

Minutes

Planning and Licensing Committee Tuesday, 28th June, 2016

Attendance

Cllr McCheyne (Chair) Cllr Mrs Hubbard Cllr Ms Rowlands (Vice-Chair) Cllr Keeble

Cllr Barrell Cllr Mrs Middlehurst

Cllr Bridge Cllr Mynott
Cllr Faragher Cllr Newberry

Apologies

Cllr Mrs Murphy Cllr Morrissey

Substitute Present

Cllr Barrett
Cllr Wiles

Also Present

Cllr Reed Cllr Mrs Pound Cllr Hossack Cllr Ms Sanders

Cllr Foan West Horndon Parish Council

Officers Present

Claire Mayhew Governance and Member Support Officer Caroline McCaffrey Development Management Team Leader

Christine Stephenson Planning Solicitor
Kathryn Mathews Senior Planning Officer

Phil Drane Planning Policy Team Leader

Charlotte White Senior Planning Officer Jonnathan Binks Planning Assistant

Brendan Johnston Highways Representative

Paulette McAllister Design and Conversation Officer

70. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Cllr Morrissey, Cllr Barrett was present as a substitute and Cllr Mrs Murphy, Cllr Wiles was present as a substitute.

71. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the Planning and Licensing Committee of 31st May 2016 were approved as a true record.

The Chair, confirmed the amendment to the resolution on the application 06/00226/FUL, Land Rear of 139-141 Coxtie Green Road, Pilgrims Hatch, South Weald, Brentwood.

It was resolved that Planning approval is granted subject to conditions and a Section 106 agreement, in consultation with the Development Management Team Leader and the Chair of this committee. This is reflected within the minute no. 24.

72. Woodacre, The Glade, Hutton, Essex CM13 2JL Application No: 16/00134/FUL Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of three new dwellings

The application had been referred by Cllr Reed for consideration by the Committee.

Mr Hudson was present and addressed the committee in objection to the application.

Mr Hunter, Hutton Residents Association was also present and addressed the committee in objection to the application.

Mr Ward-Booth, Agent was present and addressed the committee in support of the application.

Cllr Reed, Ward Member spoke in objection to this application.

A motion was **MOVED** by Cllr Mynott and **SECONDED** by Cllr Newberry that the application be **REFUSED** as the development is contrary to the NPPF and policies, CP1 (Criteria (i) and (iii)) and H15 of the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan that seeks ensure that new development is of a high quality design that reinforces local distinctiveness; specifically, in this case, Hutton Mount.

A vote was taken by a show of hands.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Cllrs Faragher, Mynott, Newberry, Mrs Hubbard, Barrett and

Keeble (6)

AGAINST: Cllrs Wiles, Mrs Middlehurst, Ms Rowlands and McCheyne (4)

ABSTAIN: Cllr Bridge (1)

RESOLVED, that the application be **REFUSED**.

(Due to a technical fault with the hearing loop, Cllr Barrell withdrew from the debate and was unable to vote on this application).

(The Chair declared a non-pecuniary interest on behalf of the members of the Conservative Group that the members of the committee, as stated in the minute 346 of Planning and Development Committee held on 4th February 2014, that the landowner makes donation to the Conservative Party and isn't personally known to any individual member of this committee).

73. Land west of North Drive, Hutton, Essex Application No: 16/00178/FUL Construction of 2 houses and 2 bungalows with garaging

This application was referred by Cllr Ms Sanders for consideration by the Committee.

Mr Ashworth, was present and addressed the committee in support of the application.

Ms Carpenter, the Agent, was also present and addressed the committee in support of the application.

Ward Councillors, Cllr Ms Sanders and Cllr Hossack, both spoke in support of the application.

A motion was **MOVED** by Cllr Wiles and **SECONDED** by Cllr Faragher the application be **APPROVED** due to the special circumstances of housing needs, ideal infill site which is already partly developed, improvement to the appearance of the area, quality of life for local residents and highways. Local residents in support of this application.

A vote was taken by a show of hands.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Cllrs Wiles, Faragher, Bridge, Mrs Middlehurst, McCheyne,

Ms Rowlands, Newberry and Keeble (8)

AGAINST: Clirs Mynott, Mrs Hubbard and Barrett (3)

ABSTAIN: (0)

RESOLVED, that the application be **APPROVED** subject to conditions in consultation with the Development Management Team Leader and the Chair of Planning and Licensing Committee (N.B. the Committee did not specify any planning conditions).

(Due to a technical fault with the hearing loop, Cllr Barrell withdrew from the debate and was unable to vote on this application).

74. The Croft, Mores Lane, South Weald, Essex CM14 5RU Application No: 16/00278/FUL Modification to approval 14/0037/FUL (construction of a pitched roof canopy over existing dressage training area incorporating covered link to existing stables) to retain existing structure with altered roof cladding, roof pitch increased from 10 to 15 degrees, maximum ridge height increased from 6.95m to 7.95m, number of translucent panels increased from 24 to 80 depth of eaves overhanging increased from 0.6m to 2.0m (retrospective)

This application was referred by Cllr McCheyne for consideration by the Committee.

Mrs Day, was present and addressed the committee in objection to the application.

Ms Lucas, the Applicant Representative, was also present and addressed the committee in support of the application.

Cllr Barrell, spoke on behalf of the Ward Member in support of this application.

A motion was **MOVED** by Cllr Bridge and **SECONDED** by Cllr Middlehurst to **APPROVE** the application.

A vote was taken by a show of hands.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Cllrs Wiles, Faragher, Bridge, Mrs Middlehurst and Ms

Rowlands (5)

AGAINST: Clirs Mynott, Mrs Hubbard, Barrett, Newberry and Keeble (5)

ABSTAIN: (0)

The Vice Chair used her casting vote and the application was approved 6 votes to 5.

RESOLVED, that the application be **APPROVED**.

(Due to a technical fault with the hearing loop, Cllr Barrell withdrew from the debate and was unable to vote on this application and left the meeting after this item).

(Under 5.2 of the Constitution, Cllr McCheyne was not able to vote as he referred this item to the Committee).

75. Oaklands, 26 Hillwood Grove, Hutton, Essex CM13 2PD Application No: 16/00434/FUL Lower ground floor rear and first floor side extensions, rear dormer and alterations

This application had been referred by Cllr Reed for consideration by the Committee.

Mr Golding was present and addressed the committee in objection to the application.

Cllr Reed, Ward Member spoke in objection to this application. Relating to the size of the development and H15 of the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan that seeks ensure that new development is of a high quality design that reinforces local distinctiveness; specifically, in this case, Hutton Mount.

A motion was **MOVED** by Cllr Mynott and **SECONDED** by Cllr Wiles to **REFUSE** this application as there is no compliance with policies CP1 and H15.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Cllrs Wiles, Faragher, Bridge, Mrs Middlehurst, Mynott, Mrs

Hubbard, Barrett, Newberry and Keeble (9)

AGAINST: Clirs Mrs Rowlands and McCheyne (2)

ABSTAIN: (0)

RESOLVED, that the application be **REFUSED**.

76. Castle Point Local Plan Response

The report seeks Members agreement on a formal response to the Castle Point New Draft Local Plan consultation.

The proposed response set out an objection on the basis that Castle Point Borough Council fail to meet the full objectively assessed housing needs for their borough. No information is provided as to where the shortfall of new homes or pitches could be placed, either within the Thames Gateway South Essex housing market area or in adjoining areas, such as Brentwood Borough.

Both Councils have a "duty to cooperate" on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries, particularly strategic priorities between housing market areas.

A motion was **MOVED** by Cllr McCheyne and **SECONDED** by Cllr Ms Rowlands to agree the recommendation set out in the report.

A vote was taken be a show and hands, it was **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY** to:

1. To approve the response to the Castle Point draft New Local Plan as set out in Appendix A.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION

Castle Point has an objectively assessed housing need of between 326 and 410 new homes per annum (Thames Gateway South Essex Strategic Housing Market Assessment, May 2016). This is within a strategic housing market area that includes the boroughs of Basildon, Castle Point, Rochford, Southend-on Sea and Thurrock. Castle Point is proposing to meet a need of only 107 new homes per annum. The Castle Point draft New Local Plan states that this figure "reflects the capacity of the borough to accommodate growth".

Furthermore, the Castle Point draft New Local Plan provides no information as to where the shortfall of new homes or pitches could be placed, either within the housing market area or adjoining areas. Brentwood Borough adjoins the Thames Gateway South Essex housing market area.

89% of Brentwood Borough's total land area is designated as Green Belt, which severely restricts options for new development. In order to meet the identified objectively assessed needs of Brentwood Borough the Council is proposing limited release of Green Belt, potentially reducing Green Belt coverage in the Borough (Brentwood Draft Local Plan, January 2016). This is in order to meet local needs locally, despite Green Belt and infrastructure constraints. The possibility of adding the unmet needs of Castle Point Borough, due to their proposed low annual target of 107 new homes to Brentwood Borough, is unreasonable and is unjustified.

Brentwood Borough is constrained, restricting suitable and available sites for new homes, pitches or transit site provision. For this reason Brentwood Borough Council is unable to accommodate the unmet needs of surrounding districts and object to the Castle Point draft New Local Plan on this premise.

77. Urgent Business

There were no items of Urgent Business.

The meeting concluded at 9.49pm