

Planning Committee

Thursday, 16 March 2017

Attendees: Councillor Lyn Barton, Councillor Helen Chuah, Councillor Pauline Hazell, Councillor Theresa Higgins, Councillor Brian Jarvis, Councillor Cyril Liddy, Councillor Derek Loveland, Councillor Jackie Maclean
Substitutes: Councillor Dave Harris (for Councillor Rosalind Scott)

446 Site Visits

Councillors Barton, Chuah, Hazell, Higgins, Jarvis, Liddy, Loveland and J. Maclean attended the site visits.

447 Minutes of 16 February 2017

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 February 2017 were confirmed as a correct record.

448 163203 3 Ward Close, Belle Vue Road, Wivenhoe, Colchester

Councillor Chuah (by reason of her acquaintance with the applicants) declared a non-pecuniary interest in the following item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(5).

Councillor Higgins (by reason of her acquaintance with the applicants and the residents of the neighbouring property) declared a non-pecuniary interest in the following item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(5).

The Committee considered a retrospective application to remove condition 19 of planning permission 140208 at 3 Ward Close, Belle Vue Road, Wivenhoe, Colchester. The application had been referred to the Committee because the application had been called in by Councillor Scott. The Committee had before it a report in which all the information was set out. The Committee made a site visit in order to assess the impact of the proposals upon the locality and the suitability of the proposals for the site.

RESOLVED (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

449 170158 St James' House and the Waiting Room, Queen Street, Colchester

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of St James' House and the Waiting Room at Queen Street, Colchester. The application had been referred to the Committee because the applicant was Colchester Borough Council. The Committee had before it a report in which all the information was set out. The Committee made a site visit in order to assess the impact of the proposals upon the locality and the suitability of the proposals for the site.

Simon Cairns, Major Development and Projects Manager, presented the report and assisted the Committee in its deliberations.

RESOLVED (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

450 170260 8 Roman Road, Colchester

The Committee considered an application to demolish the rear extension, build a two storey rear extension and replace the entrance door to the front of 8 Roman Road, Colchester. The application had been referred to the Committee because the applicant was an employee of the Council. The Committee had before it a report and amendment sheet in which all the information was set out. The Committee made a site visit in order to assess the impact of the proposals upon the locality and the suitability of the proposals for the site.

Daniel Cameron, Planning and Contributions Officer, presented the report and, assisted the Committee in its deliberations. He explained that, following representations from the applicant confirming there was no prospect of a collaborative way forward in respect of the width of the first floor rear window and the use of brick facing materials, the recommendation contained in the report had been changed to refusal of the application.

John Pearce addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in support of the application. He explained that the proposed extension faced a green space which was a discreet part of Castle Park. There were various forms of rear extensions to neighbouring properties and he considered the proposal would be a visual improvement to the existing extensions at the application site. The design was a mix of contemporary and traditional and accorded with 'golden ratio' design principles. The proposed finish would be larch rather than the originally intended cedar which would complement the host dwelling. He considered the use of brick as a facing material would have a jarring effect as it would be difficult to source an exact match with the existing brick and it would create an incoherent finish.

He referred to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which sought to raise standards of design and advocated design respecting the character of a location. However, he also considered that the NPPF argued against the imposition of a design style and accordingly asked the Committee to view the application favourably.

The Planning and Contributions Officer referred to the various trees in the locality which, it had been argued, would provide a measure of screening of the proposed extension. He explained that the trees were not in the ownership of the applicant and, as such, there was no assurance that they would remain. He was of the view that the application drawings did not entirely comply with the 'golden ratio' spiral which had been applied to them, particularly in relation to large parts of the upper window. In any event the spiral ratio of proportionality was only one method of measuring good design. He went on to confirm that the requirement for a brick finish had been at the request of the Council's Historic Buildings and Areas Officer, given the application site's location within the town centre conservation area.

Members of the Committee noted the applicant's request for the application to be refused should his application not be acceptable without revision and went on to express their considerable disappointment that the applicant was unwilling to accede to the requirements deemed necessary within a conservation area and that, given the circumstances, it had not been possible to agree on a suitable compromise.

RESOLVED (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be refused and the Head of Commercial Services be given delegated authority to determine the detailed wording of the reasons for refusal based on the heads of terms set out in the report, namely the design of the proposed rear pattern of fenestration and the proposed facing materials and the harm which would be caused to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

451 163120 29 The Crescent, Great Horkesley, Colchester

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of a small brick shed and new extension to the rear of the property at The Crescent, Great Horkesley, Colchester. The application had been referred to the Committee because the applicant was an employee of the Council. The Committee had before it a report in which all the information was set out.

RESOLVED (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

452 162876 40 Heckworth Close, Colchester

Councillor Liddy (by reason of his directorship of Colchester Borough Homes)

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 a museum store extension at 40 Heckworth Close, Colchester. The application had been referred to the Committee because the applicant was Colchester Borough Homes. The Committee had before it a report in which all the information was set out.

RESOLVED (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.