

**PLANNING COMMITTEE  
28 MARCH 2013**

*Present :-* Councillor Theresa Higgins\* (Chairman)  
Councillors Nick Barlow\*, Peter Chillingworth\*,  
Helen Chuah\*, John Elliott\*, Cyril Liddy\*,  
Jackie Maclean\*, Jon Manning, Nigel Offen,  
Philip Oxford and Laura Sykes

*Substitute Members :-* Councillor Mark Cable for Councillor Nigel Chapman  
Councillor Michael Lilley for Councillor Stephen Ford  
Councillor Marcus Harrington  
for Councillor Sonia Lewis

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

**107. Minutes**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 28 February 2013 were confirmed as a correct record, subject to the correction of the word 'heir' in the third paragraph from the bottom of page 11 to read 'their'.

**108. Reasons for refusal on application No. 120965//Change of use and development of land to form 'The Stour Valley Visitor Centre at Horkesley Park'.**

**Councillors Barlow (in respect of having met the applicants in his previous capacity as Portfolio Holder), Cable (in respect of being the Council's representative on the Dedham Vale and Stour Valley Project and a volunteer for the National Trust, Flatford), Chillingworth (in respect of his membership of CPRE Essex) and Offen (in respect of his membership of CPRE Essex) declared a non-pecuniary interest in the following item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(5).**

At the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 28 February 2013 application No. 120965 was considered and the Committee resolved that it was minded to refuse planning permission with detailed reasons to be submitted to a future meeting for approval. The Head of Environmental and Protective Services submitted a report which detailed the proposed reasons for refusal of application 120965. In addition, a 'Statement of Positivity' was provided in the Amendment Sheet.

The Committee thanked Officers for their work in successfully encapsulating the Committee's deliberations and formulating the detailed reasons for refusal.

**RESOLVED** (NINE voted FOR and THREE ABSTAINED from voting) that the reasons for refusal, as set out in the report, be approved and a formal decision notice be issued

**109. 130333 Pavilion, Mile End Recreation Ground, Fords Lane, Colchester.**

**Councillors Chuah and P. Oxford joined the Committee at this point.**

The Committee considered an application for prior notification of the proposed demolition of a disused toilet block. This application had been brought before the Committee as Colchester Borough Council was the applicant. The Committee had before it a report in which all information was set out.

*RESOLVED* (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application for prior notification be approved, without conditions, subject to the informative set out in the report.

**110. 121313 Land to the north of Lion Quay, High Street, Rowhedge**

**Councillor Lilley (in respect of his previous meetings with Rowhedge Heritage Trust) declared a non-pecuniary interest in the following item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(5).**

The Committee considered an application for the development of a Riverside Centre on land to the north of Lion Quay, High Street, Rowhedge. This application had been brought to the Committee as a result of objections received which could not be resolved through conditions and the lack of on-site parking. The Committee had before it a report in which all information was set out. The comments from Anglian Water and the Highways Authority were set out in the 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.

Ms Sue Jackson, Principal Planning Officer, attended to assist the Committee in its deliberations.

Mr Neil Chatterjee submitted a petition pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in the following terms:

‘We the undersigned object to the proposal on the grounds that it is too large and high for the area and will add further to the already considerable parking problems in the High Street and surrounding areas. We feel that it would be better for all of the community and the Heritage Project itself if such a large building was situated in the proposed Port Development Area.’

Mr Chatterjee addressed the Committee in opposition to the application. He drew the Committee’s attention to the 16 written objections, the 30 online objections and the petition against the proposal containing 200 signatures. He highlighted the Land Registry covenant stating that the site would not be used for anything other than a Heritage Centre or public open space. He stated that no alternative parking had been provided in the village and no precise information had been received from the Highways Authority. He also referred to the request from the Parish Council for a

structural survey to confirm the stability of the land, which had yet to be carried out.

Mr Keith Philips, Chairman of the Rowhedge Heritage Trust, addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in support of the application. He stated that public consultation had taken place and that the Heritage Trust was working with the Parish Council. He suggested that the temporary structure had shown the need for a permanent structure on the site. He was of the view that the parking issues would only affect a small minority and highlighted the point that the Centre would be for local use with the majority of visitors coming by foot, bicycle or ferry.

Members of the Committee sympathised with concerns regarding parking, noted that the adopted parking standard for this class of building required a maximum number of parking spaces not a minimum and commented on the considerable support for the project as well as the development's favourable design. The Principal Planning Officer explained that a note could appear on the decision notice advising that a Structural Survey would be required.

*RESOLVED* (TWELVE voted FOR and TWO voted AGAINST) that the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives as set out in the report and the amendment sheet together with an additional informative regarding the need for a structural survey to be undertaken.