

**PLANNING COMMITTEE  
16 DECEMBER 2010**

*Present :-* Councillor Ray Gamble\* (Chairman)  
Councillors Peter Chillingworth\*, Helen Chuah\*,  
John Elliott\*, Andrew Ellis\*, Stephen Ford,  
Theresa Higgins, Jackie Maclean\*, Jon Manning,  
Ann Quarrie\* and Laura Sykes\*

*Also in Attendance :-* Councillor Nick Cope  
Councillor Christopher Garnett  
Councillor Colin Sykes  
Councillor Tim Young

(\* Committee members who attended the formal site visit.)

**139. 102241 Ascott House, 83-85 London Road, Colchester, CO3 9AL**

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of existing buildings and structures and the erection of thirty-five newly constructed residential dwellings comprising six three-bedroom houses, seven two-bedroom apartments, eight one-bedroom apartments and fourteen studio flats, together with a staff area and a community space as part of the supported housing scheme. The Committee had before it a report in which all information was set out, see also Amendment Sheet.

The Committee made a site visit in order to assess the impact of the proposal upon the locality and the suitability of the proposal for the site.

Andrew Huntley, Planning Officer, attended to assist the Committee in its deliberations.

Moira Griffiths, Regional Director for Family Mosaic in Essex, addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in support of the application. Family Mosaic is a Registered Social Landlord providing affordable accommodation, and they already manage a number of similar facilities in other parts of Essex. She was of the opinion that the current provision was very poor and this scheme would provide supported accommodation and care. She stated that there was evidence to demonstrate that people who live in such accommodation develop skills and strategies to enable them to achieve successful outcomes and move on. Family Mosaic had secured a significant grant for this scheme which included the purchase of a piece of land to the side of the Ascot House site.

Councillor T.Young attended and, with the consent of the Chairman, addressed the Committee. He stated that the Council had a legal duty to house people who were homeless so emergency accommodation has to be provided. He believed the scheme had great benefits and would be good for Colchester. The scheme had attracted £4.5million which would allow the site to be completely rebuilt. This was a partnership between the Council and Family Mosaic who were specialists in

accommodating vulnerable people. He agreed with the previous speaker that the current provision was not very good and although staff did a good job they were restricted by the limitations of the current building. They provide 24 hour staffing which reduces problems out of hours. There was general support for the scheme in the area and there had been liaison with several neighbours.

Members of the Committee were disappointed that the parking provision was below the Council's current standard but it was considered that this scheme was not directly comparable with a private scheme. The proposed scheme was considered to be a vast improvement on what currently existed on the site and a real benefit for Colchester, but would have an impact on residents nearby. Assurance was sought regarding landscaping and the possibility of erecting a fence to provide screening until the landscaping was sufficiently mature.

The planning officer explained that there had been an issue regarding notification of neighbours but it was confirmed that all neighbours with a boundary abutting the site had been notified. Initially neighbours had not been aware that the additional piece of land had an existing permission for five dwellings. In respect of the brickwork on the buildings, it was intended they should be patterned to break up the bulk of the buildings. In respect of landscaping, it was explained that the conifer hedges could be removed at any time. However there was a condition regarding landscaping and both the Council and Family Mosaic were keen to provide a full and proper landscaping scheme together with a wall to provide security. It was acknowledged that the removal of the trees within the site and the conifer hedges around the perimeter of the site would have an impact on neighbours.

*RESOLVED* (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be approved with conditions and informatives as set out in the report, together with the following additional condition as set out on the supplementary Amendment Sheet:-

The windows marked OBS on the northern elevation of Block F and the southern elevation to Block D of the hereby approved scheme shall be glazed in obscure glass with an obscuration level equivalent to scale 4 or 5 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale of obscuration and shall be retained as such at all times thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining residents from a loss of privacy.

**140. 101947 and 101951 Angel Court, 136-137 High Street, Colchester, CO1 1SP**

The Committee considered planning application 101947 for a proposed development for a change of use from B1 Offices to a mixed use scheme comprising:- retail, restaurants and offices and residential. including the construction of new penthouse accommodation on the existing roof. The Committee also considered listed building application 101951 relating to the replacement of two windows facing onto the High Street with a doorway; a new internal staircase to 136 High Street; and the sealing up of internal openings to various parts of the building. The Committee had before it a

report in which all information was set out, see also Amendment Sheet.

The Committee made a site visit in order to assess the impact of the proposal upon the locality and the suitability of the proposal for the site.

*RESOLVED* (UNANIMOUSLY) that, in respect of planning application 101947 –

(a) Consideration of the application be deferred for completion of a Section 106 legal agreement to provide for the implementation of the illustrated public realm works prior to the first occupation of the development, other than by Colchester Borough Council who already occupy part of the building; and for a contribution towards community facilities of £4,439.

(b) Upon receipt of a satisfactory Section 106 legal agreement, the Head of Environmental and Protective Services be authorised to grant consent with conditions and informatives as set out in the report and on the Amendment Sheet.

*RESOLVED* (UNANIMOUSLY) that, in respect of listed building application 101951, the application be approved with conditions and informatives as set out in the report and on the Amendment Sheet.

#### **141. 101983 Land to the rear of Brook Street, Colchester**

The Committee considered an application relating to an extant planning permission to extend the time limit for the implementation of a residential development of 110 units with new access, parking and open space and provision of shoppers car park, to include the demolition of existing buildings. The Committee had before it a report in which all information was set out, see also Amendment Sheet.

*RESOLVED* (UNANIMOUSLY) that –

(a) Consideration of the application be deferred for completion of a Section 106 legal agreement to link this application to the existing Section 106 legal agreement.

(b) Upon receipt of a satisfactory Section 106 legal agreement, the Head of Environmental and Protective Services be authorised to grant consent with conditions and informatives as set out in the report, the effect of which would be to extend the permission from its current expiry date of 10 April 2011 to 10 April 2014.

**Councillor Jackie Maclean (in respect of having a business relationship with the applicants, Knights Developments Limited) declared a personal interest in the following item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(3)**

#### **142. 101524 and 101525 St Albrights, 1 London Road, Stanway, CO3 0NS**

The Committee considered planning application 101524 and listed building

application 101525 for partial demolition and conversion of a vacant B1 use office complex with additional new build to provide sixty-four C3 residential units in total. The Committee had before it a report in which all information was set out, see also Amendment Sheet.

The Committee made a site visit in order to assess the impact of the proposal upon the locality and the suitability of the proposal for the site.

Mark Russell, Planning Officer, attended to assist the Committee in its deliberations. There would be fewer units than the previous scheme but there was also a shortfall of seven spaces for the standard parking provision required. There had been a privacy issue which had been resolved by replacing a clear glass window with obscure glazing. An additional condition was requested for the cycle store to prevent people from using it to climb into neighbouring gardens. The provision of affordable homes was also below the standard because the scheme had been evaluated through the 'open book' process.

Bob Wilson addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in support of the application. He read out a statement by the Agent, Mr Alistair Grills, who was unable to attend in person. Approval had been obtained for eighty-five dwellings in 2006 after which the market for flats stalled. A new design for the conversion of the listed building known as the Lexden and Winstree Workhouse had been developed which was an improvement on the previous proposal because it gave the listed building more space with the new buildings being subservient. New trees, park railings and landscaping were proposed and views would be improved. The proposal had gone through the 'open book' process to provide a fair level of planning gain, comprising seven affordable housing units, an historic interpretation board, upgraded bus shelters and a road crossing. The scheme had been amended to reduce overlooking, loss of privacy and loss of light to neighbours' gardens. He believed this would be a better scheme and would be a development of which Colchester could be proud.

Members of the Committee had concerns regarding parking of construction traffic and requested a condition requiring on site parking. The only footway in New Farm Road was on one side of the road alongside the development site which was used by school children. There was also an elderly persons complex nearby. There was a request for contact details of the site management to be displayed on hoarding so that local residents could report any incidents. Members were also concerned that the colour of the mortar used on the new dwellings should match the colour of the lime mortar used on the listed buildings and this requirement should be in perpetuity. Members considered this to be an improved scheme with more houses than flats and the site would be more open and would not affect existing residents' amenity.

The planning officer explained that it would be impossible to prevent people from parking on the highway but it was hoped that developers would be good neighbours and not park on the highway. It would be possible to agree a methodology for larger vehicles to adhere to a route to the site via London Road only. Additional conditions requiring a board displaying contact details could be added as could one requiring specific materials to be required in perpetuity.

*RESOLVED* (UNANIMOUSLY) that in respect of application 101524 –

(a) Consideration of the application be deferred for completion of a Section 106 legal agreement to provide for:

- the Listed Buildings to be secured and made wind and weather-tight prior to the commencement of any development;
- seven units of affordable housing, comprising four one-bedroom flats and three three-bedroom houses, to be provided in the first tranche of development;
- the conversion of the retained buildings to be completed prior to development of a set number of new build units, the precise number to be agreed.

(b) Upon receipt of a satisfactory Section 106 legal agreement, the Head of Environmental and Protective Services be authorised to grant consent with conditions and informatives as set out in the report and on the Amendment Sheet together with the following additional conditions:-

- for heavy vehicle routing;
- design of cycle store;
- mortar colour on new build to match as closely as possible the lime mortar used on listed buildings;
- materials conditions to be required, including colour scheme for every new build, to be maintained in perpetuity;
- site hoardings to display company contact details prominently for the public wishing to report incidents or problems relating to the development;

and additional informatives to request that a routing scheme be provided for larger construction vehicles and for all construction vehicles be parked within the site.

*RESOLVED* (UNANIMOUSLY) that in respect of application 101525, the application be approved with conditions and informatives as set out in the report and on the Amendment Sheet; officer to ensure that materials conditions to be required in perpetuity.

**Councillor Helen Chuah (in respect of being employed on an ad hoc basis by the NHS Trust) declared a personal interest in the following item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(3)**

**143. 101527 Former Severalls Hospital Site, Boxted Road, Colchester, CO4 5HG**

The Committee considered the erection of a Child and Adolescent Mental Health Unit, including twenty-five bedrooms in two wards, entrance/reception/administration building, an education building and a section 136 suite, all with associated parking, drainage and landscaping. The Committee had before it a report in which all information was set out.

*RESOLVED* (UNANIMOUSLY) that –

- (a) Consideration of the application be deferred for completion of a Unilateral Undertaking to provide for the safeguarding of land adjacent to Boxted Road for future highway improvements/footway improvements and its availability at nil cost to the highway authority or those carrying out such works where approved.
- (b) Upon receipt of a satisfactory Unilateral Undertaking, the Head of Environmental and Protective Services be authorised to grant consent with conditions and informatives as indicated in the report to include:-
- Standard time for implementation;
  - Restriction on the use to that proposed for a child and adolescent mental health service unit;
  - tree protection;
  - boundary treatment;
  - provision and retention of adequate vehicle parking;
  - provision and retention of additional secure cycle parking.

**144. 102202 172 London Road, Marks Tey, CO6 1EJ**

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a four-bedroom dwelling. The application is a resubmission of 100285. The Committee had before it a report in which all information was set out, see also Amendment Sheet.

*RESOLVED* (UNANIMOUSLY) that –

- (a) Consideration of the application be deferred for completion of a Unilateral Undertaking to provide for a contribution towards Open Space, Sport and Recreational Facilities in accordance with the Council's Supplementary Planning Document.
- (b) Upon receipt of a satisfactory Unilateral Undertaking, the Head of Environmental and Protective Services be authorised to grant consent with conditions and informatives as set out in the report and on the Amendment Sheet.

**145. 102205 172 London Road, Marks Tey, CO6 1EJ**

The Committee considered a listed building application for the removal of a rear boundary wall and the removal/reconstruction of the front boundary wall. The application is a resubmission of 100286. The Committee had before it a report in which all information was set out, see also Amendment Sheet.

*RESOLVED* (UNANIMOUSLY) that –

- (a) Consideration of the application be deferred for receipt of amended drawings

to mitigate the concerns of the Design and Heritage Officer.

(b) Upon receipt of satisfactory amended drawings, the Head of Environmental and Protective Services be authorised to grant consent with conditions and informatives as set out in the report and on the Amendment Sheet.

#### **146. 102315 Land adjacent to 3 Highfield Drive, Colchester, CO3 3QA**

The Committee considered an outline application for a detached three bedroom house and replacement garages. The application was a resubmission of 101564. The Committee had before it a report in which all information was set out, see also Amendment Sheet.

Vincent Pearce, Planning Service Manager, and Mark Russell, Planning Officer, attended to assist the Committee in its deliberations. He referred to landscaping as the only matter remaining to be addressed by the reserved matters application. The Highway Authority did not require the visibility splays to be improved. The applicant asserts that two of the three reasons for refusal had been addressed. The new house had been realigned so it was not set back so far from the adjacent dwellings and the effect on the amenity of No. 3 Highfield Drive had been reduced; two parking spaces were provided, one 7 metres and one 6 metres in length. It was assumed that the land for car parking spaces did exist and that it was within the control of the applicant. The amenity of other houses was not considered to be sufficient reason for refusal. The only matter outstanding was the broad principle of the dwelling itself.

Louise Smith addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in opposition to the application. She hoped that the application would be refused on the basis of the loss of the open area and the harm caused to the street and the area by the proposal. She was concerned that the dwelling may cause an obstruction to the view of cars and pedestrians, that the hardstanding would extend into the lane and that the proposal would cause congestion and contractors vehicles would constitute a traffic hazard. If approved she asked that conditions be imposed to prevent any further extension of the house and the garage, and to require the applicant to restore the road surface.

Marguerite Livingstone addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in support of the application. The application had been amended to take account of members' concerns. The property had been sited further away from No. 3 and further forward. The garages also been altered to comply with current standards and she believed the proposal met all planning policy requirements. She was aware that densities in the town centre could be higher than elsewhere. The rear garden of the property was 120 square metres. She believed there were no planning reasons to refuse this application.

Planning officers explained that permitted development rights were applicable. Any damage caused to a property was a private matter between parties. The garden size was sufficient and in accordance with the policy but the Committee needed to have regard to the surrounding area as well. The Backland and Infill Supplementary

Planning Document made clear reference to corner spaces. The reasons given for refusal of the earlier application remained applicable to this application.

Although the applicant believed that some objections had been overcome, members of the Committee remained concerned about the fundamental objection regarding the appearance of cramping and the harm caused to the open and airy feel of the lane. It was considered that the proposal did not make a positive contribution to the area but would, on the contrary, have a negative impact on the area and was contrary to the Backland and Infill SPD. Furthermore, the location did not come within the town centre but was a suburban area where a higher density was inappropriate.

*RESOLVED* (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be refused on the grounds that the additional prominent dwelling would harm the current open airiness which characterises that part of the street, and it was contrary to the Backland and Infill SPD.

**Councillor Helen Chuah (in respect of her acquaintance with the applicant) declared a personal interest in the following item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(3)**

**147. 102169 Land adjacent to Alefounders Barn, Wick Road, Langham, CO4 5PG**

The Committee considered a reserved matters application following outline approval on application 080543, for the erection of a four bedroom house. The Committee had before it a report in which all information was set out.

*RESOLVED* (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be approved with conditions and informatives as set out in the report.

**Councillor Andrew Ellis and Councillor Jackie Maclean (in respect of having been a former dental patient of the objector, Mrs Laxton) declared a personal interest in the following item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7 (3)**

**148. 102214 31 Creffield Road, Colchester, CO3 3HY**

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of an existing garage and conservatory and the erection of a new conservatory and attached garage. The Committee had before it a report in which all information was set out, see also Amendment Sheet.

The Committee made a site visit in order to assess the impact of the proposal upon the locality and the suitability of the proposal for the site.



Bradly Heffer, Principal Planning Officer, attended to assist the Committee in its deliberations. Officers believed that this proposal was far more in keeping with the area, with elevational details and treatment of the building more appropriate to the setting. In overall terms the impact was not so excessive to warrant a refusal of the scheme. The Arboricultural Officer recommended conditions relating to tree protection.

Lesley Laxton addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in opposition to the application. Her property was to the rear of the proposed development and she was concerned about the height of the extension and the consequent loss of daylight and sunlight to her property and to overlooking all of which were covered by policies. She did not want to lose light from the east from her dining room which would significantly affect the enjoyment of her property. She had no objection to a single storey building. She regretted that no site visit had been made to her property.

Mrs Heathbrook addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in support of the application. They had fully consulted with planning officers and neighbours, and in line with comments made by the Committee, they had simplified the design of the proposal which was now based on traditional lines and materials. There was one remaining objection from the neighbour, who was the previous occupier of the proposal site, concerning impact on light from the east. However, the neighbour's own garage was directly to the east of her house and the roofline was 1.4 metres higher than the proposed building. The proposal contained no windows overlooking the neighbour's property.

Councillor Cope attended and, with the consent of the Chairman, addressed the Committee. He had been approached by the objector because of her concerns regarding loss of light. She believed that the Supplementary Planning Document, Extending your house and Policy DP1 specified that proposals should not overshadow neighbours or have a negative effect. He had believed that the Committee had made a site visit to assist in resolving the conflict. He would defer to the collective opinion of the Committee on the officers report and policy.

Members of the Committee recalled the previous proposal, which was refused on the grounds of design of the building and the proposed materials which were totally out of character with the conservation area. The applicant had not gone to appeal but instead had taken on board the Committee's preference for a design and materials in the local vernacular that would sit comfortably in the area. Members were of the opinion that the applicants had done exactly what they were asked to do and considered it unreasonable to refuse this application. The height was much reduced and it was not considered that the bulk would be detrimental to the neighbour. A condition to protect trees was requested.

It was explained that whilst the neighbour would see the change from their window, light would be gained from the east. The proposal was not considered to be so detrimental that it could be refused. Trees along the boundary with Joyce Brookes House had been pollarded recently allowing more light to the objector's house. In terms of overlooking it was not considered that there had been any change and

Condition 3 would provide protection in this respect to the neighbour.

*RESOLVED* (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be approved with conditions and informatives as set out in the report and on the Amendment Sheet.

**149. 102225 New Bungalow, Maypole Road, Tiptree, CO5 0EP**

The Committee considered an application for the removal of Condition 06 of permission 85/0670/a in order to enable a garage to be converted to a granny annexe. The Committee had before it a report in which all information was set out, see also Amendment Sheet.

*RESOLVED* (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be approved with conditions and informatives as set out in the report, see also Amendment Sheet.

**150. 102230 11 Spring Road, Tiptree, CO5 0BD**

The Committee considered an application to vary Condition 19 of permission 090897 which requires that all existing trees are to be retained. The Committee had before it a report in which all information was set out.

*RESOLVED* (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be approved with conditions and informatives as set out in the report.

**151. 102314 Gransden, Church Road, Copford, CO6 1DE**

The Committee considered an application for the construction of a garden room on the rear of the property. The Committee had before it a report in which all information was set out.

*RESOLVED* (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be approved with conditions and informatives as set out in the report.

**152. 100704 Bluebells, Drakes Corner, Great Wigborough, CO5 7SA**

The Committee considered a retrospective application for a stable block/hay store. The Committee had before it a report in which all information was set out.

*RESOLVED* (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be approved with conditions and informatives as set out in the report.

**153. 101018 Rose and Crown, Crown Street, Dedham, CO7 6AS**

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of a public house and one residential unit and the erection of three dwellings. The Committee had before it a report in which all information was set out.

Nick McKeever, Planning Officer, attended to assist the Committee in its deliberations.

Nigel Emeny addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in opposition to the application. His property was adjacent to the proposal and he had lived there since 1923. The boundary was closer to his property than shown and the illustration does not show the depth because it is on the slope. The sewer serves seven back houses and he wanted a retaining wall. He questioned the proposal for three detached houses because all the houses on the other side of the road were semi-detached. He would prefer to see affordable houses or smaller houses for local elderly people who were living in three bedroom houses because there were none smaller.

Councillor Garnett attended and, with the consent of the Chairman, addressed the Committee. This was an outline application and the first concern was the slope level between the existing and the new properties because the sewer could slip into the road. Also the urban design of the detailed application did not suit the village. In regard to slab levels, he was concerned about the height of any fencing between No. 3 and 1 Crownfields. The slope would mean that a six foot high fence would be too high from the neighbour's side because they were looking up the slope. He asked that the height of the fence be lowered because of the effect on visibility at the access points for cars onto the main road. He also referred to the need for smaller homes to enable elderly inhabitants to down size. This point was supported by the Village Plan.

Members of the Committee raised similar issues regarding the sewer and retaining wall, the Village Design Statement, semi-detached and smaller house types, affordable housing in villages, the first two dwellings to be set back.

In respect of the difference in levels the planning officer explained that it would be in the interest of the developer to put in a retaining wall and it was suggested that this be achieved by condition. In terms of the slope levels and fencing, it was considered that further consideration should be given to an additional condition. In respect of the public sewer, this was a matter for building regulations. In regard to affordable housing and other types of housing, reference was made to paragraph 13.3 of the report and the adopted Village Design Statement which was supportive of affordable housing and smaller homes. Affordable housing was fully supported in terms of planning policies on three or more dwellings and the applicants had agreed to make provision through a legal agreement. However, there was no such requirement for smaller accommodation and it would be difficult to support a refusal on those grounds because the spatial policy team had not made reference to smaller housing types. In terms of house types, adjacent properties to the south and north are semi-detached but further down Crown Street there are almshouses and thatched properties. It was considered that three detached properties would sit reasonably comfortably in that

location and that No. 1 could be set further back.

*RESOLVED* (UNANIMOUSLY) that –

(a) Consideration of the application be deferred for completion of a Unilateral Undertaking to provide for a contribution towards one three-bedroom affordable housing unit and a contribution towards Open Space, Sport and Recreational Facilities in accordance with the Council's Supplementary Planning Document.

(b) Upon receipt of a satisfactory Unilateral Undertaking, the Head of Environmental and Protective Services be authorised to grant consent with conditions and informatives as set out in the report including Condition 11 to include reference to provision of a retaining wall, and additional conditions regarding details of slab levels to be submitted and agreed and to exclude the indicative drawings.

**154. 101161 Unit 14 Lodge Lane, Langham, CO4 5NE**

The Committee considered an application for an extension and alterations to an existing commercial building. The Committee had before it a report in which all information was set out.

*RESOLVED* (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be approved with conditions and informatives as set out in the report.

**155. 101546 37 Mile End Road, Colchester, CO4 5BU**

The Committee considered an application to use the shop for A2 Use (Estate Agent) in addition to the A1 Use (Retail). The Committee had before it a report in which all information was set out.

Nick McKeever, Planning Officer, attended to assist the Committee in its deliberations.

Mr Bajaj addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in support of the application. The application was withdrawn from the Committee meeting on 7 October without any reason being given. He had visited the planning office with his architect to present the amended drawing requested but they were not permitted to submit the drawing, he subsequently submitted an appeal. He made it clear to planning officers that the appeal would be withdrawn if the current application was withdrawn. He had the details on approval 071946 and two letters in October and November. Two further applications show the drawing and parking area; there is no question of extra parking.

Members of the Committee sought further explanation on the sequence of events in respect of this particular application. It had been established that there were multiple uses including unauthorised accommodation units, but there were insufficient

diagrams available for members to make a determination, however the Committee needed to make a decision to provide an indication to the appeal inspector. On the basis that there was insufficient information to make a determination on the parking requirement for all the various uses, the Committee considered they had no alternative but to refuse the application.

The planning officer confirmed that the planning office did not have full details of all uses taking place on the site. Only when the information requested has been provided can a determination be made on what parking facilities would be required for the site. There was a need to ensure that the site could accommodate parking to a proper standard for all the uses together with a turning area of sufficient dimensions. It was also confirmed that the Inspector would make a determination on the appeal and the outcome would give reasons. It was also confirmed that the applicant would have the right to submit a further application free of charge.

*RESOLVED* (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be refused for reasons set out in the report.

**156. 101777 54 Wimpole Road, Colchester, CO1 2DL**

The Committee considered an application for a single storey extension to the rear to include a waiting area, a surgery, disabled wc and disabled access via a ramp to the side gate. The Committee had before it a report in which all information was set out, see also Amendment Sheet.

*RESOLVED* (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be approved with conditions and informatives as set out in the report and on the Amendment Sheet.

**157. 101991 85 Church Road, Tiptree, CO5 0HB**

The Committee considered an application for a single storey front extension and the demolition of an existing canopy. The Committee had before it a report in which all information was set out, see also Amendment Sheet.

*RESOLVED* (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be approved with conditions and informatives as set out in the report.

**158. 102055 Land surrounding 15 Queen Street, Colchester, CO1 2PH**

The Committee considered an application for development which includes hard landscape works to the existing garden to 15 Queen Street and adjacent access routes from Queen Street to the public space associated with the new First Site building. The boundary walls to the garden of 15 Queen Street will be removed and the space will become part of the wider public realm with close relation to facilities located within 15 Queen Street. Hard landscape surfaces include stone paving,

mosaic floor tiles and high quality concrete seating walls. The Committee had before it a report in which all information was set out, see also Amendment Sheet.

*RESOLVED* (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be submitted to the Secretary of State for confirmation that the application would not be called in. Upon receipt of such confirmation from the Secretary of State, the application be approved with conditions and informatives as set out in the report and on the Amendment Sheet.

**Councillor Peter Chillingworth and Councillor Jackie Maclean (in respect of having an acquaintance with the applicant's family) declared a personal interest in the following item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(3)**

**159. 102064 Fairfield's Farm, Fordham Road, Wormingford, CO6 3AQ**

The Committee considered an application for a new cold store for potato storage to run in conjunction with existing buildings on the farm. The Committee had before it a report in which all information was set out, see also Amendment Sheet.

*RESOLVED* (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be approved with conditions and informatives as set out in the report.