



**REPORT of
DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND REGULATORY SERVICES**

to
**SOUTH EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE
15 AUGUST 2016**

MEMBERS UPDATE

AGENDA ITEM 8

Application Number	FUL/MAL/16/00577
Location	Manor Farm, Old Heath Road
Proposal	Revised orientation of farm worker's dwelling and use of roof void incorporating rear dormer (Revision of FUL/MAL/10/00702, 13 October 2010)
Applicant	Mr Russell Forde - Smart Planning
Agent	N/A
Target Decision Date	19.08.2016
Case Officer	Kara Elliott
Parish	SOUTHMINSTER
Reason for Referral to the Committee / Council	Parish Trigger

7.4 Representations received from Interested Parties

Correction: The following persons were incorrectly listed as objectors to the application;

- Mr Richard Anderson, Roseville, 2 Scalby Road, Southminster;
- Mr Stuart Pankhurst, Appleby, Old Heath Road, Althorne;

7.4.1 Letters were received **objecting** to the application from the following and the reasons for objection are summarised as set out in the table below:

- Mrs D Howman, St Margarets, Old Heath Road, Southminster;
- Mr Mark Howman, St Margarets Old Heath Road Southminster
- Mrs Penny Gilchrist, 3 West View, Scarborough Road, Southminster;
- Mrs Michelle Bott, 2 West View, Scarborough Road, Southminster;
- Mr L & Mrs C Swallow, 3 Old Heath Road, Southminster

Objection Comment	Officer Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Would not make a contribution to addressing the housing shortfall in the district sufficient to outweigh the harm arising from the	Material Considerations are discussed within the officer's report. Many objections raised deal with the principle of the dwelling. However, as stated

Objection Comment	Officer Response
<p>construction of a new dwelling on this rural site;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By consenting to such an application it would set an undesirable precedent to encourage other similar proposals that would result in an unsustainable impact and further erosion of the rural character of the district; • - The NPPF states that new isolated homes in the countryside should be avoided and additionally, the application provides no evidence or support for its own proposal description with regard to paragraph 55 regarding farm working. • There is no proposal for a sustainable drainage solution; • Building is not representative of farm workers dwelling; • There is no farming activity at this site and has not been for some time; • No eggs sold at the gate for some time now; • Some time ago a new entrance was made in the hedge for a second gateway; • Recent police investigations and digging in the location of the proposed dwelling indicate footings are likely not present or at least are of insufficient substance to meet the requirements of planning; • Very worrying as there are plenty of neighbouring plots that could follow suit; • The proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the countryside and would be in conflict with current planning policy that seeks to protect the countryside for its own sake; 	<p>within previous sections of the report a lawful development certificate was granted for the dwelling which confirmed that the foundations represent commencement of development granted under 10/00702/FUL</p>