some grass to create a more usable car park, with wider spaces. It was noted that the increased facilities from the extension, would provide a benefit for Chelmsford residents, especially for orthodontic treatment.

The Committee also heard objections in person and in writing from members of the public, who lived nearby. They raised concerns including that there would only be one extra parking space available and that the majority of current parking spaces were often left empty, with visitors parking on nearby roads causing issues instead. They also asked how the surgery would encourage customers and staff to cycle. Concerns were also raised regarding windows being left open at the rear of the surgery, leading to noise nuisance and privacy issues for residents nearby.

A local ward member spoke against the application, supporting the concerns raised by local residents and the Parish Council. They stated that they had observed inconsiderate parking on the nearby roads and questioned the increase of the car park, just by a single space. They also asked that if the application was to be approved, could a condition be added to make it clear to visitors that they were expected to use the car park, rather than parking on nearby roads.

In response to the points raised about the car park only increasing by one space, officers noted that the main issue with the current arrangements was the small size of the spaces. It was noted that the plans increased the sizes to accommodate modern size cars and that the rearrangement should encourage the use of the car park, rather than parking on nearby roads. It was also noted that the offering of cycle bays, would encourage the use of sustainable transport methods. Officers also informed the Committee that the new proposed conditions on the closing of windows would be easier to enforce than the existing condition from the 1994 application.

In response to a point raised about the use of an informative on any possible approval, about encouraging the use of the car park and sustainable transport methods, officers agreed that this was something that could be added. Officers also informed the Committee, that nearby residents were always welcome to approach the South Essex Parking Partnership regarding the possibility of adding parking restrictions.

RESOLVED that planning application 22/01874/FUL be approved subject to the conditions detailed in the officer report and an informative encouraging the use of the car park and sustainable transport methods.

(8.41pm to 9.11pm)

The meeting closed at 9.11pm.

Chair