



**MINUTES of
SOUTH EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE
23 JULY 2025**

PRESENT

Chairperson	Councillor V J Bell
Vice-Chairperson	Councillor A Fittock
Councillors	D O Bown, A S Fluker, L J Haywood, W J Laybourn, M G Neall, U C G Siddall-Norman and W Stamp, CC

132. CHAIRPERSON'S NOTICES

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

133. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors M G Bassenger and R G Pratt.

134. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The Chairperson advised that the Minutes of the last meeting had been circulated as a supplementary pack prior to the meeting.

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 25 June 2025 be approved and confirmed.

135. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

There were none.

**136. 24/00947/FUL (PD), LAND WEST OF THATCHED COTTAGE GREEN LANE
BURNHAM-ON-CROUCH ESSEX**

Application Number	24/00947/FUL
Location	Land West of Thatched Cottage Green Lane Burnham-On-Crouch Essex
Proposal	Erection of 3 no detached dwellings with garages
Applicant	Penny Homes Ltd
Agent	Andrew Pipe Associates
Target Decision Date	31.07.2025
Case Officer	Patrick Daly

Parish	Burnham-on-crouch
Reason for Referral to the Committee / Council	Departure from the Local Plan Member Call-in by Councillor W Stamp CC for the Housing Mix (Policy H2) and Outside of Settlement Boundary (Policy S8)

Prior to the Officer presentation they clarified that the report should say Mangapp Chase not Mangapp Close and reference to the Stoney Hills settlement boundary should be Burnham-on-Crouch settlement boundary. This was duly noted.

Following the Officers presentation Mrs Sadler an objector addressed the Committee.

During the lengthy debate that ensued, a number of Members commented on the application and particular concerns relating to the following areas were raised:

- a lack of footpaths and street lighting in the area
- highways issues including the speed limit on Green Lane adjacent to the site leading to accidents and incidents
- the affordability of the proposed housing
- the lack of an arboricultural impact assessment mentioned by some statutory consultees
- the development breaching the character and beauty of the surrounding area
- the development being an incongruous form of development in relation to its surrounding.

Councillor W Stamp proposed that the Committee reject the Officer recommendation and refuse this application. This was duly seconded.

In response, the Development Management Team Manager provided the following information:

- In terms of Planning Policy, as the Council didn't have a Five-Year Housing Land Supply the titled balance would be engaged.
- In terms of planning balance, Officers had recognised there would be new houses but given the scale of the development this was given minimum weight.
- An arboricultural impact assessment was not a requirement that had to be submitted with an application, however in this case as the agricultural consultant has identified there was a need this could be satisfied by a condition.

In response to a request for clarification on the reasons for refusal Members discussed these as well as the relevant policies. The Officer provided guidance advising that issues raised in terms of location, design, height, layout and the combined incongruous form of development in that location could form a reason for refusal in terms of Policies S1, S8, D1 and H4. In terms of comments regarding location, she suggested a reason relating to the inaccessible location due to the narrow road, being unlit, no footways and therefore poor access to public services so occupants would be reliant on a car. A Member mentioned the national speed limit in terms of the unlit narrow road being in a 60 mile per hour zone and this was noted.

Following further discussion and questions from Members, the Officer suggested a third reason for refusal relating to Policy H2, having a suitable housing mix, the Local Housing Needs Assessment and not meeting the greatest need because the Council already had provision for large homes.

The Chairperson then put the proposal to refuse the application to the Committee, subject to the three reasons for refusal discussed (the detail to be agreed in consultation with the Chairperson outside of the meeting). Upon a vote being taken this was agreed.

RESOLVED that the application be **REFUSED** for the following reasons

“

1. The site is outside of a defined settlement boundary and is in open countryside. The site is in a poorly accessible location due it being on a narrow, unlit lane, with no footway and the national speed limit of 60mph. Future occupants of the site would therefore be heavily reliant on the use of the car to gain access to everyday services and facilities, as such the proposal does not provide a sustainable form of development. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies S1, S2, S8, D1, H4, T1 and T2 of the Maldon District Local Development Plan (2017), the Maldon District Design Guide (2017) and the policies and guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The site is within a rural location which provides an important green break between settlement boundaries. The proposed development, by virtue of its design, height and layout, results in an incongruous form of development that is out of keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The development would therefore be unacceptable and contrary to Policies S1, S8, D1 and H4 of the Maldon District Local Development Plan (2017), the objectives of the Maldon District Design Guide (2017) and the policies and guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. Policy H2 of the Maldon District Design Guide (2017) requires all developments to provide a suitable mix and range of housing. The proposal provides for three no. four bedroom properties. The provision of solely larger homes does not meet the District's identified housing need as set out in the Local Housing Area Needs Assessment which established that there is the greatest need for smaller dwellings. The development would therefore be unacceptable and contrary to Policy H2 of the Maldon District Local Development Plan (2017) and the policies and guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework specifically paragraph 61.

In response to a query regarding whether the constitutional brake should be applied, the Chairperson clarified that this would not apply because Officers felt they had defensible reasons for refusal.

There being no other items of business the Chairperson closed the meeting at 8.18 pm.

V J BELL
CHAIRPERSON