



SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS
TOWN COUNCIL

Champions Manor Hall
Hullbridge Road
South Woodham Ferrers
Essex CM3 5LJ
Tel. 01245 321817

PLANNING COMMITTEE AGENDA

For a Meeting to be held at 7.00pm on
Tuesday 26th March 2019

at Champions Manor Hall, Hullbridge Road,
South Woodham Ferrers

Membership:

Councillor K Golding (Vice Chairman)

Councillor M Sismey
Councillor P Ferry
Councillor I Roberts

Councillor J Birch
Councillor A John
Councillor R Luckman

Councillor D Eley
Councillor M Lobar

Local residents are welcome to attend this meeting. At the meeting, your elected Councillors will take decisions affecting YOU, the Community and the Town. At the beginning of the meeting there is an opportunity for you to make representations, answer questions and give evidence in respect of any item of business on the agenda. The public may participate for up to 15 minutes for this purpose. If you have any queries, please telephone the Town Clerk on 01245 321817. Please join us.

**Karen Hawkes BSc (Hons)
Town Clerk
19th March 2019**

1. Election of Chairman

2. Apologies for Absence

To RECEIVE and ACCEPT any apologies for absence.

3. Declarations of Interest

Any Member declaring an interest is asked to state whether this is a pecuniary or non-pecuniary interest. Clarification, if required, can be sought prior to the meeting with the Chairman or the Town Clerk.

4. Confirmation of Minutes

To APPROVE the minutes of the meeting held on 26th February 2019 as a true record.

5. Public Questions

In accordance with Standing Order 3.e to allow up to 15 minutes for members of the public to make representations, answer questions and give evidence in respect of any item of business on the agenda. At the close of this item members of the public will no longer be permitted to address the Committee; Members with pecuniary interests will also not be permitted to speak, address the Committee on those interests and must leave the meeting when the item in relation to their interest is being discussed.

6. Previous Planning Decisions

To note the City Council planning decisions which differ from the Town Council recommendations as circulated at the meeting.

7. Current Planning Applications

To consider such planning and tree applications as are outstanding. Applications have been received on the following properties:

19/05023/TPO	5	Clevis Drive	(T1) - Oak - Rear garden - Crown reduce to previous pruning points of 2-2.5m maximum - Remove epicormic growth up to crown break - Reason: Good tree maintenance to safeguard future life of tree	AJ
19/05027/TPO	5	Clevis Drive	(T1) - Oak - Rear garden - Reduce the crown back to previous pruning points, approx. 2-2.5m, remove deadwood - Reason: To maintain tree, not to exceed current size.	AJ
19/00263/FUL	9	The Bight	Single Storey Rear and Side Extension with Flat Roof.	MS
19/00278/FUL	5-7	Baron Road	Conversion of existing function room and construction of additional two storeys to create six residential units. New vehicle crossover and parking area. Construction of bicycle and bin stores.	ML
19/00283/FUL	13	Whitehouse Road	Proposed single storey annexe.	KG
19/00222/FUL	3	Connaught Drive	Demolition of existing conservatory, part single and part two storey rear extension. Additional front roof window.	PF
19/00300/FUL	1-10	Queen Elizabeth II Square	Change of use of 9 parking spaces to hand car wash and valeting operation including the installation of a cabin and erection of a canopy.	JB
19/00279/FUL	Land North of Car Park	Creekview Road	Construction of club house and changing rooms.	JB
18/02069/ADV	Site At Crouch Vale Nurseries	Burnham Road	Installation and display of the following signs: 1x internally illuminated Combined Totem	KG

19/00371/FUL	59	Downleaze	Single storey front extension. Garage conversion.	KG
19/00310/FUL	131	Hullbridge Road	Single storey rear extension.	DE

8. Planning Applications – Non Material Amendments

To consider the Non Material Amendment to the following planning application.

14/00830/NMAT/9 - Former Crouch Vale Nurseries & Plantworld Burnham Road - Non-material amendment to planning permission 14/00830/FUL (Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of site to provide a retail foodstore (Use Class A1) and petrol filling station, a health facility (Use Class D1), associated car parking, a new roundabout access, landscaping & associated works.) for a screened area to the west of the site to enclose air source heat exchangers for the heating system and air conditioning condensers.

9. Chelmsford City Council Local Plan

To note the Examiners Post Hearing Advice Note attached to the agenda.

10. Report to Council

To agree items for report to the next Council meeting on 14th May 2019.

11. Media Coverage

To consider whether any items on this Agenda warrant a Media release, and, if so, to agree a Councillor to comment, if applicable.

12. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Committee will be on 30th April 2019, at 7pm.

Examination into the soundness of the Chelmsford Local Plan

Inspector's Post Hearing Advice

Introduction

1. At this stage I consider that the Local Plan (LP) is a plan which could be found sound subject to main modifications (MMs). However, I have reached no final conclusions at this time. The MMs will be subject to consultation and I will reach my final conclusions taking representations into account.
2. During the hearing sessions a number of potential MMs were discussed and a list has been maintained by the Council. I will be commenting on this list in due course. In addition I indicated at the hearings that there were matters on which I would need to deliberate before I would be in a position to advise the Council as to whether any additional work or further MMs should be considered. This letter provides my views on those matters where I consider further MMs are necessary. It also sets out next steps and the administrative arrangements relating to all potential MMs.
3. I am only seeking comments from the Council on the contents of this letter and am not inviting any other responses. Any received by the Programme Officer will be immediately returned. I will detail my reasoning on all the main issues in my final report on the LP.

Further main modifications

Gypsy, traveller and travelling showpeople sites

4. Policy HO3 criterion A) iii requires that when considering planning applications for gypsy, traveller and travelling showpeople accommodation '*the capacity of the site does not exceed 10 pitches or plots*'. In relation to the sub-division of sites criterion B) iv states that this will be permitted if it '*does not result in a total of more than 10 pitches on a site*'. As discussed within the hearings I questioned this 10 pitch/plots restriction.
5. National planning policy for traveller sites requires that criteria based policies should be fair and effective in facilitating the traditional and nomadic life of travellers while respecting the interests of the settled community. The available evidence does not adequately demonstrate why sites should be restricted to 10 pitches or plots. Furthermore, the policy contains other criteria against which impact and scale of any proposals could be considered. For these reasons, and given the lack of evidence, criterion A) iii and B) iv are not justified and should be deleted.

Green belt

6. Paragraph 6.77 of the LP states that '*only minor and limited alterations to the green belt boundary are proposed*'. If changes are to be made to the green belt boundary, exceptional circumstances must be demonstrated. No such evidence is before me. Consequently, this wording must be deleted from the LP and set out as a MM. In addition, the green belt boundary alterations must be deleted from the policies map and set out in the proposed policies map changes document, including in map form. The Council may also wish to consider whether this results in the need for any further consequential changes to the LP or policies map.

Green wedges, green corridors and valued landscapes

7. I have considered the evidence base for the designation of green wedges and green corridors within the LP and their identification as valued landscapes.
8. In the case of green wedges the LP seeks to protect and enhance them for their openness and function as important green networks within and adjacent to the urban environment. Though set out in evidence and referred to by the Council in the hearings, their important role in preventing coalescence of urban areas is not made explicitly clear within relevant policies or the supporting text. Consequently, the Council should amend these to include this purpose, to ensure that the green wedge designation is clear and effective. This should be set out as a MM.
9. The Council has confirmed that the valued landscapes reference in the LP is in the context of paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). I recognise that the river valleys within and beyond the urban areas are important landscape and environmental features within the Chelmsford area, have a predominantly high sensitivity to change as set out within the Landscape Character Assessment (EB099) and are of value to local communities. However, this does not necessarily mean that they are valued landscapes in the context of the Framework.
10. Whilst I accept that the Framework does not prescribe how valued landscapes should be defined, an assessment, using suitable landscape and visual impact criteria, is a useful way of considering and demonstrating value. I note that the consultants who produced the Green Wedges and Green Corridors Review Report (EB094A and EB094B) were not tasked with assessing whether these areas are valued landscapes. No other assessment of these or any other landscape areas within the plan area has been carried out. Due to the lack of evidence, the valued landscape designation within the LP for both green wedges and green corridors is not justified.

11. As regards the green corridors, the available evidence does not adequately demonstrate why these areas require a separate landscape designation, and why they have been specifically identified when compared to the surrounding landscape. The purpose and function of these designations within the LP is not entirely clear, particularly when combined with my concerns about lack of justification for their identification as valued landscapes. Furthermore, these areas are within the open countryside and are already covered by either green belt or rural area designations. Some of the areas are also protected for their value for ecology and wildlife, heritage, and functional requirements including flood zones.

12. Consequently, in relation to my above concerns I suggest that the Council has two options:

Option 1 - To delete the green corridor designations and valued landscape references within the LP. The Council should carefully consider any implications of these changes for other relevant policies within the LP. These changes should be set out as MMs. In addition, changes to the submission policies map should be set out in a separate schedule, to include maps, as this will need to be consulted on alongside the MMs.

Option 2 - To re-visit the green corridor evidence and designations now and produce an assessment on valued landscapes. This would require a pause of the examination until the additional work and consultation on it is completed. It may also be necessary to hear evidence on these matters at a further hearing session. Inevitably this would result in a delay to the examination.

13. If the Council decides to pursue option 1, it would be able to re-visit these issues when it next updates the plan.

Sustainability appraisal

14. The sustainability appraisal (SA) refers to green corridor designations as a reason for rejecting development. Should the green corridors be removed from the LP it may be necessary to consider whether this would make any difference to the SA findings. Whilst the actual landscape attributes and effects of development on landscapes would be the same, it is not clear what affect, if any, the removal of this designation would have on such factors as the weighting to be given to protection from development? The Council may wish to consider this matter further.

15. The Council should also satisfy themselves that they have met the requirements for SA in relation to the other potential MMs, as appropriate. I will need to see a draft of any SA addendum or update and may have comments on it. This should be published as part of the future MMs public consultation.

Next steps

16. The Council should now consider their options in relation to green corridors and valued landscapes and inform me of their decision by **22 February 2019**. If option 2 is chosen, then details of the work required and timescales necessary to undertake the additional work should be clearly set out in a work programme. This should be submitted to me through the Programme Officer by the above date.
17. If the option to remove the green corridor designations and valued landscape references is chosen, the Council should prepare the further MMs highlighted in this letter and incorporate them into a consolidated schedule of all the potential MMs. The Council should also consider the need for any consequential changes to the LP and from the submission policies map that might be required in connection with any potential MMs. Any changes to the submission policies map should be set out in a separate schedule, including in map form.
18. I will need to see the draft MM schedule and may have further comments on it. I will also need to agree the final version along with any proposed map changes before these are made available for public consultation. For clarity and to avoid an excessive number of MMs, it is best to group all the changes to a single policy together with any consequential changes to the supporting text as one MM wherever possible.
19. The Council has proposed some other changes to the LP. Except for those I consider should be defined as potential MMs, any other changes which are not necessary for soundness are *additional modifications* and are a matter solely for the Council. I will advise the Council which of the changes they have advanced are actually AMs in due course. If the Council intends to publicise or consult on them it should be made clear that such changes are not a matter for me to consider. Furthermore, the MMs are put forward without prejudice to my final conclusions.
20. The general expectation is that issues raised on the consultation of the draft MMs will be considered through the written representations process and further hearing sessions will only be scheduled exceptionally.

21. I look forward to receiving the Council's response by **22 February 2019**.
If there are any queries or matters that require clarification, please
contact me through the Programme Officer.

Yvonne Wright, Planning Inspector

8 February 2019