

# Planning Committee Meeting

**Online Meeting, Virtual Meeting Platform  
Thursday, 21 January 2021 at 18:00**

**The Planning Committee** deals with planning applications, planning enforcement, public rights of way and certain highway matters. If you wish to come to the meeting please arrive in good time. Usually, only one person for and one person against each application is permitted. Attendance between 5.30pm and 5.45pm will greatly assist in enabling the meeting to start promptly.

## Information for Members of the Public

### Access to information and meetings

You have the right to observe all meetings of the Council, its Committees and Cabinet including those which may be conducted online such as by live audio or video broadcast / webcast. You also have the right to see the agenda (the list of items to be discussed at a meeting), which is published on the Council's website at least five working days before the meeting, and minutes once they are published. Dates of the meetings are available here:

<https://colchester.cmis.uk.com/colchester/MeetingCalendar.aspx>.

Occasionally certain issues, for instance, commercially sensitive information or details concerning an individual have to be considered in private. When this is the case an announcement will be made, the live broadcast will end and the meeting will be moved to consider in private.

### Have Your Say!

The Council welcomes contributions and representations from members of the public at most public meetings. Planning Committee meetings, other than in exceptional circumstances, are subject to one representation in opposition and one representation in support of each application. Representations can be a statement or questions of no longer than three minutes when spoken (maximum 500 words) submitted online by noon on the working day before the meeting date. Please use the form [here](#).

If you would like to speak at a meeting and need to find out more, please refer to the Have Your Say! arrangements here:

<https://colchester.cmis.uk.com/colchester/HaveYourSay/HYSPlanning.aspx>.

**COLCHESTER BOROUGH COUNCIL**  
**Planning Committee**  
**Thursday, 21 January 2021 at 18:00**

**The Planning Committee Members are:**

Councillor Cyril Liddy	Chairman
Councillor Lyn Barton	Deputy Chairman
Councillor Helen Chuah	
Councillor Pauline Hazell	
Councillor Brian Jarvis	
Councillor Derek Loveland	
Councillor Jackie Maclean	
Councillor Philip Oxford	
Councillor Martyn Warnes	

**The Planning Committee Substitute Members are:**

All members of the Council who are not members of this committee and who have undertaken the required planning skills workshop training:-

**Councillors:**

Christopher Arnold	Kevin Bentley	Tina Bourne	Roger Buston
Nigel Chapman	Peter Chillingworth	Nick Cope	Simon Crow
Robert Davidson	Paul Dundas	Andrew Ellis	Adam Fox
Dave Harris	Theresa Higgins	Mike Hogg	Mike Lilley
Sue Lissimore	A. Luxford Vaughan	Sam McCarthy	Patricia Moore
Beverley Oxford	Gerard Oxford	Chris Pearson	Lee Scordis
Lesley Scott-Boutell	Lorcan Whitehead	Dennis Willetts	Julie Young
Tim Young			

**AGENDA**  
**THE LIST OF ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED AT THE MEETING**  
**(Part A - open to the public)**

**Please note that Agenda items 1 to 6 are normally dealt with briefly.**

An Amendment Sheet is published on the Council's website by 4:30pm on the day before the meeting and is available to view at the bottom of the relevant Planning Committee webpage. Please note that any further information for the Committee to consider must be received no later than 5pm two days before the meeting in order for it to be included on the Amendment Sheet. With the exception of a petition, no written or photographic material can be presented to the Committee during the meeting.

**Live Broadcast**

Please follow this link to watch the meeting live on YouTube:  
<https://www.youtube.com/user/ColchesterCBC>

**1 Welcome and Announcements (Virtual Meetings)**

The Chairman will welcome members of the public and Councillors to the meeting and remind those participating to mute their microphones when not talking. The Chairman will invite all

Councillors and Officers participating in the meeting to introduce themselves. The Chairman will, at regular intervals, ask Councillors to indicate if they wish to speak or ask a question and Councillors will be invited to speak in turn by the Chairman. A vote on each item of business will be taken by roll call of each Councillor and the outcome of each vote will be confirmed by the Democratic Services Officer.

**2 Substitutions**

Councillors will be asked to say if they are attending on behalf of a Committee member who is absent.

**3 Urgent Items**

The Chairman will announce if there is any item not on the published agenda which will be considered because it is urgent and will explain the reason for the urgency.

**4 Declarations of Interest**

Councillors will be asked to say if there are any items on the agenda about which they have a disclosable pecuniary interest which would prevent them from participating in any discussion of the item or participating in any vote upon the item, or any other pecuniary interest or non-pecuniary interest.

**5 Have Your Say! (Virtual Planning Meetings)**

At meetings of the Planning Committee, members of the public may make representations to the Committee members. Each representation, which can be a statement or a series of questions, must be no longer than three minutes when spoken (500 words maximum). One single submission only per person and a total limit of 30 minutes (10 speakers) per meeting. Members of the public may register their wish to address the Committee members by registering online by 12 noon on the working day before the meeting date. In addition, a written copy of the representation will need to be supplied for use in the event of unforeseen technical difficulties preventing participation at the meeting itself. The Chairman will invite all members of the public to make their representations at the start of the meeting.

These speaking arrangements do not apply to councillors who are not members of the Committee who may make representations of no longer than five minutes each.

**6 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

7 - 18

The Councillors will be asked to confirm that the minutes of the meeting held on 10 December 2020 are a correct record

**7 Planning Applications**

When the members of the Committee consider the planning applications listed below, they may decide to agree, all at the same time, the recommendations in the reports for any applications which no member of the Committee or member of the public wishes to address the Committee.

7.1	<b>201753</b>	<b>7 Lexden Grove, Colchester</b>	19 - 30
	Erection of two-storey front and rear extension, increased width of existing side box dormer, and porch		
8	<b>Interim Planning Scheme of Delegation</b>		31 - 34

Members are asked to consider an amendment to the temporary measures that were introduced to allow planning decisions to be made during the Covid-19 lockdown and changes to the scheme of delegation while virtual committees are in operation. Members are also asked to note all those applications that have been determined under the delegated arrangements since the last update in December.

#### **Exclusion of the Public (not Scrutiny or Executive)**

In accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to exclude the public, including the press, from the meeting so that any items containing exempt information (for example confidential personal, financial or legal advice), in Part B of this agenda (printed on yellow paper) can be decided. (Exempt information is defined in Section 100I and Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972).

### **Part B (not open to the public including the press)**



# Planning Committee

## Thursday, 10 December 2020

**Attendees:** Councillor Lyn Barton, Councillor Helen Chuah, Councillor Pauline Hazell, Councillor Brian Jarvis, Councillor Cyril Liddy, Councillor Derek Loveland, Councillor Jackie Maclean, Councillor Martyn Warnes  
**Apologies:** Councillor Philip Oxford  
**Substitutes:** Councillor Gerard Oxford (for Councillor Philip Oxford)

### 814 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Warnes (in respect of his membership of the Board of Colchester Commercial Holdings Ltd) declared a non pecuniary interest in item 7.2 pursuant to the provisions of rule 7(5) of the Meetings General Procedure Rules.

Councillor Jarvis (in respect of being a resident of Bakers Lane) declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 7.3 pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(5).

### 815 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 October 2020 were confirmed as a correct record.

### 816 201236 Hall Road, Copford

The Committee considered an Outline application for the erection of up to 49 houses and associated highway works.

The Committee had before it a report in which information about the application was set out.

The Committee members had been provided with videos and photographs of the site taken by the Principal Planning Officer to assist in their assessment of the impact of the proposals upon the locality and the suitability of the proposals for the site.

Mr Barney addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in opposition to the application.

Mr Barney, Chair of the Parish Council stated that the application had significant issues, was premature, speculative and not in keeping with CBC policies for rural East Copford.

There were a large number of issues with the urban design and it was clear that the proposals were contrary to Policy in design and place making.

There were unresolved highways issues, increased traffic flow would mean a high risk to pedestrians and cyclists and would therefore fail to meet policies D17 and DM21.

There was also the gradient of the road to consider. The survey carried out during

lockdown failed to recognise an increase in flow post lockdown and the HGV sewage trucks that use the road to access Copford sewage works. Figures only mention vehicle flow in one direction. No modelling of flow from the potential development had been undertaken and a July email from Colchester Borough Council was referenced. Highway standards specify 25 dwellings for a shared roadway but the development currently proposed 49 dwellings in addition to the current residents of Hall Road. Details of mitigation measures had been promised at the consultation but this was not mentioned in the report.

Privacy was a significant concern for existing residents for both Hall Road and London Road. DP1 (to protect residential amenity) had been ignored.

Contaminated land was an issue particularly in relation to gas as this is a known problem in nearby sites and no survey to check this had been carried out. The footpath proposed for children to the local Primary School via Pits Wood was not safe or suitable in bad weather and dark winter nights.

No acknowledgement had been made of RCCE Housing Needs Survey and the emerging Neighbourhood Development Plan produced in Spring 2020. On behalf of the Parish Council and residents he urged the Committee to decline the application and that this should not be considered until Local Plan Part 2 had been examined as the current plan is still in force with no Housing Allocation for Copford. The Outline application should not be considered until a detailed application is submitted that confirms or allays the concerns raised in our comments and in the comments of 128 other Copford residents.

Raymond Long addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in support of the application explaining that the land had been in the ownership of the Harrison family for many years and had been promoted for development through the Call for Sites and Draft Local Plan Consultation process since 2015. The site was identified in the Draft Local Plan Preferred Options published in September 2016 and again in the Publication Draft Local Plan. Therefore, the principle of development had been the subject to successive opportunities for public consultation and review.

Issues identified through the public consultation process relating to drainage, landscaping, heritage, archaeology and access had been fully investigated by specialist consultants at the landowners' expense and supporting information provided to the Council. He stressed that the site was viable and deliverable and would contribute to housing numbers in the Borough without adverse impacts on the community, ecology or the environment. The site was well located in terms of access to rail and bus services. Particular care had been taken to address concerns raised about the access to Hall Road and the proposed improvement works included widening of Hall Road from the minimum width of 3.8m to a more useable total width of 5.5m between London Road and the site access; provision of a priority junction and improvements to bus stops and public footpaths. The proposed access and associated improvement works had been considered and found to be acceptable by the Highway Authority.

The Pre-Application response received from the Council in December 2019 confirmed that subject to the development complying in full with all relevant matters set out in Policy SS4 of the Emerging Local Plan, the Council would not object to the principle of development on policy grounds.

Setting aside design and layout issues that were not to be decided as part of the application, the applicant had worked collaboratively with the Development Control Team to demonstrate compliance with Policy and other related issues. Fenn Wright had advised that the proposed scheme had generated interest from a number of high quality local residential developers. If the outline application were to be approved as recommended then subject to approval of reserved matters there would be every likelihood that the new development would deliver a range of sustainable and environmentally sound family homes that would integrate well with Copford village and its residents.

The Committee were urged to support the officers recommendation to approve.

Councillor Bentley attended and with the consent of the Chairman addressed the Committee speaking on behalf of the Parish Council and residents. Concerns were raised about traffic flows and the potential risk to the village should the development go ahead. This was a speculative application and was premature as Part 2 of the Local Plan had not yet been approved. No homes were allocated on this site in current plan and there are other brownfield sites allocated.. The proposal would lead to more traffic on to London Road and many large vehicles already use this to get down to Stanway. There was a need to think in future about how many traffic movements there would be and consider the impact on utilities and surface flooding. If more houses are built and connected to old utilities then consideration needs to be given to those facilities and the application should provide information on this. Whilst companies recognise their legal obligations, the treatment works was already at capacity. He asked the Committee to refuse the application.

Councillor Ellis attended and with the consent of the Chairman addressed the Committee relaying objections on behalf of the Parish Council with specific reference to road and traffic issues. Hall Road is used by Heavy Goods Vehicles en route to the sewage treatment works and the road width would prove a challenge if another large vehicle needed to pass. Pedestrian access was not good for those with pushchairs, a visual impairment or those using a wheelchair as to accommodate larger vehicles it had been proposed that verges may be used. The proposed development was not consistent with the ambitions of Planning Policy. He pointed out that the Inspector's letter had been received for Part 1 of the Local Plan and Part 2 was likely to be examined in the Spring. Approval would remove Copford residents' right to make representations on the inclusion of this site in Local Plan and he proposed that the application be deferred to allow that participation. It was suggested that an alternative site could be explored.

James Ryan, Principal Planning Officer, presented the application to the Committee.

The site was not allocated in the current adopted Local Plan but is an emerging allocation (SS4) and the balancing process on the weight to be given was explored fully in the report. It was not felt necessary to wait until the emerging plan had been examined, the scheme would not use other green sites and would contribute to the 5 year supply target. Approval being sought is for outline only and the site drawings were indicative only. If outline approval was given then design issues would be dealt

at the Reserved Matters stage.

The report outlined conditions such as ground gas as well as consultation responses; Anglian Water were working on infrastructure upgrades and the sewage plant had a permit and was able to take waste from 49 dwellings.

Access to the site via Hall Road was planned where there would be less impact on nature. Essex County Council had assessed the application and concluded that it would not cause severe harm to the Highway.

Martin Mason, Strategic Development Engineer, Essex County Council explained further that he had been involved in pre-application discussions that sought to achieve safe access from London Road to Hall Road. A scheme to improve Hall Road for this development had been achieved through a Highway carriageway of a width of 4.3 metres and a 1.2 metre wide footway on the Eastern side with the ability for vehicles to overrun if larger vehicles were to meet each other. 4.1 metres width was required for 2 cars to pass each other so 4.3 metres was acceptable. There were modest vehicle flows, numbers of large vehicles were low and there was not a large footfall on the footway. The judgement was that this provided safe access.

Members of the Committee had a number of concerns, commenting that the application was premature with unresolved issues and it was suggested that permission should not be given until there was an assurance that services would cope. It was also suggested that other sites could be looked at.

The width of the road for access was below recommended guidelines and did not adhere to the Essex Design Guide. Although this was not mandatory concern remained over access (in particular sharing that access with HGVs), potential parking issues/parking on verges, traffic flows and the width of the path/footway. If the access was used by larger vehicles this would be a safety issue for those using the pavements particularly residents with pushchairs and the 1.2 metre wide footway would not allow for a double buggy. The provisions in the Equality Act required a width of 1.547metres.

Members were disappointed that the number of planned units fell just below the 50 required for a contribution to the NHS and felt that money should be allocated for an NHS surgery.

The issue of badger setts was also raised, as well as the removal of trees and the impact on Air Quality especially given that the Council had signed up to a Climate Emergency.

Flooding was also a concern and it was pointed out that there was often surface flooding near the bus stop. Drainage down to the Roman River fed into an overloaded system sewage system and a stronger assurance that the system could cope with the development was needed from Anglian Water.

The Principal Planning Officer clarified that the site was higher topographically than the Roman River, the site was not at risk of fluvial flooding. A SUDS scheme had been proposed providing a technical solution that was not considered to cause

flooding harm. There were conditions outlining these in the application. Simon Cairns, Development Manager further explained that Anglian Water had confirmed that they had contingency plans in place and could deal with sewage effluent.

No badger setts had been found on site and once the reserved matters stage is reached a refreshed ecological report would be produced and mitigation would be considered at that point.

A number of sizeable contributions from the developer would be made but the NHS had not been included. The Development Manager explained further that contributions should be primarily spent on projects that are geographically proximate but that some smaller elements would be used for strategic borough wide projects. Should members wish to be involved in the detailed agreement of the destinations for spend under Heads of Terms this could be arranged.

The Principal Planning Officer stressed that prematurity was rarely a viable reason for refusal and the Development Manager clarified that under the NPFF the application was not of sufficient scale to disrupt the plan making process so it would not be an option to refuse on this ground alone.

The Development Manager reminded members that substantive planning reasons would be needed for any refusal.

A proposal to refuse the application was proposed and seconded, on the grounds that the proposed pavement width was in breach of the requirements of the Equality Act, potentially putting users at risk, and concerns on the shared access to the site. Given that a proposal contrary to the officer recommendation had been made the Chairman invoked the Deferral and Recommendation Overturn Procedure (DROP). The application was therefore deferred under the DROP procedure for a further report from officers on the proposed reasons for refusal and any risks or other implications arising from them.

RESOLVED that the application be deferred under the DROP procedure for a further report from officers on the risks or implications from refusing the application on the grounds on that the proposed pavement width was in breach of the requirements of the Equality Act, potentially putting users at risk, and concerns on the shared access to the site.

**817 Colchester Northern Gateway, Land at Cuckoo Farm West, United Way, Colchester**

The Committee considered an application for Redevelopment of the site to provide a Cinema (use class D2), active leisure units (D2), a hotel (C1), restaurants (A3) and/or hot food takeaways (A5), including drive through units, and/or a Public House (A4) in the alternative as well as flexible A3/A5 and/or D2 floorspace in the alternative, together with the provision of a single decked car park, a landscaped plaza with associated hard and soft landscaping, cycle parking, service laybys and drop off zones, the creation of a pedestrian and cycle link connecting United Way with Tower Lane and the installation/construction of balancing ponds, substation and

associated infrastructure.

The Committee had before it a report and amendment sheet in which detailed information about the application was set out.

Chris Goldsmith addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in support of the application explaining that the leisure facility would enhance the other significant investments made, and being made, at the Northern Gateway. An earlier proposal for this site in 2017 had led to Planning Permission being granted but the scheme had been updated to reflect changes in the leisure market.

Turnstone remained committed to the core aim of the original scheme to create a state-of-the-art leisure destination that would enhance Colchester's position as a regional hub. The design ethos remained consistent with the previous scheme but adapted, changes included:

- To reflect a changed market environment, a reduction in the number of restaurant units with flexibility to allow one to be a pub – a key local consultation request.
- Resulting from a commitment from Hollywood Bowl, an increase in the active leisure space by the introduction of an indoor bowling centre to sit alongside climbing and indoor golf.
- A reduction in the height but not the capacity of the cinema and the provision of a new foyer space that now fronts onto the central piazza.
- A reduction in the height of the car parking by the removal of a deck.
- Provision of two drive through restaurants to respond to roadside demand.
- An increase in the size of the hotel to further boost business and tourism, and finally
- The addition of an electric vehicle rapid charging station and a significant number of charging spaces in the main public car park.

The scheme would deliver significant investment in Colchester and generate 450 new jobs. It would result in high quality public realm and improved public transport and sustainable transport links. It would provide a mix of uses that complement Colchester Town Centre, increasing overall visitor numbers to the town. Despite COVID-19 restrictions extensive public consultation had been undertaken and public support received. Delivering this facility would provide a boost to the local economy, to people's mental health and the wellbeing of the town.

The Committee were urged to support the officer's recommendation to approve.

Chris Harden, Senior Planning Officer presented the report and assisted the Committee in its deliberations. If the application were supported it would, as before, go to the Secretary of State. It was considered that diverging from the original approval would be acceptable as there were material considerations.

A presentation including plans and photographs was made showing the layout of the development and comparisons between the original planned designs and the amended designs now proposed including changes to cinema and leisure elevations, planting scheme with enhanced landscaping arrangements, and parking provision (including 5% disabled parking). The design was contemporary, pleasing with a brick pattern now for the cinema elevations, and was appropriate for the Northern Gateway. Sequential tests and impact assessments had been undertaken and an independent consultant's analysis had confirmed that there would be no significant impact on the

Town Centre in terms of users.

A Legal Agreement would need to be drawn up and all amendments to conditions attached to the application were shown in detail in the papers.

Members were pleased with the proposal overall but asked for clarification on the following points:

- Were there enough electric car charging points for future use?
- Was there secure cycle parking provision?
- Were disabled parking bays wide/large enough?
- How would parking be managed on Match days at the Stadium
- Concerns about the impact on the Town Centre cinemas and businesses, and possible relocations from the Town Centre.
- Was there a traffic plan for the A12 and the roundabout given the introduction of drive through units?
- Concern over litter possibly being deposited in the surrounding area/roads (from drive throughs)
- Would the alternative drainage proposal be effective or should the tested method of intersector tanks with a maintenance schedule be a better way? There were also concerns over water pollution.

Members were assured that there was a Car Park Management Plan, and that parking was ticketed, disabled spaces complied with adopted parking standards and cycle parking was provided.

Martin Mason, Strategic Development Engineer, Essex County Council confirmed that a comprehensive traffic assessment had been undertaken as part of the application and that Highways England had assessed the impact on Junction 28 and it was not considered severe. A bus stop was also proposed on the site.

The Development Manager stated that the agreement would include a clause to prevent relocation of existing town centre businesses and clarified that in terms of the cinema it would attract a different geographic clientele to the Town Centre cinemas. The issue of litter from drive through establishments could be picked up in through the Legal Agreement.

The Senior Planning Officer explained officers would include a condition to ensure effective drainage and that the maintenance plan is vetted.

**RESOLVED (UNANIMOUSLY that**

(a) The application be referred to the Secretary of State in order that a decision can be made with regard to whether the application is to be called in for determination.

(b) Delegated **AUTHORITY to APPROVE** be granted subject to minor design detailing revisions and potential minor changes to conditions and the signing of a legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 within 6 months from the date of the Committee meeting.

In the event that the legal agreement is not signed within 6 months, to delegate authority to the Assistant Director Place and Client Services to refuse the application, or otherwise to be authorised to complete the agreement to provide the following:

(i) From liaison between the applicant company, ECC and officers, the s106 agreement would seek to achieve the Bus Service Level criteria as outlined in the

Highways Section of this report (or variation that is agreed by ECC and CBC):

- (ii) Public Transport - Contribution to fund bus improvements (current requested sum £543,000).
- (iii) Agreement with regard to target a number of job opportunities in leisure and hospitality on jobseekers/returners/college leavers in the Borough.
- (iv) Contribution to ensure litter from site does not impact upon amenity outside of the site.
- (v) A litter mitigation strategy for drive- through restaurant units.
- (vi) Inclusion of a clause in the S106 agreement whereby the developer would agree to sign a 'no poaching' agreement that would prevent relocations of Class A3 uses from the town centre to the application site.

On completion of the legal agreement, the Assistant Director be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the conditions outlined in the report together with an additional condition to secure effective drainage (with delegation to officers for minor amendments to conditions if required).

## **818 201130 West House Farm, Bakers Lane, Colchester**

The Committee considered an application for the Change of use of land from agricultural and the erection of 3n holiday lodges

The Committee had before it a report in which information about the application was set out.

Robert Pomery addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in support of the application reminding members of the appeal decision in relation to the previous proposals for the site, which was recommended for approval, but refused by Committee. The refusal had been subject to appeal. At the appeal, the Inspector had considered the site in two parts Parcel A and Parcel B and concluded that no harm arose from the three proposed holiday lodges on Parcel A. He pointed out that there could be no doubt from the Inspector's conclusions that development on Parcel A was found to be acceptable. Current proposals mirrored those considered by the Inspector on Parcel A and were the proposals to come before the Inspector again or another Inspector, the same conclusions would be reached. The Inspector had confirmed that the proposals for Parcel A are also compliant with Policy DP 10 of the Local Plan, which the Inspector states "supports small-scale visitor accommodation in rural areas even in areas which have poor accessibility."

It was difficult therefore to comprehend the call-in reasons given: "impact on wildlife, the proposal is on agricultural land which is not appropriate nor in an appropriate location for these proposals, this land is not earmarked for development in the current or emerging local plan, visual amenity and design, flood plan issues, the precedent this proposal would cause in this rural location and highways safety."

The objections to the current application raised matters that were dealt with conclusively in the appeal.

The proposals were compliant with relevant local and national planning policy.

Consultation with statutory consultees also reveals that there are no objections on the grounds of flooding, landscape, air quality, amenity of neighbours, highway safety and

access, ecology, trees, archaeology and contamination. These are the views of professionals in the relevant fields of expertise who have considered the proposals having regard to adopted standards and policies.

Members had had the benefit of assessment by an Inspector and were able to consider his findings and conclusions. The appeal decision is also a material consideration of significant weight. Mr Pomerey urged that the recommendation be approved.

Councillor Barber attended and with the consent of the Chairman addressed the Committee relaying some of the concerns he had raised when calling in the application. The application was in a rural area close to a flood plain and there was a risk of increased traffic causing a hazard on an already dangerous road. The proposed lodges were in the wrong position and not appropriate for the locality, they would have an impact on the countryside and would bring more harm to the local area than benefits. He reminded members that this was a different application to the one that went to appeal and urged the Committee to reject the proposal.

Chris Harden, Senior Planning Officer presented the report and assisted the Committee in its deliberations. A presentation including plans and photographs was made. The site was not in the Flood Zone and a condition had been included to ensure the lodges were at an appropriate level. There was an alternative access available for emergency use and for the main access vegetation would be removed to allow visual splay. Other vegetation removal was planned on the site but there would be replanting. The proposal was a moderate development and deemed to fit in with the environment and would support the rural economy. The Highways Authority found it acceptable.

Some members raised issues as to whether this was appropriate in a rural setting where there was a narrow country lane with no shops or public transport, what effect the change of use from agriculture might have in terms of future development of the area and whether this would result in losing rural unspoilt parts of Colchester. There were concerns around the road: it frequently flooded, there was overgrown vegetation that inhibits visibility, and it would be dangerous particularly for visitors who do not know the road. Cycling and walking would be difficult.

Martin Mason, Strategic Development Engineer, Essex County Council confirmed that the speed limit near the site was 30 mph, but it then moves into derestricted. Visibility splays had been dealt with by means of a condition.

Screening of the site and replanting were considered important and members asked how long the lets of the units would be. The Senior Planning Officer explained that screening to the neighbouring property would be provided. There was no desire to undermine the rural character and a condition would ensure an appropriate wooden access and egress sign. Another condition determined the length of stay for visitors as not exceeding 28 days in any 90-day period.

Members noted that this was a small-scale development which would support the rural economy as the Inspector had concluded. It was noted that the Highways Authority were satisfied and there were no landscaping issues.

**RESOLVED** (FIVE voted FOR, THREE voted AGAINST, ONE ABSTAINED from voting) That the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the report with DELEGATED AUTHORITY being given to amend the pre-commencement conditions as necessary in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (pre-Commencement conditions) Regulations 2018).

## **819 Variation to Section 106 Agreement – Hythe Mills**

The Committee had before it a report in which information about the variation requested was set out.

Jane Thompson, Project Officer (Transport and Sustainability) explained that changes were needed to the agreement to now be less specific to ensure funds would be spent on relevant projects. The accommodation manager for Hythe Mills had been involved looking at local area sustainable travel improvements.

Members were all keen to ensure that the funding would in the main be used for local projects such as the bus infrastructure and were reassured that this would be the case and noted there were already a number of local projects drawn up.

RESOLVED (UNANIMOUS) that the proposed deed of variation be endorsed

## **820 Temporary Changes to Planning Scheme of Delegation**

The Committee considered a report by the Assistant Director, Place and Client Services proposing an extension to the temporary changes to the scheme of delegation and giving details of the applications which had been determined in accordance with the revised scheme of delegation agreed at the Committee's meeting on 18 June 2020.

Karen Syrett, Planning and Housing Manager, presented the report and explained that the interim arrangements for the consideration of planning applications and changes to the scheme of delegation had worked well. However, it was necessary to extend the changes to the scheme of delegation for another six months as circumstances did not allow for a return to physical meetings at this stage. Some concern was expressed about the fact that applications were being determined without full consideration by Committee and that ward councillors were not always made aware of applications being determined. However, it was explained that applications were determined following consideration by the Chair and group spokespersons, and that the Chair and Group Spokes could notify ward councillors, if they considered it necessary.

RESOLVED (UNANIMOUS) that

- (i) An extension to the revised scheme of delegation for a period of approximately 6 months be agreed
- (ii) The applications listed in the Assistant Director's report which had been determined under the emergency delegation be noted.







The Ordnance Survey map data included within this publication is provided by Colchester Borough Council of Rowan House, 33 Sheepen Road, Colchester CO3 3WG under licence from the Ordnance Survey in order to fulfil its public function to act as a planning authority. Persons viewing this mapping should contact Ordnance Survey copyright for advice where they wish to licence Ordnance Survey map data for their own use. This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey Material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller Of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Crown Copyright 100023706 2017

**Item No:** 7.1

**Application:** 201753

**Applicant:** Mr Sachin Sadani

**Agent:** Mr Ben Willis, Vision Design & Planning Consultants

**Proposal:** Erection of two-storey front and rear extension, increased width of existing side box dormer, and porch

**Location:** 7 Lexden Grove, Colchester, CO3 4BP

**Ward:** Prettygate

**Officer:** Chris Harden

**Recommendation:** Approval

## **1.0 Reason for Referral to the Planning Committee**

- 1.1 This application is referred to the Planning Committee because it has been called-in by Councillor Lissimore for the following reasons: “Too big in scale. Too bulky. Visual appearance. Protection of residential amenities including loss of light, outlook and privacy.”

## **2.0 Synopsis**

- 2.1 The application seeks extensions to a chalet style, detached house. key issues for consideration are the design, scale and form of the proposal as well as any impact upon neighbouring amenity in terms of outlook, light and privacy. Impact upon parking provision and vegetation also needs to be considered.
- 2.2 The application is subsequently recommended for approval. The revised scheme, which has omitted a significant element of the originally proposed front extension, is considered acceptable in terms of its design, scale and form. The character of the existing dwelling and street scene would not be undermined in the opinion of officers. It is considered the extensions would not result in any significant overbearing impact, loss of light or overlooking in respect of neighbouring properties. Comments received from neighbours have been carefully considered in this respect and the relevant standard policy criteria have been met, subject to a condition. Adequate car parking on site would be retained and there would not be any significant impact upon vegetation.

## **3.0 Site Description and Context**

- 3.1 The site lies within the settlement limits and comprises a relatively modern, existing 1 ½ storey detached dwelling with a parking forecourt area at the front. It lies towards the end of a Cul-de-Sac and has detached properties set to either side. There is also a tree in the neighbouring front garden to the South that is the subject of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO).

## **4.0 Description of the Proposal**

- 4.1 The proposal is for the erection of two-storey front and rear extension and the increased width of an existing side box dormer, and a porch addition. The proposal has been amended to reduce the originally proposed front extension which had been shown to project forward around 5.4 metres and was on two stilts. The stilts have now been removed and the front projection reduced by approximately 2.5 metres in depth.

## **5.0 Land Use Allocation**

- 5.1 Settlement limits.

## **6.0 Relevant Planning History**

- 6.1 101334  
Removal of conservatory and construction of breakfast area extension.  
Approve Conditional - 23/08/2010

## **7.0 Principal Policies**

- 7.1 Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) must be taken into account in planning decisions and is a material consideration, setting out national planning policy. Colchester's Development Plan is in accordance with these national policies and is made up of several documents as follows below.

- 7.2 The adopted Colchester Borough Core Strategy (adopted 2008, reviewed 2014) contains local strategic policies. Particular to this application, the following policies are most relevant:

SD1 - Sustainable Development Locations  
UR2 - Built Design and Character

- 7.3 The adopted Colchester Borough Development Policies (adopted 2010, reviewed 2014) sets out policies that apply to new development. Specific to this application are policies:

DP1 Design and Amenity  
DP13 Dwelling Alterations, Extensions and Replacement Dwellings  
DP14 Historic Environment Assets  
DP16 Private Amenity Space and Open Space Provision for New Residential Development  
DP19 Parking Standards  
DP21 Nature Conservation and Protected Lanes

- 7.4 Some "allocated sites" also have specific policies applicable to them. The adopted Site Allocations (adopted 2010) policies set out below should also be taken into account in the decision making process:

Not applicable.

- 7.5 The Neighbourhood Plan: Not applicable

- 7.6 Submission Colchester Borough Local Plan 2017-2033:  
The Council is developing a new Local Plan that has been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate (October 2017). An Inspector has been appointed and the formal examination commenced in January 2018. The examination is ongoing on part 2 of the plan. The examination process is now completed on part one and the Inspectors report having been received finding the modified part one of the plan sound.

Paragraph 48 of the Framework states that decision makers may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

1. The stage of preparation of the emerging plan;
2. The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies in the emerging plan; and
3. The degree of consistency of relevant policies to the policies in the Framework.

The Emerging Local Plan is at an advanced stage and is, therefore, considered to carry some weight in the consideration of the application, but as it is yet to undergo a full and final examination, it is not considered to outweigh the material considerations assessed above in accordance with up-to-date planning policies and the NPPF.

- 7.7 Regard should also be given to the following adopted Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

The Essex Design Guide  
External Materials in New Developments  
EPOA Vehicle Parking Standards  
Sustainable Construction  
Managing Archaeology in Development.

## 8.0 Consultations

- 8.1 The stakeholders who have been consulted and who have given consultation responses are as set out below. More information may be set out on our website.
- 8.2 **Councillor Lissimore** raises the following concerns: “Too big in scale. Too bulky. Visual appearance. Protection of residential amenities including loss of light, outlook and privacy.”
- 8.3 **Tree officer** has raised no objections.
- 8.4 **Archaeologist states:** “No material harm will be caused to the significance of below-ground archaeological remains by the proposed development. There will be no requirement for any archaeological investigation.”

## 9.0 Parish Council Response

- 9.1 Unparished

## 10.0 Representations from Notified Parties

- 10.1 The application resulted in a number of notifications to interested third parties including neighbouring properties. The full text of all of the representations received is available to view on the Council's website. However, a summary of the material considerations is given below.

10.2 **10 letters of objection** (some from same neighbours and multiple) have been received which make the following points (include comments on front extension now omitted):

- Affects mainly 5 Lexden Grove, 6 Colvin Close and 9 Lexden Grove -but the front extension impacts also on the whole look of the road, extending past the building line of the houses by about 4.8metres.
- Rear two-storied extension on the south border of 5 Lexden Grove will significantly impact on the amenity of my garden, and patio area, and deprive my house and garden of winter light.
- Two-storey rear extension will overlook the back garden of 6 Colvin Close, being 4.14 metres closer to their garden. Will also overlook the garden of 5 Lexden Grove.
- Light in 5 Lexden Grove is already compromised by large oak tree which cuts out the morning sun for a couple of hours, and two-storey extension will make kitchen (on south side of house) even darker.
- Front extension will block evening light to front garden and house of 9 Lexden Grove.
- 7 Lexden Grove was originally a modest, 3 bedroomed house when we bought no.5 in 1997. Previous occupants of 7 Lexden Grove extended it considerably, adding a two-storied extension with very large lounge on ground floor and a master suite above to south side of the house and single storied 'breakfast room' on the north side (my south border).
- Proposed extensions are an overdevelopment of the site, and would result in a severe and unreasonable loss of amenity and light to my house and garden.
- Any further extension will make this property totally beyond keeping with other properties in the area.
- Front extension would obstruct the natural light/setting sunset from neighbours.
- Could require the need for additional vehicles to be parked on front driveway which occasionally could force vehicles to be parked on the public roadway, which is a designated turning circle at the top of Lexden Grove. Already non-residents parking in cul-de-sac.
- Believe applicants in the dental profession and at some future date could be application to use enlarged property as dentistry.
- Rearward extension extends the two storey building line of the house highly intrusively some 12 feet into the site's rear garden (about one third of its depth), and within about 20 feet of our western boundary. This means that the upper floor of this extension (the master bedroom we understand) would directly intrude and overlook our back garden and garden terrace area, with consequent significant loss of privacy and amenity.
- Two storey rear extension would be ugly.
- Will obstruct views.
- Amendment hasn't changed rear extension so same objections remain to this.

## **11.0 Parking Provision**

11.1 Room for at least two cars at front of site.

## **12.0 Accessibility**

12.1 The proposal has the ability to comply with the provisions of the Equalities Act in respect of access.

## **13.0 Open Space Provisions**

13.1 N/A

## **14.0 Air Quality**

14.1 The site is outside of any Air Quality Management Area and will not generate significant impacts upon the zones.

## **15.0 Planning Obligations**

15.1 This application is not classed as a “Major” application and therefore there was no requirement for it to be considered by the Development Team and it is considered that no Planning Obligations should be sought via Section 106 (s.106) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

## **16.0 Report**

### Principle

16.1 As the proposal is for extensions to a dwelling within the settlement limits, the application should be judged on its planning merits. The most significant planning issues are the design of the proposed development, as well as its impact on neighbouring amenity in terms of outlook, light and privacy. Other factors such as retained parking provision and any impact upon vegetation also need to be considered.

### Design, Scale and Form of the extensions

16.2 It is considered that the design, scale and form of the proposed extensions is acceptable. The front extension has been reduced in length and the originally proposed ‘stilts’ have been omitted. The front extension now sits quietly on the front of the property and is in keeping with the character of the existing dwelling and street scene. The roof height of this extension remains lower than the highest part of the existing roof and so is appropriately subordinate.

16.3 Similarly the rear extension would not be prominent in the street scene and respects the scale and form of the existing dwelling. Its roof height matches that of the existing dwelling and accordingly it is not considered visually dominating. The dormer is also a continuation of an existing dormer and does not appear over scaled or visually dominating on the roof. Overall, the character of the existing

dwelling would be retained having regard to all of the proposed alterations and there would not be unduly visual dominant nor detrimental to the character of the surrounding area either.

- 16.4 It is therefore considered the proposal complies with Local Plan Policy DP1 which provides that all development must be designed to a high standard and respect and enhance the character of the site, its context and surroundings in terms of its architectural approach, height, size, scale and form.

Impact upon neighbouring residential amenity

- 16.5 A key consideration is the potential impact upon neighbouring residential amenity. Policy DP1 is clear that development must avoid unacceptable impacts upon amenity and must protect existing residential amenity, including with regard to privacy and overlooking.
- 16.6 It is considered that the development would not appear overbearing on the outlook of neighbours. The front extension has been reduced and is far enough away from the neighbouring property to avoid causing an overbearing affect or material loss of light. Similarly, the rear extension, whilst introducing an additional storey, represents a modest increase in the flank wall length (3.89 m) and would project approximately 3.6 m beyond the rear wall of the neighbouring dwelling. The neighbouring dwelling (no.5) and the applicant's dwelling are set off the side boundary (approximately one metre) so there is a gap between the dwellings. The Council policy sets out that a 45 degree angle of outlook from the mid-point of the nearest neighbouring windows should be preserved and the proposal satisfies this requirement. Similarly, there are no concerns regarding loss of light. The combined plan and elevation tests are not breached and the proposal therefore satisfies the Council's standards for assessing this issue as set out in the Essex Design Guide.
- 16.7 Subject to a condition relating to the side dormer extension, the proposal does not include any new windows at first floor level that would offer an unsatisfactory angle of overlooking that potentially harmed the privacy of the neighbouring properties, including their protected sitting out areas as identified in the above SPD. The first floor window in the rear of the rear extension clearly is nearer to the rear boundary than the existing windows and is larger. Nevertheless it is considered to be far enough from the rear boundary and there is sufficient rear boundary vegetation to ensure there would not be any significant additional overlooking of the neighbouring property to the rear, including its rear garden. It is not considered an objection can be raised in relation to overlooking of the property adjacent as the window looks predominantly rearward over the applicant's garden which is a standard arrangement.
- 16.8 As referred to above, the extended dormer could offer the potential for limited overlooking of the property to the South as it projects further rearwards than the rear wall of the main part of the dwelling and faces that property. Whilst there is some vegetation on the boundary of that property, it is considered necessary to limit this part of the dormer extension to being obscured glazed and non-opening up to a height of 1.7 m above floor level. This will ensure there is not potential for overlooking.

### Other issues

- 16.9 It is concluded that adequate parking provision would be retained on site. There is room for at least two cars to park at the front of the site where there is existing hard surfacing. This accords with Policy DP19 which refers to the Essex County Council adopted car parking standards and requires two car parking spaces.
- 16.10 The comments received about use of the Cul-de-sac by non-residents and the potential increase of parking pressure in the vicinity is not considered a reason to refuse the application given that the proposal complies with the car parking standards. The County Council could control parking with the use of double yellow lines if considered appropriate. It is considered prudent to condition a construction management plan.
- 16.11 The proposed works are far enough from significant vegetation, including the TPO tree at the front in the neighbouring property and the Oak tree to the rear to avoid any damage. A condition can be applied to secure the erection of protective fencing at the rear of the site to ensure no materials are stored under the canopy of the oak tree.
- 16.12 There are no archaeological implications (policy DP14).

### Environmental and Carbon Implications

- 16.13 The Council has declared a Climate Emergency and has committed to being carbon neutral by 2030. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework. Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways. These are economic, social and environmental objectives. The consideration of this application has taken into account the Climate Emergency and the sustainable development objectives set out in the NPPF. It is considered that on balance the application can contribute to achieving sustainable development.

## **17.0 Conclusion**

- 17.1 To summarise, the revised scheme, which has omitted a significant element of the originally proposed front extension is considered acceptable; in terms of its design scale and form. The character of the street scene would not be undermined or adversely affected. It is not considered the extensions would result in any significant overbearing impact, loss of light or overlooking in respect of neighbouring properties. Comments received from neighbours have been carefully considered in this respect and the relevant standard criteria have been met, subject to a condition. Adequate car parking on site would be retained and there would not be any significant impact upon vegetation.

## **18.0 Recommendation to the Committee**

18.1 The Officer recommendation to the Committee is for:

APPROVAL of planning permission subject to the following conditions:

### **1. ZAA - Time Limit for Full Permissions**

The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

### **2. ZAM – Development Accord with Approved Plans**

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the details shown on the submitted Drawing Numbers: 20-040-PL01A rec'd 26.8.20, 20-040-PL03B rec'd 21.10.20.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the proposed development is carried out as approved.

### **3. ZBA- Matching Materials**

The external facing and roofing materials to be used shall match in colour, texture and form those used on the existing building.

Reason: This is a publicly visible building where matching materials are a visually essential requirement.

### **4. ZPA- Construction Method Statement**

No works shall take place, including any demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period and shall provide details for:

- the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- hours of deliveries and hours of work;
- loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
- wheel washing facilities;
- measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
- and
- a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works.

Reason: In order to ensure that the construction takes place in a suitable manner and to ensure that amenities of existing residents are protected as far as reasonable.

## 5. ZFQ- Tree Protection

No works shall take place until the Oak tree near the rear of the site boundary has been safeguarded behind protective fencing to a standard that will have previously been submitted to and agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority (see BS 5837). All agreed protective fencing shall thereafter be maintained during the course of all works on site and no access, works or placement of materials or soil shall take place within the protected area(s) without prior written consent from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard existing trees, shrubs and other natural features within and adjoining the site in the interest of amenity.

## 6. ZDG -Obscure Glazing

Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), the extended element dormer window shall be glazed in obscure glass to a minimum of level 4 obscurity and be non-opening (on both points) where it projects beyond the line of the rear wall of the main element of the existing house and up to 1.7 m above floor level before the development hereby permitted is first occupied and shall thereafter be permanently retained in this approved form.

Reason: To avoid the overlooking of neighbouring properties in the interests of the amenities of the occupants of those properties.

## 19.0 Informatives

19.1 The following informatives are also recommended:

### 1. ZT0 – Advisory Note on Construction & Demolition

The developer is referred to the attached advisory note *Advisory Notes for the Control of Pollution during Construction & Demolition Works* for the avoidance of pollution during the demolition and construction works. Should the applicant require any further guidance they should contact Environmental Control prior to the commencement of the works.

### 2. ZTA - Informative on Conditions Stating Prior to Commencement/Occupation

PLEASE NOTE that this permission contains a condition precedent that requires details to be agreed and/or activity to be undertaken either **before you commence the development or before you occupy the development**. This is of critical importance. If you do not comply with the condition precedent you may invalidate this permission and be investigated by our enforcement team. Please pay particular attention to these requirements. To discharge the conditions and lawfully comply with your conditions you should make an application online via [www.colchester.gov.uk/planning](http://www.colchester.gov.uk/planning) or by using the application form entitled 'Application for approval of details reserved by a condition following full permission or listed building consent' (currently form 12 on the planning application forms section of our website). A fee is also payable, with the relevant fees set out on our website.

## **2. ZTB - Informative on Any Application With a Site Notice**

PLEASE NOTE that a site notice was erected in a publicly visible location at the site. Colchester Borough Council would appreciate your co-operation in taking the site notice down and disposing of it properly, in the interests of the environment.



21 January 2021

<b>Report of</b>	<b>Assistant Director for Place and Client Services</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Karen Syrett</b>
<b>Title</b>	<b>Interim Planning Scheme of Delegation</b>		<b>☎ 506477</b>
<b>Wards affected</b>	All		

## 1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 This report seeks an amendment to the temporary measures that were introduced to allow planning decisions to be made during the Covid-19 lockdown and changes to the scheme of delegation while virtual committees are in operation. It also details all those applications that have been determined under the delegated arrangements since the last update in December.

## 2. Recommended Decision

- 2.1 The Committee are asked to agree a change to the interim scheme of delegation to require all member call-ins, made in accordance with the Planning Procedures Code of Practice, to be referred to the virtual Planning Committee.
- 2.2 Planning Committee are also asked to note those applications that have been determined under the emergency delegation.

## 3. Reason for Recommended Decision

- 3.1 To allow Council decision making to continue in the most efficient manner whilst ensuring those applications which are controversial or contrary to policy are determined in the public domain.

## 4. Alternative Options

- 4.1 The Committee could decide not to agree the change to the proposed scheme of delegation.

## **5. Background Information**

- 5.1 In March 2020 due to the Coronavirus pandemic and in response to Government advice on social distancing etc, the Council cancelled all scheduled formal decision-making meetings for the remainder of the 19/20 Municipal Year. However, it was recognised that it was important to ensure that the Council's ability to determine planning applications which would ordinarily have been considered by members of the Planning Committee could still function during this period. Accordingly, Interim Planning Arrangements following agreement by the Leader of the Council, Group Leaders and the Chair of the Planning Committee, were introduced with effect from 18 March 2020.
- 5.2 The initial Interim Arrangements were in place for 11 weeks between March and June. This demonstrated that there are certain types of applications/developments that can be determined without the need for a formal committee decision. It was therefore agreed at the first virtual Planning Committee held on 18<sup>th</sup> June that the arrangements would be adapted so fewer applications would be referred to the committee while it operates on a virtual basis. It was also agreed that the arrangements would be reviewed in December 2020.
- 5.3 At the Planning Committee meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> December it was agreed that the interim arrangements would continue for a further 6 months. There was however concern raised about ward councillor involvement and it has become apparent that some Councillors are not aware of the temporary arrangements in so far as they relate to 'Call-Ins'. Accordingly, it is recommended that all applications 'Called-In' within the 25 day period and in accordance with all other requirements set out in the Planning Procedures Code of Practice, should be considered by the Planning Committee.
- 5.4 The revised Interim Scheme of Delegation is as follows;
1. Delegated to Assistant Director for Place and Client Services - the determination of all planning applications irrespective of scale and size (including changes of use and all applications for Listed Building Consent, Certificates of Lawfulness, applications for the determination as to whether prior approval is required, consent to display advertisements and other notifications) except any application which is significantly contrary to adopted policies or a departure from the development plan, and which is recommended for approval.
  2. Those major applications, that are recommended for approval and where a section 106 Agreement is required will only be referred to Committee if there is a dispute about the detail of the S106 agreement.
- 5.5 It was also agreed that all those applications to be determined under the revised Interim Arrangements would be reported to 'The Members' who could recommend that an application is referred to the Virtual Committee if they consider it to be in the public interest. It is suggested that this decision needs to be taken within 5 working days of the report being circulated to 'The Members'.
- 5.6 All decisions taken under the Interim Arrangements, that would ordinarily be considered by the Committee, are reported to the next available committee meeting.
- 5.7 All applications determined under the interim procedures are reported to the next available committee. In line with this protocol details of each application determined since the last update are contained in Appendix 1 to this report. A verbal update will be provided at the committee if further applications have been considered under the Interim Arrangements following the writing of this report.

## **6. Standard References**

- 6.1 There are no particular references to the Strategic Plan; consultation or publicity considerations or financial; community safety; equality, diversity and human rights implications, or health and safety implications.

## **7. Risk Management Implications**

- 7.1 The proposed scheme of delegation is intended to improve decision making by ensuring the Planning Committee can concentrate on matters that are of most importance.

## **8. Environmental and Sustainability Implications**

- 8.1 The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.

## **9.0 Background Papers**

- 9.1 Planning Procedures Code of Practice

([https://colch.sharepoint.com/sites/Store/DyLi/Documents%20for%20GovUk/Forms/AllItems.aspx?id=%2Fsites%2FStore%2FDyLi%2FDocuments%20for%20GovUk%2FYour%20Council%2FGovernance%2FLocal%20Councils%20Charter%2FPlanning%20Procedures%20Code%20of%20Practice%2Epdf&parent=%2Fsite%2FStore%2FDyLi%2FDocuments%20for%20GovUk%2FYour%20Council%2FGovernance%2FLocal%20Councils%20Charter&p=true&originalPath=aHR0cHM6Ly9jb2xjaC5zaGFyZXBvaW50LmNvbS86Yjovcy9TdG9yZS9EeUxpL0VjODVTaEJXdXhGSmdzUFo2T1JwVHZJQldlMURXYkgtYk5BNEJUendNOGdFSkE\\_cnRpbWU9N2ozajBlMncyRWc](https://colch.sharepoint.com/sites/Store/DyLi/Documents%20for%20GovUk/Forms/AllItems.aspx?id=%2Fsites%2FStore%2FDyLi%2FDocuments%20for%20GovUk%2FYour%20Council%2FGovernance%2FLocal%20Councils%20Charter%2FPlanning%20Procedures%20Code%20of%20Practice%2Epdf&parent=%2Fsite%2FStore%2FDyLi%2FDocuments%20for%20GovUk%2FYour%20Council%2FGovernance%2FLocal%20Councils%20Charter&p=true&originalPath=aHR0cHM6Ly9jb2xjaC5zaGFyZXBvaW50LmNvbS86Yjovcy9TdG9yZS9EeUxpL0VjODVTaEJXdXhGSmdzUFo2T1JwVHZJQldlMURXYkgtYk5BNEJUendNOGdFSkE_cnRpbWU9N2ozajBlMncyRWc)).

## Appendix 1

App. Ref.	Site	Ward	Recommendation	Decision
201339	R/O 64/66 Blackheath	Berechurch	Approval	Approval
202207	Hewthorn, Wivenhoe	Wivenhoe	Approval	Approval
201943	Elfreda House	Shrub End	Approval	Approval with extra condition
191830	School Rd, Langham	Rural North	Approval	Approval
202105	Stane Park	Stanway	Approval	Approval subject to referral to SoS
202078	Severalls	Mile End	Approval	Approval
192837	Butt Road	New Town & Christchurch	Approval	Approval subject to S106