

## MINUTES

of the

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

held on 14 July 2020 at 6:00 pm

Present:

Councillor J A Sosin (Chair)

Councillors L Ashley, H Ayres, A Davidson, S Dobson, P Hughes,  
R J Hyland, R Lee, G H J Pooley, R J Poulter, T E Roper, C Shaw,  
R J Shepherd and I Wright

Also present: Councillors P Clark and L Millane

### 1. Chair's Announcements

For the benefit of the public, the Chair explained the arrangements for the meeting.

### 2. Attendance and Apologies for Absence

The attendance of those present was confirmed. Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor E J Sampson.

### 3. Declarations of Interest

All Members are reminded that they must disclose any interests they know they have in items of business on the meeting's agenda and that they must do so at this point on the agenda or as soon as they become aware of the interest. If the interest is a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest they are also obliged to notify the Monitoring Officer within 28 days of the meeting. Any declarations are recorded in the relevant minute below.

### 4. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting on 9 June 2020 were confirmed as a correct record.

## 5. Public Question Time

Members of the public made statements on items 11 and 12 on the agenda. Details are recorded under the relevant minute numbers below.

### 6. Nos 10-12 and 14 Hanbury Road, Chelmsford – 19/01917/FUL

### 7. Nos 10-12 and 14 Hanbury Road, Chelmsford – 19/01916/FUL

### 8. No 14 Hanbury Road, Chelmsford – 19/01692/FUL

Councillor Hughes did not participate in consideration of these items as she had not attended the site visit on 13 July 2020. Councillor Pooley did not participate as he had missed part of the Committee's consideration of the applications at its last meeting.

(M6, 7 and 8, PL2, 2020) At its last meeting the Committee had deferred for a site visit:

- an application (19/01917/FUL) for the change of premises at 10-12 and 14 Hanbury Road, Chelmsford from B2 (printing press) and B8 (storage) to sui generis (a builders merchants);
- an application (19/01916/FUL) for a rear and side extension of premises at 10-12 and 14 Hanbury Road, Chelmsford, the construction of three metre high acoustic fencing, and retrospective permission for exterior works to the building; and
- an application (19/01692) for permission to demolish the western part of Unit 4 and the offices to the south frontage of the site at 14 Hanbury Road, Chelmsford; the replacement and repair of the remaining roof and wall cladding; the installation of signage; and the construction of a 2.1 metre perimeter fence.

Since the last meeting, further representations had been received from local residents which had been circulated to members of the Committee. They raised concerns about the accuracy of the information presented to the Committee at the last meeting and since and included a further report from the noise consultant engaged by the residents. They also commented on the height of the proposed buildings and the materials to be used for the roofs. Officers' responses to the points raised by the residents were contained in a Green Sheet of additions and alterations that had been distributed before the meeting.

In discussing the applications, members expressed concerns about:

- the materials to be used for the roofs of the rear building and rear extension. Officers confirmed that a condition could be added to require that non-reflective materials be used for the roofs;

- the discrepancies between the opinions of the various acoustic consultants who had reported on the levels of noise from the operations in the buildings. Officers explained that the discrepancies could be explained by the different methodologies used by the consultants. It was the view of officers that the noise mitigation measures proposed met required standards but that should unacceptable disturbance or nuisance be caused to residents the Council could take enforcement action; and
- the disturbance to local residents from external lighting around the application site and internal lighting visible through the translucent panels on the building. Officers confirmed that a condition could be added requiring the submission of details of the external lighting. The possibility could also be explored of adding a condition requiring that there be no internal lighting outside of the hours of operation that could cause a disturbance to neighbouring residents.

In response to other questions from members, officers said that the hours of operation of the business would be less than those associated with the previous use of the site. Questions of health and safety and whether there was sufficient space at the rear boundary of the application site and distance between the rear of the proposed buildings and the neighbours' properties were a matter for building regulations and were not a planning consideration.

RESOLVED that applications 19/01817/FUL, 19/01916/FUL and 19/01692/FUL in respect of 10-12 and 14 Hanbury Road, Chelmsford be approved, subject to

- the conditions set out in the reports to the meeting,
- the addition of conditions requiring that the roof of Nos 10-12 Hanbury Road to be treated with a non-reflective finish and one requiring the submission of details of external lighting, and
- the possibility being explored of adding a condition requiring that there be no internal lighting outside of the hours of operation that could cause a disturbance to neighbouring residents.

(6.06pm to 6.35pm)

## 9. Land South of 69 Torquay Road, Chelmsford – 20/00094/FUL

Councillor Lee did not participate in the consideration of this item.

(M11, PL5, 2020) On 9 June 2020 the Committee had been minded to refuse this application which was for the erection of a two-storey detached dwelling on land to the south of 69 Torquay Road and a part one-storey, part two-storey rear extension to the host dwelling. It had deferred a decision to enable reasons for refusal to be drawn up based on the Committee's concern about the adverse effect the development would have on the street scene of Torquay Road and the character and openness of current development in that road.

Since the last meeting the agent for the applicant had submitted further comments on the application and the accuracy of information presented at the last meeting. These had been circulated to members of the Committee, and the Green Sheet distributed before the meeting

set out the officers' comments on the points made by the agent. The Committee was of the view that nothing had changed its opinion that the development was not acceptable for the reasons given at the last meeting.

RESOLVED that application 20/00094/FUL in respect of 69 Torquay Road, Chelmsford, be refused for the reason set out in the report to the meeting.

(6.35pm to 6.42pm)

## 10. No 90 Brook Lane, Galleywood, Chelmsford – 20/00251/FUL

Councillor Hughes did not participate in consideration of this items as she had not attended the site visit on 13 July 2020. Councillor Hyland declared a non-prejudicial interest and withdrew from the meeting during its consideration.

(M9, PL3, 2020) The Committee considered at its meeting on 9 June 2020 an application for a first floor rear and side extension to 90 Brook Lane, Galleywood. It had deferred a decision to enable a site visit to be carried out.

A Green Sheet of additions and alterations distributed before the meeting included clarification about the position of the kitchen and bathroom windows of 88 Brook Lane.

Members who spoke on the application were primarily concerned about the loss of light to the neighbouring property the development would cause and the majority believed that it should be refused for that reason.

RESOLVED that application 20/00251/FUL in respect of 90 Brook Lane, Galleywood be refused for the following reason:

Policy DM29 of the Chelmsford Local Plan relates to protecting living and working environments and states that planning permission will be granted providing the development, amongst other matters, safeguards the living environment of the occupiers of any nearby residential property by ensuring that the development is not overbearing and does not result in unacceptable overlooking or overshadowing.

The proposed extension would increase the amount of built form close to the boundary with Number 88. The side facing kitchen window to Number 88 would suffer from a loss of light as a result of the first floor side and rear extension. This would be harmful to the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers and would be contrary to Policy DM29.

(6.42pm to 6.57pm)

## 11. The Lodge Country Inn, Hayes Chase, Battlesbridge, Wickford – 20/00386/FUL

The Committee considered an application for the construction of 22 single-storey two-bed chalets to supplement the existing accommodation at The Lodge Country Inn, Hayes Chase, Battlesbridge.

A statement on behalf of the applicant was read out at the meeting and a ward councillor attended to speak in support of the application. Both argued that the development would provide economic benefits to that part of Chelmsford and that such benefits would constitute the very special circumstances necessary to justify development in the Green Belt. Other similar establishments had been extended in recent years and in the present circumstances caused by the coronaries pandemic the Council should be supporting businesses rather than preventing their development. The development would have minimum impact on the openness of the surrounding countryside, and issues about lack of public transport were not uncommon in such a rural location.

The Committee was not convinced by the argument that the economic benefits associated with the development represented very special circumstances. It was also concerned about the loss of the current beer garden and family play area, both of which were popular features, and the potential for exacerbating the already problematic parking situation in the area.

RESOLVED that application 20/00386/FUL in respect of The Lodge Country Inn, Hayes Chase, Battlesbridge be refused for the reasons set out in the report to the meeting.

(6.57pm to 7.34pm)

## 12. Site at The Mount, Meadow Lane, Wickford – 20/00425/FUL

An application had been received for the demolition of existing outbuildings at The Mount, Meadow Lane, Wickford and the construction of a new dwelling and cart lodge.

A statement on behalf of the applicant was made at the meeting. It argued that the planning merits of the application outweighed arguments against the mass, scale and height of the development. A ward councillor also spoke in support of the application.

The Committee was of the opinion that there were no special circumstances for granting the application. Although it would be on previously developed land, the development would have a greater impact on the countryside than the current buildings.

RESOLVED that application 20/00425/FUL in respect of the site at The Mount, Meadow Lane, Wickford be refused for the reasons set out in the report to the meeting.

(7.34pm to 7.52pm)

### 13. Planning Appeals

RESOLVED that the information on appeal decisions between 1 June and 1 July 2020 be noted.

The meeting closed at 7.52pm

Chair