



**MINUTES of
SOUTH EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE
11 DECEMBER 2024**

PRESENT

Vice-Chairperson Councillor A Fittock
(in the chair)

Councillors M G Bassenger, D O Bown, A S Fluker, L J Haywood,
W J Laybourn, M G Neall, R G Pratt, U C G Siddall-Norman
and W Stamp, CC

437. CHAIRPERSON'S NOTICES

The Chairperson welcomed everyone to the meeting and went through some general housekeeping arrangements for the meeting.

438. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received from Councillor V J Bell.

439. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

RESOLVED

- (i) that the Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 13 November 2024 be received.

Minute No. 387 – 24/00017/FULM – Glebe Meadow, Adjacent King Georges Field, Station Road, Southminster, Essex

Councillor A S Fluker expressed some concern that the Minutes did not fully reflect the points he had raised at this meeting, particularly that the application was contrary to Policy D1 regarding both design (specifically the tapering between existing properties at Vicarage Court and the proposed new properties) and loss of amenity, and contrary to Policy S8 due to the size of the buffer zone, which he commented had reduced.

In response, the Head of Service: Development Management and Building Control provided Members with some guidance in respect of how Officers would have identified the reasons for refusal detailed in the Officers' report due to be considered at a later point on this agenda. He noted that reference to Policy S8 had not been included in the reasons for refusal and advised that this could be amended when the Committee considered the Officers' report.

Councillor Fluker then provided further detail of the points he had raised at the last meeting and he commented that the reasons for refusal should reference Policy S8.

Following further discussion, it was agreed that the second sentence in the second paragraph of this Minute would be amended to include reference to loss of amenity and

design. In the subsequent sentence the words ‘to the above policies’ would be replaced with reference to the specific policies D1 and S8. The exact wording was to be agreed with the Chairperson and Councillor Fluker outside of the meeting.

The Chairperson put the proposed amendment to the Committee, and this was duly agreed.

RESOLVED

- (ii) that subject to the above amendment the Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 13 November 2024 be confirmed.

440. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

There were none.

441. 24/00017/FULM - GLEBE MEADOW ADJACENT KING GEORGES FIELD, STATION ROAD, SOUTHMINSTER, ESSEX

Application Number	24/00017/FULM
Location	Glebe Meadow Adjacent King Georges Field, Station Road, Southminster, Essex
Proposal	Application for planning permission to create 36 no. one, two, three and four bedroom houses and maisonettes, associated landscaping, roads, parking and drainage infrastructure, plus a new area of public open space and the addition of a footway to the east side of Vicarage Court.
Applicant	Benferri Developments Limited
Agent	JCN Design & Planning
Target Decision Date	29.11.24 (EoT)
Case Officer	Lisa Page
Parish	SOUTHMINSTER
Reason for Referral to the Committee / Council	Major Application Call in Councillor A S Fluker – Policy D1

The Head of Service: Development Management and Building Control presented the report and reminded Members that this application had been deferred from the last meeting of the South Eastern Area Planning Committee and in accordance with the Council’s Constitution the constitutional brake invoked. The report provided further advice to Members following the last meeting and detailed three suggested reasons for refusal, taking into discussions at the last meeting and relevant Local Development Plan policies, should Members be minded to refuse the application.

In response to comments raised regarding the land ownership, the Head of Service provided guidance in respect of consideration given to this matter when any planning application was submitted. Comments specifically relating to the footpath were raised and the Head of Service advised that this land was under the ownership of the developer. Councillor A S Fluker asked that it be Minuted, that concerns had been raised regarding land ownership and the Committee was unhappy with this. Councillor M G Bassenger also commented and asked that it be minuted that the Committee did not agree that the developer had control of the footpath. Councillor Fluker further requested that it be minuted that Essex County Council Highways had not confirmed if they had visited the site and their consultation response appeared ambiguous as it

referred to an adopted highway and then stated the access road was not adopted by the Highways authority.

A lengthy debate ensued with particular discussion had regarding the amenity of the site. Concern was expressed regarding loss of amenity and that the quality of life of residents that could occupy the proposed dwellings would be greatly impacted by noise and disturbance from adjacent existing developments. Reference was made at this point to the King George V Sports Field, the recently upgraded Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA), sports pavilion and community centre. Councillor Fluker asked that it be recorded that should the proposal go ahead along with the proposed changes to walls, street furniture, hedged and lampposts to accommodate the proposed footpath, he felt this would result in problems for some of the existing properties coming out from their garages straight onto a footpath.

It was noted that loss of amenity had been raised during discussions at the last meeting of the Committee and Members felt that this should have been included in the suggested reasons for refusal. The Head of Service advised that he had captured the additional points referred to in the debate and these could be incorporated into the reasons for refusal.

In response to concern raised regarding the proposed design and it being incongruous to the existing layout. The Head of Service advised that this could be included as a reason for refusal.

Councillor A S Fluker proposed that the application be refused, for reasons relating to the application being outside of the settlement boundary taking into consideration comments raised by the Planning Inspectorate regarding this (referring to a recent appeal decision granting 13 dwellings), there was no buffer zone and therefore Policy S8 would apply. The Officer advised he was unable to consider the S8 argument as he did not have the appeal decision with him.

Councillor W Stamp referred to an appeal decision relating to 2 Maldon Road, Burnham-on-Crouch and asked that it be Minuted that when the decision was made by the Committee a number of the points raised were not included in the reasons for refusal on the advice of Officers.

Following further discussion, Councillor Fluker proposed that the application be refused, contrary to Officers' recommendation for reasons relating to Policies S1, B1, H4 and S8. The Chairperson then referred to the suggested reasons for refusal set out in the Officers' report at paragraphs 2.4 and 2.5. Councillor Fluker requested that reference to design, settlement boundary, loss of amenity to existing and future occupants of the houses also be included, and he was happy to agree the wording of this outside of the meeting with the Chairperson and Head of Service. The Head of Service clarified that there would be three reasons for refusal, the impact on the amenities of the expected residents, Policy S8 and then the design referring to the incompatibility of the proposed housing type against the existing. He advised that the wording could be confirmed outside of the meeting.

Councillor Fluker clarified his earlier proposal and proposed that in reference to paragraph 2.4 (1) and (2) of the Officers' report in relation to design, the settlement boundary and loss of amenity that the application be refused. This proposal was duly seconded. Councillor Fluker then amended his proposal to include paragraph 2.5 (3) and this amendment was duly seconded.

The Chairperson put the proposal to the Committee, and this was duly agreed.

It was noted that in accordance with the appeal protocol, Councillor Fluker had previously nominated himself to be the Member to represent the Council at any appeal.

RESOLVED that this application be **REFUSED** for reasons as set out in paragraph 2.4 and 2.5 of the report in relation to design, the settlement boundary and loss of amenity.

There being no other items of business the Chairperson closed the meeting at 8.38 pm.

A FITTOCK
CHAIRPERSON