



## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **Minutes of the Meeting held on 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2016 at 7.30pm in the Meeting Room, The Old School House, Main Road, Danbury**

**Present:** Cllrs: S Berlyn (ex officio), Mrs A Chapman (ex officio), D Carlin, Mrs Gardiner, A Keeler

In Attendance: Mr R Cole-Jones (Danbury Society)  
Mrs M Saunders (Clerk)  
Mrs H Mayes (Assistant Clerk)  
Mr D Simmonds (Planning Consultant, RPS Group)  
Mr H Atkar (CEO, Oakland Prime Care)  
Three members of the public from St Johns Church

Cllr Berlyn opened the meeting as the Chairman and Vice Chairman were not present.

#### **1 Election of Chairman 2016-2017**

Cllr Telling had indicated that he would be prepared to be nominated. Cllr Carlin nominated Cllr Telling. This was seconded by Cllr Mrs Gardiner. No other nominations were received and Cllr Telling was elected unopposed.

RESOLVED: that Cllr Telling be elected Chairman for 2016-2017

#### **2 Election of Vice Chairman 2016-2017**

Cllr Mrs Chapman nominated Cllr Carlin. This was seconded by Cllr Berlyn. No other nominations were received and Cllr Carlin was elected unopposed.

RESOLVED: that Cllr Carlin be elected Vice Chairman for 2016-2017.

Cllr Carlin then continued to chair the meeting.

#### **3 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received and accepted from Cllr Telling and Mr Alexander.

#### **4 Declarations of Interest**

Members were reminded that they must disclose any pecuniary or non-pecuniary interests they knew they might have in items of business on the meeting's agenda and that they must do so at this point, or as soon as they become aware of the interest. They were reminded that they would need to repeat their declaration at the appropriate point in the meeting and leave the room if the interest is a pecuniary one. They were also obliged to notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest within 28 days of the meeting, if they had not previously notified the Monitoring Officer about it. Unforeseen interests must be declared similarly at the appropriate time.

No interests were declared.

## **5 Public Question Time**

Five members of the public had attended to speak about two different issues.

The first group were from St John's Church and wished to speak regarding a temporary frame to advertise church events. They were aware that they should have spoken to the Parish Council prior to putting up the frame and posts as the land belonged to the Parish Council. The banners would be put up a few days before an event and removed straight after. The next event would be a Flower Festival in June and the representatives from the Church hoped that there would be no objections to the use of the frame.

Cllr Berlyn advised that the Parish Council had received a letter on behalf of the PCC regarding the new frame. The PCC had not requested prior permission to install the concrete bases or the frame from either the Parish Council or Chelmsford City Council. Cllr Berlyn was concerned that the Parish Council could be in breach of planning regulations regarding outdoor advertising. He felt that it would be useful to start the process again to ensure that it was correctly done. He advised that the PCC would need to find out if formal planning consent was required, what the constraints were regarding the size of the frame etc. and whether it was allowed within the conservation area.

The Church Representative confirmed that their noticeboard had been on the land prior to the deed of gift and had been replaced 6 years ago. This was disputed by the Parish Council.

The representatives present were advised that they should send a request in writing to the Parish Council to formally request permission for the frame. Details should be included e.g. type of signs, size etc. Chelmsford City Council would also need to be consulted. The Parish Council did not wish the frame to be used until permission was given and the guidelines for future advertisements were established.

The second group were from RPS Group and Oaklands Primecare and had attended to speak about a proposed care home facility on Hitchcocks Meadow.

Mr Atkar (Oaklands Primecare) spoke first and explained that the proposal was in the very early stages and this was the first time the idea had been discussed in public. He outlined the concept of the proposed facility and explained that Oakland Primecare was a family business established in 1989 and now had 18 care homes around the country. The care homes were for people requiring residential, dementia and nursing care services. Oaklands Primecare considered that they were providing high quality services and looked to surpass the CQC guidelines. They also provided additional amenities e.g. a cinema, library, outdoor space, fine dining restaurant etc. in order to promote independent living. They used a variety of methods to engage with residents with dementia and aimed to ensure that the home was for life and could meet the changing needs of residents. There would also be a wing containing suites which could accommodate people who wish to downsize and allow a couple to continue to live together with different care requirements.

The site in Danbury had been identified for several reasons including its proximity to the new medical centre and its location in the centre of the village. Councillors were welcome to visit the nearest facility which was located in Loughton.

Mr Simmonds then addressed the committee and confirmed that he was aware of history of medical centre, conservation area issues, the views of the Parish Council on previous proposals and the outcome of previous planning applications on the site. Independent research had been commissioned which showed that current provision was sub-standard in this area and there was a shortfall in the supply of beds available locally. Although he agreed there were constraints on the site he also considered there were advantages and that this was the best site available. The geographical area measured for need was within a 5 mile radius of Danbury.

Members commented that planning permission had been refused for a care home sized property at the rear of site previously. At the time of the medical centre applications, the Parish Council held two public meetings and the views of the village were made clear. The medical centre was accepted by residents as there was a need for a new building, however, this was on the basis that there was no development on the field. At the time of the previous application there were no contracts in place to confirm it would be an autism unit and it could have been used for other purposes. It was noted that the Danbury Mission had since put in a car park behind the new medical centre which the Parish Council had objected to.

The units would not be for purchase but on a rental basis. There were currently no options for people to downsize and enjoy a similar standard of living whilst being able to access care. It was likely that the care facility would be split into thirds for each type of care (residential, dementia and nursing).

There was no fixed timescale for a planning application submission. They would be seeking the views of the public and may put in a pre-application to CCC.

Members were concerned that this part of the meadow didn't have its own access. A planning application had been put in for a gate and access across the medical centre entrance. It was explained that there was a contract with the vendor and the access would be shared with the medical centre. The representative from the Danbury Society advised that they were very strongly opposed to development in the centre of the village.

The developers had instructed a Transport Consultant to look at the traffic and highways implications. They would assess access, suitability and generation of traffic. The delay in the medical centre opening had deferred this as they needed to consider the cumulative effects of the traffic from the medical centre. Members advised that there was also a pedestrian crossing due to be put in and that ECC Highways had advised previously that Eves Corner would be at saturation point by 2026 without any further development in Maldon. Further development in the Maldon district was already underway. There were already concerns that accessing the medical centre would be hazardous.

Cllr Berlyn advised that this development might require another public meeting due to the proposals and the location. The developers would welcome this and although

they understood that the Parish Council did not wish to see the rest of the field developed, they hoped that if the village understood their concept, they would be in favour and take a different view.

One resident then made a final comment that the land mentioned under minute 15 would be going for auction shortly and that the Church had been in touch with the agents regarding the access rights.

*All the Members of the Public and the Clerk then left the meeting at 8.15pm*

## **6 Minutes**

RESOLVED: that the minutes of the meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> April 2016 were approved and signed as a correct record.

## **7 Planning Applications – Appendix A**

Five applications were considered and responses agreed.

RESOLVED: that the responses to the planning applications in appendix A be submitted to Chelmsford City Council, and that these applications did not need to be referred to the local Ward Members.

## **8 Planning decisions – Appendix B**

Seven planning decisions were received.

RESOLVED: to note the decisions in Appendix B

## **9 Trees Applications – Appendix C**

Two tree applications were considered and responses agreed.

RESOLVED: that the responses in Appendix C be submitted to Chelmsford City Council.

## **10 CCC Planning Committee**

The last planning meeting was held on 17<sup>th</sup> May 2016. There were no items for Danbury. The next meeting was due on 14<sup>th</sup> June 2016.

RESOLVED: that the information be noted.

## **11 Neighbourhood Plan**

The Area Designation Consultation had now finished and will go to the CCC Development Policy Committee on 9<sup>th</sup> June for a decision. There were three comments in support of the plan and one which raised queries. There had been little interest from residents so far to join a steering group which would be necessary to move the plan forward. The Danbury Society had been approached to see if they would be interested in sending a representative. There would be an article in the next Danbury Times regarding the plan and asking for assistance from residents. Nationally, there was greater emphasis on the weight of Neighbourhood Plans within a Local Plan and it was hoped that there would be some right of reply in the future.

RESOLVED: that the information be noted.

## **12 Neighbouring Parishes Planning Applications**

Updates from neighbouring parishes were circulated. It was noted that two applications in Little Baddow were for the same property (Eastmead) but from two

different applicants for different work. The Assistant Clerk was asked to find out the reason for this.

RESOLVED: that the information be noted and the Assistant Clerk makes enquires regarding the two planning applications in Little Baddow for Eastmead.

**13 Danbury Palace – Permissive Path**

Members discussed an email from Chase New Homes regarding the permissive path opening times Danbury Palace. Members were very disappointed with the limited times and dates offered and also that appointments would need to be made. The path shown on the map does not lead to the gardens which are part of the listed building. The Parish Council would like to see access given to the listed gardens as well as to view the building. The Parish Council would also wish to see the footpath open on additional days during August (and perhaps also every bank holiday) and also without an appointment system. The concierge could be available within a certain hours on agreed days to allow access. The Parish Council would be able to advertise the agreed days on its noticeboards, website, Facebook page and local publications. The Assistant Clerk was also asked to find out if the gardens had now been returned to their original state.

RESOLVED: that the comments made above are sent to Chase New Homes regarding the viewing days of the permissive path at Danbury Palace.

**14 Planning Enforcement**

**14.1 CCC Enforcement Record:** An update was circulated.

RESOLVED: that the information be noted.

**14.2 Enforcement Matters:** There were two signs still up at Eves Corner despite the events having taken place at the weekend. The Assistant Clerk was asked to contact the groups concerned to request their removal.

RESOLVED: that the signs at Eves Corner were requested to be removed.

**15 Planning matters for report (for information only)**

A letter to ECC had been copied to the Parish Council advising that Christian Aid would be putting up signs at Eves Corner regarding Christian Aid Week from 9<sup>th</sup> May until 30<sup>th</sup> May 2016.

The Parish Office had been informed that the land south east of the telecommunications mast (adjacent to St Johns Church) is currently up for sale for commercial use.

**16 Forthcoming meetings 2016**

Meetings were scheduled for 13<sup>th</sup> June, 4<sup>th</sup> July and 25<sup>th</sup> July. There were no meetings in August.

There being no further business the Vice Chairman closed the meeting at 9.10pm.

Cllr Telling  
Chairman

.....  
Signed

.....  
Date

<b>Ref no</b>	<b>Property</b>	<b>Street name</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Committee date</b>	<b>Comments</b>
16/00501/FUL	34	Hopping Jacks Lane	Replacement two storey detached house and detached garage.	23/05/16	The Parish Council has concerns about the proposed roof height. We support the comments of the neighbours. Please ensure root protection for trees is adequate.
16/00511/FUL	Little Gibcracks	Moor Hall Lane	Raising of the roof to create first floor accommodation and single storey side extension	23/05/16	No comments
16/00683/FUL	21	St Cleres Way	Proposed first floor front and single storey front and side extension. New first floor side window and alterations to the roof.	23/05/16	The Parish Council has concerns with the bulkiness of the proposed side extension and the fact that it butts up to the neighbouring property.
16/00718/ADV	54	Maldon Road	2 non-illuminated name signs under each of the existing entrance signs.	23/05/16	Does the coffee shop at the Mission have, or need, a change of use as it is now open to the public and charging accordingly?
16/00764/FUL	1	Millfields	Single storey front extension	23/05/16	No comments

**DANBURY PARISH COUNCIL**  
**Planning Committee Agenda: 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2016**

**Appendix B**  
**Planning Decisions**

Ref no	Property	Street name	Proposal	Committee date	Comments	Dec'n & Date
16/00344/FUL	17	Parkdale	Removal of existing double garage and construction of two storey side extension	14/03/16	This is a substantial extension and conflicts with DPF14 & DPF15 of the Danbury Planning Framework SPD.	Approved 20/4/16
16/00210/FUL	Copthill	Copt Hill	New decking to the rear and side of the property.	14/03/16	No comments	Approved 22/4/16
16/00115/FUL	Carnoy	Pump Lane	Four semi-detached houses to replace existing bungalow	29/02/16	The Parish Council strongly objects to this application for the following reasons: This road is not suitable for this proposed development due to its nature. It is a narrow unmade footpath which is accessed via other similar lanes. There is very limited access for vehicles and no turning circle which raises concerns regarding access for emergency, construction and delivery vehicles etc. The development of four properties on this site would greatly increase the amount of traffic using the lane and be detrimental to the rural environment and wildlife. There is very poor drainage in the area and the development would add to the issues already experienced by residents with regard to flooding. The Parish Council supports the comments of the Highways Authority.	Refused 21/4/16
15/00579/FUL	24	Butts Lane	Demolition of all existing buildings and construction of building containing 8, two-bed flats for persons over the age of 55 years, parking, refuse store and access.	04/04/16	There are no parking spaces as indicated. We support the objections of the residents. Our previous comments still apply.	Approved 29/4/16
16/00424/FUL	1	Danbury Vale	Replacement single storey side extension	04/04/16	No comments	Approved 05/05/16

Ref no	Property	Street name	Proposal	Committee date	Comments	Dec'n & Date
16/00382/FUL	Holly House	Southview Rd	New raised roof to provide additional first floor accommodation including front & rear dormers. New first floor side windows. Porch extension. External alterations. New 1.2m high brick wall.	04/04/16	The new raised roof will not result in an overlooking of adjacent properties.	Approved 28/4/16
16/00129/OUT	Old Chase Farm	Hyde Lane	Outline Planning application for 59 dwellings and a shop unit with all matters reserved	29//02/16	<p>The Parish Council strongly objects to this application for the following reasons:</p> <p>The Parish Council has concerns about road safety. The site is located on a busy road which contains several dangerous bends and is a main route to Bicknacre and South Woodham Ferrers. The access from the proposed site is directly onto this road and the Parish Council is very concerned that this would impact the safety of vehicles and pedestrians in this location. There is no pavement in this location and it is a high risk area for accidents. The local schools and medical centre do not have the capacity to cope with a large number of additional residents. The Parish Council understands that there is also a large planning application for Bicknacre of over 100 houses and this should also be taken into account as this is too much development for this rural area. The Parish Council notes that the proposed affordable housing does not comply with the national standards.</p> <p>There is an issue with the amount of traffic that will be generated by this application. There is already an unacceptable amount of traffic and congestion through Danbury.</p>	Refused 03/05/16



					<p>Cont.</p> <p>This proposal would add to the current problems and also put additional pressure on Woodhill Road and other local narrow lanes which are already used as rat runs for people avoiding the A414. ECC Highways has already confirmed that the A414 will be at capacity by 2026 without the additional developments taking place in the Maldon District. There is no indication of the type of shop being sought for the site and the proposed operating hours of this business. The shop will also generate additional traffic movements onto Hyde Lane. The development is located outside the defined settlement boundary and located in an inappropriate area. The site is very isolated and is not within walking distance to local amenities in either Danbury or Bicknacre. There are concerns regarding surface water flooding due to the current use of the site and the large amount of hard surface currently on it. There are also concerns about the waste water management.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**DANBURY PARISH COUNCIL**  
**Planning Committee Agenda: 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2016**

**Appendix C**  
**Works to Trees**

<b>Ref no</b>	<b>Property</b>	<b>Street name</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Planning Cttee date</b>	<b>Comments</b>
16/05539/CAT	12	Main Road	G1 Pines - reduce branches growing towards the house by up to 1m, raise dropper branches up to 3m from the ground level, remove deadwood and thin out by 5% upper canopy branches no greater than 150mm back to branch collar to balance the trees.	23/05/2016	No comments
16/05544/CAT	78	Main Road	Spruce - in front of property - fell to ground level. Reason: blocking out light and close proximity to cables overhead.	23/05/2016	No comments