

**COLCHESTER BOROUGH COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE
29 March 2012 at 6:00pm**

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

Part A

(open to the public including the media)

Pages

. Amendment Sheet

102 - 105

See Amendment Sheet attached.

AMENDMENT SHEET

**Planning Committee
29 March 2012**

AMENDMENTS OF CONDITIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

**LATE AMENDMENTS HAVE BEEN INCORPORATED INTO THIS
AMENDMENT SHEET AND ARE SHOWN AS EMBOLDENED**

7.1 111529 – Barratts Farm, East Lane, Dedham

The report presented to the Planning Committee makes references to Planning Policy Statement 7 (PPS7 - Sustainable Development in Rural Areas) and the Functional and Financial tests set out in Annex A.

This Policy Statement has now been superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which came into effect from the 27 March 2012. The requirement for Functional and Financial Tests is not included in the NPPF.

The NPPF is now a material consideration in the determination of applications for planning permission.

At the heart of this document is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. In terms of the determination of planning applications this means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan.

In this context it is acknowledged that Spatial Policy has not raised any objection to this established equestrian use in terms of the Council's adopted LDF Core Strategy/Development Policies Document. The only issue is that the scheme should be financially viable and capable of sustaining a dwelling for a person or persons employed in connection with the use.

Section 3 of the NPPF (Supporting a Prosperous Rural Economy) states:-

“Planning policies should support economic growth in rural areas in order to create jobs and prosperity by taking a positive approach to sustainable new development. To promote a strong rural economy, local and neighbourhood plans should:

- support the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well designed new buildings;**
- promote the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses;**
- support sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments that benefit businesses in rural areas, communities and visitors, and which respect the character of the countryside”.**

The current proposal relates to an established commercial equestrian use, with associated residential accommodation, and appears to satisfy the broad principle of sustainable development.

7.2 112183 - Jarmin Road Industrial Units, Jarmin Road, Colchester

The Archaeological Officer has recommended that the standard watching brief condition be added.

Condition 2 should read Drawing Issue Register sheet dated 21/3/2012.

7.4 100927 – Land to the rear of 19 & 21 Empress Avenue, West Mersea

Withdrawn from Agenda by Head of Environmental and Protective Services for consideration of issues relating to land ownership. To come back to Committee in 2 weeks

Amend recommendation to read:

Conditional Approval subject to a Unilateral Undertaking for Contribution to Open Space and Community Facilities.

7.5 111999 - 57 Rectory Road, Rowhedge

Late representation received stating:-

"I have only just found out about this planning application and while it does not directly affect my home it will adversely affect my quality of life. My main concern is that the proposal seems to run rough shod over current regulations concerning size and spacing of development and if permitted to go ahead would open the way for further unsuitable development in the village. Looking at the plans it is clear this is a garden grabbing project which I thought was not permitted under recent legislation.

The traffic issue is a serious concern. Currently there are problems leaving Hillview Close because of on street parking and the fact that Rectory Road is a major through route for traffic approaching the village from either Mersea or Donyland. Additionally the road is heavily used by pedestrians, especially school children and parents taking their children to the primary school.

As a keen naturalist I am also most concerned by the fact that the developer seems intent on removing our badgers. One of the pleasures of living in Rowhedge (which is not run down or in need of regeneration) is chance meetings with wildlife including badgers."

Further comments from 16 Hillview Close have been received stating:-

At the meeting tomorrow evening 29.03.2012 a Planning Application regarding 57 Rectory Road, Rowhedge will be discussed. I recently received a letter informing me that this application has been recommended to you for approval, despite objections from residents.

Some weeks ago, my husband and I wrote to the Council detailing our objection to the proposed build, which is to add two ADDITIONAL 4-bedroom houses onto the plot on which this house stands, necessitating an extremely tight proximity of these three buildings. The proposal clearly contravenes your own published regulations governing the proximity of buildings in a position such as this. Your regulations are that sufficient space must be left around the newly-built houses for the final effect to be comparable with the immediate surroundings. This is to avoid the cramped, 'eyesore' effect which results from crowding too many buildings into too little space - I believe the expression is 'garden-grabbing'. Can I ask you, as a matter of urgency, to look closely at this? In particular, please see Mr Richardson's very helpful letter of 19.02.2012 which shows the problem clearly from the plans, and also shows how unacceptably this proposal would encroach on his boundary, with resultant loss of light etc.

Rectory Road is the main road through the village and is our bus route. Parking for the houses immediately opposite no. 57 means that its exit comes onto a single lane width – you can understand the issues surrounding restricted space at that point, with buses and all other normal traffic also using that one lane. Also there is the question of parking for the proposed extra housing – not just enough for one or two cars but for other family members who own cars, as well as visitors.

From the vantage point of my own garden the effect of these extra buildings would be very visible indeed, at the crest of the slope and therefore giving the appearance of rising even higher and overlooking our property even more. We are deeply concerned about the overlooking of our garden and the back of our property. The three houses would be so closely packed together that they would appear to us as one single mass with no daylight at all showing between.

Seen from Rectory Road, this proposal is unlike anything surrounding it, again in direct contravention of your own regulations – none of the houses alongside are so crammed onto a plot of insufficient size to comfortably sustain them. We really cannot understand why such a proposal as this would be recommended for approval, containing as it does so many points which fly in the face of the regulations.

Can I urge you again in the strongest possible terms to look very carefully into this? It appears that both regulations and straightforward common sense are in danger of being set aside in this proposal; and I, my family and the rest of our neighbours, and indeed the village at large are the ones who would be paying the price of this folly for years to come. The proposal in its present form is unacceptable to the residents here and we ask you, our elected representatives, to deal with us fairly, to help us protect the character of our village, and to withhold planning permission in this case.”

7.6/7.7 – 120012/120013 – St Johns Ambulance Site, Chapel Road, Wivenhoe

These two items have been deferred from the meeting by the Head of Environmental and Protective Services. They will come back to Committee in 2 weeks time.

**COLCHESTER BOROUGH COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE
29 March 2012 at 6:00pm**

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

Part B

(not open to the public or the media)

Pages

There are no Section B Items