

**CIRCULATED
BEFORE THE
MEETING**



**REPORT of
CHEIF EXECUTIVE**

to
**SOUTH EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE
11 SEPTEMBER 2017**

MEMBERS' UPDATE

AGENDA ITEM NO. 10

Application Number	FUL/MAL/17/00738
Location	Land Adjacent High Steppers, Batts Road, Steeple, Essex
Proposal	Proposed demolition of existing buildings and structures and replacement with 7 new residential dwellings
Applicant	Mr & Mrs Richard Shepherd
Agent	Ms Sarah Threlfall - TMA Chartered Surveyors
Target Decision Date	15 September 2017
Case Officer	Anna Tastsoglou TEL: 01621 875741
Parish	STEEPLE
Reason for Referral to the Committee / Council	Member Call In

7.3 Internal Consultees

Name of Internal Consultee	Comment	Officer Response
Coast and Countryside Officer	<p>A landscape appraisal should have been submitted.</p> <p>The local Landscape Character Area is the Tillingham and Latchingdon Coastal Farmland. The area has moderate sensitivity to change being generally of open nature and new development being potentially visible over a wide area. At the moment the proposals do not fit with the local landscape character for several reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The settlement pattern on the Dengie is of dispersed linear villages and individual large farmsteads. This scheme does not fit with or enhance this pattern. • The local hedgerow pattern is ancient and co-axial considered of national importance. The proposed scheme disrupts this pattern by extending development into an adjoining field from the existing yard and does not provide additional hedgerow screening to the north of 	Noted. Addressed by Officers Report.

	<p>the proposed housing consistent with the Dengie-form pattern..</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The local Landscape Character Assessment proposes that new development ‘... responds to historic settlement patterns and scale ... Such development should be well integrated into the surrounding landscape’. I do not judge that this scheme currently fits with this guidance. <p>An objection is therefore raised. It is also considered that the site is unsustainably located in relation to greenspace and play facilities.</p> <p>If approved, conditions should be attached in relation to ecology, hard and soft landscaping and playspace provision.</p>	
--	---	--

Since the publication of the Agenda, the Agent has submitted a letter dated 6 September 2017 and an amended plan (Drawing No: MA/696/11 dated September 2017) clarifying the following points in the officer report:-

Parking and Turning

The amended block plan shows suitable arrangement for parking, turning and visitor parking spaces in accordance with the Maldon District Council Vehicle Parking Standards. [Officer Comment: It is considered that the amended car parking provision has overcome the concerns highlighted in Reason for Refusal 3].

Affordable Housing

A draft Section 106 is with the Council and therefore it is considered unreasonable for the Council to recommend refuse consent on this basis. [Officer Comment: Whilst it is acknowledged that the applicant has entered into discussions with the Council regarding S.106 provision there is not a signed S.106 before the Council at the time of determination of this application; the reason for refusal reflects the lack of a signed S.106 agreement. It is considered to be best practice to include a reason for refusal that highlights the lack of a completed S.106 agreement when refusing a planning application].

Loss of Employment / Car Sales

In the Applicant’s letter dated 6 September 2017, it states that the application has been refused as it would result in an unjustified loss of employment land. It confirms *‘the retail motor sales will be relocated elsewhere in the District and that the business will flourish thereby protecting the current level of employment as well as expanding the economic activity.’*

The additional information submitted goes on to state that the Applicant’s *‘are actively seeking to identify suitable new premises for the retail car sales business’*. [Officer Comment: No evidence has been submitted that the Applicant’s business will be relocated in this District. The wider point has been addressed in Paragraph 5.1.12 in the officer report; primarily it must be noted that the proposal would result in the loss of this employment generating site and the occupier of the site is irrelevant in policy terms].

Sewage Treatment Plant

A modern package sewage treatment plant is proposed on site and has been confirmed by specialist consultants that this is more than adequate to meet the needs of the seven additional dwellings. This is an unreasonable reason for refusal where it could have been dealt with by condition.

Overdevelopment / Urbanisation

The Applicant does not consider that the proposal is overdevelopment of the site as the existing commercial storage is 824sqm and will be replaced by 595sqm of residential space. The reduction of 229sqm of buildings on the land would not substantially alter the open character of the area.

[Officer Comment: This does not form part of any reason for refusal].