

AMENDMENT SHEET

Planning Committee
3 January 2019

AMENDMENTS OF CONDITIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

7.1 181382 – Tollgate Centre Shopping Park, Tollgate West, Stanway

Amendments to conditions:

Condition 5:

Non Standard Condition - Floorspace for the sale of food and drink

Other than the unit used for the sale of frozen food, no more than 1,117sqm of retail sales floorspace shall be used for the sale of food and drink.

Reason: In order to maintain the function of the site as an Urban District Centre by ensuring an adequate mix of uses on the site.

Condition 6:

Restriction on Mezzanine Floor Space

Notwithstanding the definition of 'development', the creation of any additional mezzanine level or intermediate floorspace within any building or part of a building within the development hereby approved is not permitted without the further grant of planning permission for the expansion of floorspace from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt as to the scope of the permission and because the impacts of the proposal, along with necessary forms and levels of mitigation, have been assessed on this basis.

Agenda Item 8 – Stane Park, Phase 2

A representation has been received from the Applicant's Agent as follows:

On behalf of our client, the applicant, The Churchmanor Estates Company plc, we must register concern at the unacceptable delay that has arisen here with regard to the County Council's consideration of CBC Members' desire to see the additional crossing.

We appreciate that assessments and processes no doubt need to be undertaken but a route now needs to be taken to expedite matters.

The Committee resolved to grant permission for the Stane Park development on 23rd August 2018. That Resolution has a clear expectation that the s106 Agreement would be completed and the permission issued within six months, ie by the 23rd February. In the circumstances our client supports the Officer's recommendation as set out at paragraph 1.1 of the Report (as the least worst option).

Our client has very strong reservations in respect of the two 'alternative options' set out at paragraph 3.1 of the Report. Both options would cause further delay to the scheme and, in respect of the second one, would place unreasonable requirements on the applicant to potentially have to submit a further planning application should the County Council finally come to the conclusion that the crossing proposals sought by condition 14 were unacceptable.