



**MINUTES of
SOUTH EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE
26 MAY 2021**

PRESENT

Chairman Councillor V J Bell

Vice-Chairman

Councillors M G Bassenger, B S Beale MBE, M W Helm, A L Hull and
W Stamp, CC

In attendance Councillor C Morris

1. CHAIRMAN'S NOTICES

The Chairman welcomed all present to the meeting and took the Committee through some general housekeeping issues.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors R P F Dewick and N J Skeens.

3. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

RESOLVED

- (i) that the Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 14 April 2021 be received.

Minute No. 329 – 21/00088/FUL – Burnham Yacht Harbour, Foundry Lane, Burnham-on-Crouch

That the following text outlined in bold be added to the second sentence in the second paragraph of this minute item as follows:- 'At this point Councillor W Stamp declared a pecuniary interest in this item of business **as she had a boat on the site that she paid for**, she then left the meeting'.

RESOLVED by assent

- (ii) that subject to the above amendment the Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 14 April 2021 be confirmed.

4. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Councillor W Stamp, CC declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 6 - 21/00102/FUL - Land North of Riversleigh, Nipsells Chase, Mayland as she knew the applicant and on all agenda items as a member of Essex County Council.

At this point the Chairman advised that Item 6 - 21/00102/FUL - Land North of Riversleigh, Dispels Chase, Mayland had been withdrawn by the applicant.

5. 20/01347/FUL - THE BARN, STEEPLE ROAD, MAYLAND

Application Number	20/01347/FUL
Location	The Barn, Steeple Road, Mayland
Proposal	Within the curtilage of the dwelling house form a fenced enclosure (40m x 21.2m) to provide a drained all-weather surfaced area for exercising horses owned by the occupiers
Applicant	Mr F Wiffen
Agent	Chris Francis – West & Partners
Target Decision Date	28.05.2021 – EOT
Case Officer	Hayleigh Parker-Haines
Parish	STEEPLE
Reason for Referral to the Committee / Council	Member Call In – Councillor M W Helm – Policy Reasons D1 and S8

Following the Officer’s presentation, the Chairman opened the debate.

Councillor Helm, noting that this was a retrospective application asked officers to advise what action had been taken regarding the lawful development certificate currently under appeal. The Lead Specialist Place advised that it was an accepted point of Planning Policy that where an application was retrospective this should not be a factor in determining a recommendation and it was also accepted practice to submit an application to regularise breaches of planning control.

There being no further queries the Chairman moved the Officer’s recommendation to approve the application and this was seconded by Councillor Beale. A recorded vote was requested by Councillor Helm, duly seconded by Councillor Bassenger and the results were as follows:-

For the Recommendation

Councillors M G Bassenger, B S Beale, A L Hull and W Stamp.

Against the Recommendation

None

Abstentions

Councillors V J Bell and M W Helm.

RESOLVED that the application be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
REASON To comply with Section 91(1) The Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents: 2008/001, 2008/1011, 2008/1010 and 2008/100
REASON To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the details as approved.

3. The materials used in the development hereby approved shall be as set out within the application form/plans hereby approved.
REASON In the interest of the character and appearance of the area in accordance with policy D1 of the approved Local Development Plan and guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework
4. No floodlighting or other external form of illumination of the site shall be undertaken without the prior written approval of the local planning authority.
REASON To protect the amenity and character of the area and the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with policies S1, S8 and D1 of the Local Development Plan.
5. The ménage hereby permitted shall be used solely for the private exercising of horses' ancillary to the occupiers of The Barn, Steeple Road, Mayland as shown outlined in blue on the location plan and shall not be used for business or commercial use including for the purposes of livery or any riding school activity.
REASON To protect the amenity and character of the area and the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with policies S1, S8 and D1 of the Local Development Plan.

6. 21/00102/FUL - LAND NORTH OF RIVERSLEIGH, NIPSELLS CHASE, MAYLAND

Application Number	21/00102/FUL
Location	Land North Of Riversleigh, Nipsells Chase, Mayland
Proposal	Construction of a single storey dwelling
Applicant	Mr and Mrs Kenny Paton
Agent	Mr Anthony Cussen - Cussen Construction Consultants
Target Decision Date	07.05.2021
Case Officer	Louise Staplehurst
Parish	MAYLAND
Reason for Referral to the Committee / Council	Councillor / Member of Staff

It had already been noted that prior to the meeting the applicant had withdrawn this application.

7. 21/00108/FUL - ROSEMARY, MANGAPP CHASE, BURNHAM-ON-CROUCH, ESSEX CM0 8QQ

Application Number	21/00108/FUL
Location	Rosemary, Mangapp Chase, Burnham-On-Crouch, Essex, CM0 8QQ
Proposal	Extension to existing brick plinth/timber framed barn to provide one bedroom ancillary/granny annexe for extended family
Applicant	Mrs Jane Taverner
Agent	N/A
Target Decision Date	22.04.2021
Case Officer	Annie Keen
Parish	BURNHAM NORTH
Reason for Referral to the Committee / Council	Member Call In – Councillor W Stamp – Policies S1 and H4

Following the Officer's presentation, the Applicant Mrs Taverner, addressed the Committee. The chairman then opened the debate.

A lengthy discussion ensued where Members debated a range of issues raised in the Officer's report, particularly those outlined in the reasons for refusal. Planning Officers took the committee through the 7 criteria that formed part of the Specialist Housing Needs SPD explaining where the application fell short of the requirements and hence the reason the application was recommended for refusal.

The final consensus was that Members felt, having debated the criteria and the reasons for refusal, that the proposed development fell within the annexe criteria set out within the Specialist Housing Needs SPD, and was therefore considered to be annexe accommodation, ancillary to the dwelling on the site known as Rosemary.

For that reason, Councillor Helm proposed that the application be approved contrary to the Officer's recommendation, this was seconded by Councillor Stamp.

The Chairman then put Councillor Helm's proposal to the Committee confirming that conditions would be delegated to Officers in consultation with the Chairman. The Committee agreed this by assent.

RESOLVED that the application be **APPROVED** with conditions delegated to Officers in consultation with the Chairman.

The meeting closed at 8.31 pm.

V J BELL
CHAIRMAN