

# Minutes

## Braintree Area Committee



19<sup>th</sup> September 2006

Present:

<b>Councillors</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>Present</b>
M J Banthorpe	Yes	E R Lynch	Yes
E Bishop	Yes	M Lynch	Yes
G Butland	Apologies	D Mann	Yes
R Cavinder	Yes	A F Millam	Apologies
C F Coughlan	Apologies	Lady Newton	Yes
N D C Edey (Chairman)	Yes	D M Reid	Yes
W P Edwards	Yes	D E A Rice	Yes
A V E Everard	Yes	Mrs J W Schmitt	Apologies
J H G Finbow	Yes	Miss M Thorogood	Apologies
Ms L B Flint	Yes	S M Walsh	Apologies
M J Green	Apologies	R G Walters	Yes
R M Haslam	Yes	Ms L R Watson	Apologies
A G W Jenner	Apologies	T S Wilkinson	Yes

### 38 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following declaration of interest was made:-

- Councillor Lady Newton declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 5 – Application No. 06/01570/FUL – 60 East Street, Coggeshall as she had advised the applicant and objectors and knew the objectors socially. Councillor Lady Newton left the meeting during the discussion on this item and the relevant part of Public Question Time.

In accordance with the Code of Conduct, all Councillors remained at the meeting, unless stated otherwise, and took part in the discussion for all the items and the vote thereon.

### 39 MINUTES

**DECISION:** The minutes of the meeting of the Braintree Area Committee held on 22<sup>nd</sup> August 2006 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### 40 PUBLIC 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 after 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.

41 PLANNING APPLICATION APPROVED

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

*(Councillor Lady Newton left the meeting during the discussion of the following item)*

<u>Plan No.</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Applicant(s)</u>	<u>Proposed Development</u>
*06/01570/FUL (APPROVED)	Coggeshall	Mr & Mrs S N Johns	Erection of two storey front extension, side garage and front dormer, 60 East Street.

42 PLANNING APPLICATION REFUSED

**DECISION:** That the undermentioned planning application be refused for the reasons set out in the report.

<u>Plan No.</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Applicant(s)</u>	<u>Proposed Development</u>
*06/01613/FUL (REFUSED)	Shalford	Dr P Mayo	Erection of one and a half storey side extension, single storey rear extension, porch and detached garage, 1 Old Fox Cottages, Church End.

43 MINUTES FROM OTHER GROUPS/PANELS

Braintree Town Centre Strategy Group – 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2006

**DECISION:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2006 be noted.

PLEASE NOTE: The full list of standard conditions and reasons can be viewed at the office of Planning Services, 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 8.06pm.

N D C EDEY  
(Chairman)

## APPENDIX

### BRAINTREE AREA COMMITTEE

19<sup>th</sup> SEPTEMBER 2006

### PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

#### Summary of Questions Asked/Statements Made During Public Question Time

1 Statements relating to Application No. 06/01570/FUL - 60 East Street, Coggeshall

*(Councillor Lady Newton left the meeting during the following statements)*

(a) Statement by Mr Hubert Ashton, 59 East Street, Coggeshall

Mr Ashton stated that his property was opposite the application site and would therefore be most affected by the proposal. He had nothing against the Johns family but felt he must protect his house for himself and future occupiers. He considered that if permission was granted, No. 58 would follow suit, exacerbating the damage to the conservation area. He noted that No. 53 had been extended already, No. 56 was a single storey building with no dormer windows. Mr Ashton considered that the issue of loss of privacy was a matter of opinion and should be treated with caution. He noted that the previous application was refused due to its bulky design and two storey appearance but the present application was of greater bulk and had only been modestly amended. Mr Ashton earnestly and respectfully asked the Committee to refuse the application.

(b) Statement by Mr Simon Johns (Applicant)

Mr Johns explained that since the previous application was rejected, he had met with the Council's planning department and sought advice for the revised application. He noted that the extension would be one storey in appearance, exterior features would be adjusted such as rendering and the appearance of windows. Mr Johns had noted that the parish council felt the elevation was much improved and did not object to the proposal. He regretted that the neighbours took exception to the proposal but he had done his utmost to respond to the advice of the planning department. Many of the neighbours supported the plans and considered there would be no negative impact on them or East Street. Mr Johns hoped the Committee would support the planning department recommendation for approval.

2 Statements relating to Application No. 06/01613/FUL – 1 Old Fox Cottages, Church End, Shalford

(a) Statement by Mrs Heather Matthews, Fox House, Church End, Shalford

Mrs Matthews noted that previous applications had been rejected and that her neighbours had threatened and then invoked the appeals procedure. Mrs Matthews quoted three points raised in the Planning Inspector's

statement relating to the last appeal. These referred to the dominance of the proposed extension to the side of the property, the fact that it would no longer be a modest cottage and thirdly that it would not sit comfortably in its surroundings. She noted that although the new application was for a reduced extension, it did not address the issues raised by the Planning Inspector. The property would be increased from three bedrooms to six. Mrs Matthews considered that the present application did not address the Planning Inspector's reasons for rejecting the proposal.

(b) Statement by Mr Greg Matthews, Fox House, Church End, Shalford

Mr Matthews considered that the extension would add approximately 90% to the existing floor area and was still too big. He felt the original application should not have got as far as it did and noted that the Planning Inspector declined the application. He referred to the previous application and noted that the applicants were concerned about fitting nine people around the kitchen table, however, he noted that in the new plans the kitchen would be remain its current size and the music room would be increased. Mr Matthews was concerned that if permission was granted, further extensions would be added until the property was as big as the previous submitted plans. He considered that he had been insulted in the past few months and accused of diverse tactics but he was only trying to look after the environment which his family lived in.