

Minutes

Planning Committee

8th June 2010



Present

Councillors	Present	Councillors	Present
J E Abbott	Apologies	D Mann	Yes
E Bishop	Yes	Mrs J M Money	Yes
J C Collar	Yes	Lady Newton	Yes
Mrs E Edey	Yes	J O'Reilly-Cicconi	Yes
Ms L B Flint	Yes	Mrs W D Scattergood (Chairman)	Yes
T J W Foster	Yes	Mrs L Shepherd	Yes
Mrs B A Gage	Yes	Mrs G A Spray	Yes
Mrs M E Galione	Apologies		

9 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interests were made.

10 MINUTES

DECISION: That the minutes of the meeting held on 25th May 2010 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

11 QUESTION TIME

INFORMATION: There were four statements made, a summary of which is contained in the Appendix to these Minutes.

Any amendments to the Officers' recommendations having taken into account the issues raised by members of the public would be dealt with by conditions, a summary of which is contained within the appropriate minute. Full details of the Decision Notices are contained in the Register of Planning Applications.

12 PLANNING APPLICATIONS APPROVED

DECISION: That the undermentioned planning applications be approved under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, including Listed Building Consent where appropriate, subject to the conditions contained in the Head of District Development's report, as amended below, details of which are contained in the Register of Planning Applications.

<u>Plan No.</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Applicant(s)</u>	<u>Proposed Development</u>
*10/00471/FUL (APPROVED)	Black Notley	Mr D Chapman	Proposed extensions. 93 Brain Valley Avenue.

The Committee approved this application, subject to an additional condition as follows:-

Additional Condition

8. Development shall not be commenced until a scheme showing how construction and contractors vehicles will access and park at the site, and a dust and mud control management scheme have both been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and shall be adhered to throughout the site clearance and construction process.

13 S106 AGREEMENTS

DECISION: That, subject to the applicant entering into a suitable planning obligation pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure a financial contribution of £2,290.51 towards the enhancement and provision of open space within the surrounding area, the Head of District Development be authorised to grant planning permission for the following development, in accordance with the conditions and reasons set out in his report, as amended below.

<u>Plan No.</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Applicant(s)</u>	<u>Proposed Development</u>
*10/00537/OUT	White Colne	Mr G Sharp	Erection of two storey rear extension and first floor side extension to existing dwelling and alterations including reduction in building width, rationalise existing parking area and erection of two storey dwellinghouse with parking and amenity areas and formation of new vehicular access.

PLEASE NOTE: The full list of standard conditions and reasons can be viewed at the office of the Head of District Development, Council Offices, Causeway House, Bocking End, Braintree, Essex CM7 9HB.

(Where applications are marked with an * this denotes that representations were received and considered by the Committee).

The meeting closed at 8:02pm.

MRS W D SCATTERGOOD

(Chairman)

APPENDIX

PLANNING COMMITTEE 8th JUNE 2010

PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Summary of Questions Asked / Statements Made During Public Question Time

1. Statement by Mr Stuart Rowe (AGENT) – The Planning & Design Bureau, 45 Hart Road Thundersley, speaking on Application No. 10/00537/OUT

Mr Rowe outlined that on four previous occasions an application had been refused. He said his client had listened to the views of the Parish Council and taken on board their objections. He stated that the Parish Council found two dwellings acceptable and that he has received support from some residents who want to see a regeneration of the site.

2. Statement by Mr Rodney Cutting (Objector), 89 Brain Valley Avenue, speaking on Application No. 10/00471/FUL

Mr Cutting introduced himself as resident of Brain Valley Avenue which, he said was a quiet and tranquil area with one and two bed bungalows, ideal for people wishing to retire and downsize. He objected to the extension on the grounds of size in so far as it would alter the appearance and character of the property and surroundings. He said Brain Valley Avenue should not be turned into family homes but admitted that an extension in principle would not be undesirable; but one of this size would be. He contested the recommendation of planning officers for these reasons. He also contested the visibility of the extension and queried the need for such an extension compared to the nuisance and disruption it would cause.

3. Statement by Mr Jack Cornell (Objector), 91 Brain Valley Avenue, speaking on Application No. 10/00471/FUL

Mr Cornell agreed with Mr Cutting's points and said the proposed extension to the side of the bungalow would restrict light flow to his own property. He said the bungalow in question is already the largest in the cul-de-sac and that another extension would change the character of the area detrimentally. He stated that the bungalows are adequate for a peaceful and quiet life and fulfil their purpose. He was also opposed to the level of obstruction and noise likely to be caused by the commencement of the development. In summary, Mr Cornell disputed the reports findings that there would be no visual change to the front of the property especially with regards to removal of the bay window and secondary changes to the front of the bungalow.

4. Statement by Miss Laura Clark (Objector), 113 The Street, speaking on Application No. 10/00471/FUL

Miss Clark said the property in question backs directly onto her family's house. She said that as she lived on the bottom of a slope and since the property of the applicant was high above their own property, she could clearly view the property and contested the recommendation to insert a 6ft fence as this would not sufficiently obstruct the view due to the height of the slope. She said that fences have been taken down along with bushes, and that she had a clear view straight from her bedroom window across to the property in question. The fence that has been erected in her view does not alleviate the problem.