



DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

7th JANUARY 2014

PRESENT: Councillors Ladzrie (Vice-Chairman), Anderson, Barrett, Blackwell, Mrs Govier, Hart, Mrs King, Skipp, Smith, Mrs Wass and Canvey Island Town Councillor Greig.

Councillor Mrs Challis OBE also attended.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Brunt (Chairman), Cross and Mrs Liddiard.

Due to the absence of the Chairman Councillor Ladzrie chaired the meeting.

27. MEMBERS' INTERESTS

There were no disclosures of interest.

28. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 5th December 2013 were taken as read and signed as correct.

29. DEPOSITED PLANS

(a) CPT/526/13/FUL – THE APPLETON SCHOOL, CROFT ROAD, BENFLEET (APPLETON WARD) – ERECTION OF TWO STOREY SIXTH FORM CLASSROOM BLOCK, EXTENSION OF EXISTING CAR PARKING, RELOCATION OF 3 NO. TEMPORARY MODULAR BUILDINGS AND ASSOCIATED WORKS – THE APPLETON SCHOOL

The application sought permission for a new sixth form building for the school, which did not currently provide post-16 education facilities. The proposal was considered to be in compliance with all relevant policies and guidance and was therefore recommended for approval.

The application was presented to the Committee at the request of Councillor Skipp.

It was reported that a number of objections to the proposal had been submitted by local residents. The Planning Officer explained that many of those concerns were not matters the Committee should consider. Loss of privacy and

dominance were relevant considerations; however it was not felt that a reason for refusal based on either of those objections could be supported on appeal.

With regard to objections relating to parking provision, the proposal incorporated 21 additional car parking spaces; whilst this was below the maximum requirement of 46 spaces it was considered acceptable due to the school's location within an urban area, that it was accessible by public transport, that students at the sixth form would not be permitted to park on site and would be advised to travel to the site by alternative means, and in light of the Government's commitment to the improvement of educational facilities. It was therefore not considered that an objection to the proposal based on lack of student parking provision could be supported on appeal.

Mr Hall, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application.

During discussion Members expressed their support for the proposal in principle; however there was concern regarding the lack of parking provision on the site. It was felt that parking was already a problem in this area and the addition of a sixth form at the school would only exacerbate the problem. The Committee therefore felt that it could not support a recommendation for approval unless there was an increase in the number of parking spaces to be provided on the site.

A Member also suggested that a travel plan should be submitted by the applicant setting out how the proposed building would integrate with existing public transport.

Following detailed discussion it was:-

Resolved –

1. That the application be approved, subject to the conditions as set out in the Planning Officer's report and with two additional conditions to provide a minimum of 46 parking spaces on site to meet the needs of the sixth form accommodation and the submission of an acceptable travel plan.
2. That the wording of such conditions be prepared by the Head of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Cllr Skipp, as Ward Member.

(b) CPT/599/13/FUL – LAND TO THE REAR OF 17 AND 19 DOWNER ROAD, BENFLEET (BOYCE WARD) – 2 NO. 4 BEDROOMED DETACHED HOUSES – MESSRS O'SULLIVAN AND GOODMAN

The application sought permission for two detached houses on land that was currently within the curtilages of numbers 17 and 19 Downer Road and would have a frontage to Rhoda Road. The site was allocated for Green Belt purposes; however it lay within a broader area which had been identified as

partially and previously developed land which was suitable for release for residential development.

The proposed development was considered to have an acceptable relationship with the surrounding area, both in visual terms and in terms of its impact on adjacent residents. It was therefore considered that the proposal represented an acceptable form of development.

The application was presented to the Committee as it represented a departure from the adopted Local Plan.

The Planning Officer explained that although Rhoda Road was an unmade road it was not intended to request a contribution from the developer to improve the pedestrian and vehicular access to the site. Given the scale of the development proposed and its proximity to London Road it was not considered that the level of traffic and resultant impact on the road would be so great that such a request would be justified.

During discussion some Members raised concerns that a contribution was not being sought from the developer to improve the road. Whilst Members noted the officer's comments it was felt that improvements to this section of road were essential and it was suggested that the applicant be required to enter into a Section 106 Agreement to make up the road across the frontage of the site.

It was noted that a condition to improve a section of Rhoda Road had already been imposed as part of planning consent for another development in London Road and it was requested that any further improvements to the road should be carried out in conjunction with these works.

During the debate some Members felt that the application was premature as it was prior to the approval of a new Local Plan and that it should be refused as inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Following detailed discussion it was:-

Resolved – That the application be approved subject to conditions set out in the Planning Officer's report and to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement, the effect of which is to make up the road across the frontage of the site and that any such works should be carried out in conjunction with other improvements to other sections of Rhoda Road previously agreed by the Committee.

(Councillors Anderson, Barrett, Blackwell and Mrs King requested that their vote be recorded against the above decision).

Chairman