

Minutes

Planning Committee

28th April 2009



Present

Councillors	Present	Councillors	Present
J E Abbott	Yes	D Mann	Yes
E Bishop	Yes	Mrs J M Money	Apologies
J C Collar	Yes	Lady Newton	Yes
Mrs E Edey	Yes	J O'Reilly-Cicconi	Yes
Ms L B Flint	Yes	Mrs W D Scattergood (Chairman)	Yes
T J W Foster	Yes	Mrs L Shepherd	Yes
Mrs B A Gage	Yes	Mrs G A Spray	Yes
Mrs M E Galione	Yes (until 11.00am)		

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following declarations of interest were made:

Councillor Mrs B A Gage declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Application No. 08/02213/OUT – 41 Chapel Hill, Halstead as the applicant was known to her and he had in the past taken her to a meeting of the Standards Board. Councillor Mrs Gage left the meeting whilst this application was discussed and determined.

Councillor Mrs M E Galione declared a personal interest in Application Nos. 09/00229/FUL and 09/00230/LBC – Shellards, Shellards Lane, Wickham St Paul as the applicant's agent speaking during Question Time was known to her.

Councillor Lady Newton declared a personal interest in Application Nos. 09/00229/FUL and 09/00230/LBC – Shellards, Shellards Lane, Wickham St Paul as the applicant was known to her.

Councillor J P L P O'Reilly-Cicconi declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Application Nos. 09/00229/FUL and 09/00230/LBC – Shellards, Shellards Lane, Wickham St Paul as he was a close friend of the applicant. Councillor O'Reilly-Cicconi left the meeting whilst this application was discussed and determined.

In accordance with the Code of Conduct Councillors remained in the meeting, unless stated otherwise, and took part in the discussion when the respective items were considered.

4 MINUTES

DECISION: It was noted that the Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 31st March 2009 were not available and it was agreed to defer them for consideration at a future meeting.

5 QUESTION TIME

INFORMATION: There were eight statements made, a summary of which is contained in the Appendix to these Minutes.

Any amendments to the Officers' recommendations having taken into account the issues raised by members of the public would be dealt with by conditions, a summary of which is contained within the appropriate minute. Full details of the Decision Notices are contained in the Register of Planning Applications.

6 TREE PRESERVATION ORDER NO. 14A/2008 – 1 ST. PETER'S CLOSE, BRAINTREE

INFORMATION: Consideration was given to a report on Tree Preservation Order No. 14A/2008 to which an objection had been submitted. The Order related to a walnut tree in the rear garden of 1 St Peter's Close, Braintree.

Members of the Committee were advised that the owner of the tree had sought advice from the Council as they had received a letter from an insurance company requesting that the tree be felled as it had been connected with structural damage to an adjoining property at 9 St Peter's Road, Braintree. Subsequently, a TEMPO (Tree Evaluation Method for Tree Preservation) assessment had been undertaken which indicated that the making of a Tree Preservation Order was justified. Tree Preservation Order No. 14/2008 had been made to safeguard the tree from unnecessary removal. However, the making of the Order had coincided with a change in legislation which required minor amendment of the Order. In the circumstances, Order No. 14A/2008 had been made and served. Following this, the owner of 9 St Peter's Road, Braintree had submitted an objection, a summary of which was attached to the report.

Members were advised that due to the proximity of the tree to the adjoining property, it was possible that there was root growth close to the house, but without a structural engineer's report it was not possible to confirm the effect. However, it was reported also that the tree was unlikely to be taking much water from the ground and that subsidence was common with shrinkable clay soils such as that present at the site. The objector had referred to reports which had been prepared by John Parkhouse Partnership (Consultant Engineers) and Dr Frank Hope (Arboricultural Consultant) and, in particular, to their recommendations. However, despite a number requests, these reports had not been made available to the Council and it was only very recently that Dr Hope's report had been provided. It had been explained to the objector, that if the reports provided conclusive evidence that the tree was the principal cause of structural damage and that there was no alternative but to remove the tree to prevent further damage, the Tree Preservation Order would not be confirmed. It had been concluded that failure to provide the reports meant that they did not support the objection.

Members of the Committee concluded that without evidence to the contrary there was no reason why the Tree Preservation Order should not be confirmed. It was noted that if a structural engineer's report subsequently showed that the tree was causing damage to the property this would overcome the Tree Preservation Order.

DECISION: That Tree Preservation Order No. 14A/2008 in respect of 1 St Peter's Close, Braintree, be confirmed.

7 TREE PRESERVATION ORDER NO. 26/2008 – 39 AVENUE ROAD, WITHAM

INFORMATION: The Committee considered a report on Tree Preservation Order No. 26/2008 in respect of a crab apple and cherry tree in the front garden of 39 Avenue Road, Witham.

Members of the Committee were advised that on 27th October 2008 the Council had received a Conservation Area Notice of Intent from the owners of the property to remove and replace a conifer in the back garden of the property and to remove a crab apple and a cherry tree situated in the front garden. Following a visit to the property by a Council Officer it had been concluded that the tree in the rear garden was in poor form. However, it had been considered that the trees in the front garden were not diseased or dying as the applicant had claimed and, in the circumstances, the applicant had agreed to withdraw the Notice in respect of these two trees pending a further inspection in the Spring. Witham Town Council had recommended refusal of the Notice of Intent on the grounds of lack of evidence to support the request to fell the trees.

On 2nd December 2008 the applicant had cancelled the withdrawal of the Notice, indicating that the correct reason for removing the trees was that she did not wish to keep them in the garden. Subsequently, a TEMPO (Tree Evaluation Method for Tree Preservation) assessment had been undertaken which indicated that the making of a Tree Preservation Order was justified and Tree Preservation Order No. 26/2008 had been made to safeguard the trees. The owner of 39 Avenue Road, Witham had submitted an objection to the making of the Order and a copy of this was attached to the report. The Officers had concluded that both trees were healthy, that they were important in the street scene and that they had a life expectancy in excess of 20 years. However, it was considered that the trees would benefit from remedial pruning.

The Committee agreed that the trees were an important feature within the street scene and that they should be preserved.

DECISION: That Tree Preservation Order No. 26/2008 in respect of 39 Avenue Road, Witham, be confirmed.

8 PLANNING APPLICATION WITHDRAWN

INFORMATION: The Chairman reported that the undermentioned planning application had been withdrawn by the applicant.

<u>Plan No.</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Applicant(s)</u>	<u>Proposed Development</u>
*09/00159/OUT (WITHDRAWN)	Braintree	Mr H Bishop	Erection of five no. terraced/semi-detached

9 PLANNING APPLICATIONS APPROVED

DECISION: That the undermentioned planning applications be approved under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, including Listed Building Consent where appropriate, subject to the conditions contained in the Head of District Development's report, as amended below, details of which are contained in the Register of Planning Applications.

<u>Plan No.</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Applicant(s)</u>	<u>Proposed Development</u>
*08/02213/OUT (APPROVED)	Halstead	Mr J Lovric	Demolition of existing workshop buildings and erection of 4 no. flats and associated parking, 41 Chapel Hill.

<u>Plan No.</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Applicant(s)</u>	<u>Proposed Development</u>
*09/00273/FUL (APPROVED)	Shalford	Mr S Bacon	Erection of two storey side extension, porch, extension to existing utility room, alterations to roof and associated improvement and landscaping, Fairmead, Garrets Lane.

<u>Plan No.</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Applicant(s)</u>	<u>Proposed Development</u>
*09/00285/FUL (APPROVED)	Sturmer	Mr K Silcock	Part demolition of existing single storey extension and erection of new two storey extension and alterations, Challices Farmhouse, Kedington Road.

<u>Plan No.</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Applicant(s)</u>	<u>Proposed Development</u>
*09/00286/LBC (APPROVED)	Sturmer	Mr K Silcock	Part demolition of existing single storey extension and erection of new two storey extension and alterations, Challices Farmhouse, Kedington Road.

<u>Plan No.</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Applicant(s)</u>	<u>Proposed Development</u>
*09/00229/FUL (APPROVED)	Wickham St Paul	Mr C S & R M Gosling	Proposed change of use of curtilage of listed building to B1 office use, Shellards, Shellards Lane.

Councillor Paul Snazell, Chairman of Wickham St Paul Parish Council, joined the meeting and spoke on this application and application 09/00230/LBC. Councillor Snazell stated that the Parish Council was against the applications. Concern had been expressed about the possible increased use of the access lane which was only partly adopted and very narrow. There were no passing places in the lane and sometimes vehicles had to be reversed along it which was dangerous for pedestrians. Concern was expressed also about the effect of the proposal on adjoining properties and the sewerage system.

The Committee approved this application, subject to the following additional condition:-

Additional Condition

7. The hard surface areas shall be constructed using permeable block paving on a porous base and maintained as such, or an alternative to be agreed in writing with the local planning authority prior to occupation of the development.

<u>Plan No.</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Applicant(s)</u>	<u>Proposed Development</u>
*09/00230/LBC (APPROVED)	Wickham St Paul	Mr C S & R M Gosling	Proposed change of use of curtilage of listed building to B1 office use, Shellards, Shellards Lane.

The Committee approved this application, subject to the following additional condition:-

Additional Condition

6. The hard surface areas shall be constructed using permeable block paving on a porous base and maintained as such, or an alternative to be agreed in writing with the local planning authority prior to occupation of the development.

10 **SECTION 106 AGREEMENTS**

DECISION: That, subject to the applicant entering into a suitable planning obligation pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure a financial contribution of £75,000 towards the enhancement of local public transport facilities; the provision of a Travel Plan which shall include a monitoring fee of £3,000; a financial contribution of £15,000 towards improving the woodlands at Marks Farm (recently designated as a Local Nature Reserve); and the retention of the town centre store in A1 retail use for a minimum of five years from occupation, the Head of District Development be authorised to grant planning permission for the following

development, in accordance with the conditions and reasons set out in his report, as amended below. Alternatively, in the event that a suitable planning obligation is not provided by the target date for determining this application, the Head of District Development be authorised to refuse the grant of planning permission.

<u>Plan No.</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Applicant(s)</u>	<u>Proposed Development</u>
*08/02126/FUL (APPROVED)	Braintree	Tesco Stores Ltd	Extension to existing retail store to allow additional sales floorspace, additional bulk store, new home shopping facility and associated car parking and landscaping works, Tesco Stores Ltd, Clay Pits.

Councillor Mrs Jennifer Smith, Councillor for Braintree East Ward, attended the meeting and spoke on this application. Councillor Mrs Smith stated that local residents had purchased their properties unaware that a superstore could be built nearby. Councillor Mrs Smith expressed concern about the effect of the proposal on the viability of town centre stores and she considered that it would lead to increased traffic in Clay Pits, particularly through the movement of delivery vehicles.

The Committee approved this application, subject to an additional term being included within the Section 106 Agreement requiring a contribution of £10,000 for town centre improvements; to the updated list of conditions circulated at the meeting and to condition 19 being amended further as follows:-

Amended Condition

19. The total net sales area of the store shall not exceed 3,523sqm as shown on the approved drawings and details of the convenience/comparison floorspace split of the additional 1,508 sqm net sales area shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the first use of the extension.

The Committee asked Officers to give detailed consideration as to whether this application should be referred to the Secretary of State for 'call-in'.

DECISION: That, subject to the applicant entering into a suitable planning obligation pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure a financial contribution of £225,000 towards the enhancement of local public transport facilities; the provision of a Travel Plan which shall include a monitoring fee of £3,000; a financial contribution of £7,000 towards improving the Cuckoo Wood Local Nature Reserve; and the retention of the town centre store in A1 retail use for a minimum of five years from occupation, the Head of District Development be authorised to grant planning permission for the following development, in accordance with the conditions and reasons set out in his report, as amended below. Alternatively, in the event that a suitable planning obligation is not provided by the target date for determining this application, the Head of District Development be authorised to refuse the grant of planning permission.

<u>Plan No.</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Applicant(s)</u>	<u>Proposed Development</u>
*08/02104/FUL (APPROVED)	Great Notley	Tesco Stores Ltd	Extension to retail (Class A1) store to allow additional sales floorspace, replacement units (including 2 Class A1 units and 1 Class A1/D1 unit), additional bulk store and associated car parking and landscaping works, Tesco Stores Ltd, 1 The Square, Notley Green.

Councillor Graham Butland, Councillor for Great Notley and Braintree West Ward and Chairman of Great Notley Parish Council, attended the meeting and spoke on this application. Councillor Butland stated that whilst the provision of a mini-roundabout at Cuckoo Way, Great Notley and the assistance being offered to independent retailers were welcomed, there were still objections to the extension of the Tesco Store. Councillor Butland requested that if the application was approved, conditions should be attached to restrict the hours of use of the car park to no later than 9.00pm and to prevent access to the car park by motorised vehicles when the car park is closed; to require the completion of the three replacement retail units before the completion of the extension to the Tesco store; to provide an alternative to the proposed electronic bus stop signs, which are considered to be out of keeping with the village; to require the applicant to submit a litter reduction management plan, or alternatively, to provide a contribution towards the cost of litter picking; and to require the implementation of a site management scheme during construction work to ensure the safety of the public.

The Committee approved this application, subject to an additional term being included within the Section 106 Agreement requiring a contribution of £10,000 for town centre improvements; to the updated list of conditions circulated at the meeting; to the amendment of condition 16; and to the additional conditions and paragraphs to the Information to Applicant as follows:-

Amended Condition

16. The total net sales area of the store shall not exceed 2,884sqm as shown on the approved drawings and details of the convenience/comparison floorspace split of the additional 937sqm net sales area shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the first use of the extension.

Additional Conditions

21. Development shall not be commenced until the following are submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority - details relating to the management of the proposed new overflow car parking. These shall include hours of use, means of closure, lighting and landscaping. These details shall be complied with at all times.
22. The three replacement independent units including the mezzanine floors shall be completed and available for occupation prior to the start of any work on the site of the existing units.
23. Development shall not be commenced until details of the provision of receptacles for litter and measures to dispose of litter arising from the use of the premises have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall be permanently maintained as such.

Additional Information to Applicant

6. All construction or demolition works should be carried out in accordance with the "Control of Pollution and Noise From Demolition and Construction Sites Code of Practice 2008." A copy can be viewed on the Council's web site www.braintree.gov.uk, at Planning Reception, or it can be emailed.
7. In respect of condition 21 above, you are advised that the hours of use of the additional car parking shall be no later than 9.00pm.

The Committee asked Officers to give detailed consideration as to whether this application should be referred to the Secretary of State for 'call-in'; and to discuss with Essex County Council the possibility of providing alternative bus stop signs, as the proposed electronic signs are considered to be out of keeping with the village.

11 PLANNING APPLICATION REFUSED

DECISION: That the undermentioned planning application be refused for the reason stated below.

<u>Plan No.</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Applicant(s)</u>	<u>Proposed Development</u>
*09/00306/OUT (REFUSED)	Feering	Granville Developments	Erection of B1 (office) business unit, Threshelfords Business Park, Inworth Road.

The site lies within an area designated for low density employment use under Policy RLP47 of the Braintree District Local Plan Review. Furthermore, Policy RLP31 states that within business parks standards of design and layout will need to be conformed to. It is considered that the introduction of a further business unit would be out of keeping with this low density employment site and introduce built development on a landscaped area intended to act as a gateway to the Business Park. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the above policies.

12 APPLICATION NOS. 08/01882/FUL and 08/01883/LBC – CLARKS FARM, CRANES LANE, KELVEDON

INFORMATION: Members were reminded that the following planning applications had been considered and approved by the Planning Committee on 3rd February 2009.

<u>Plan No.</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Applicant(s)</u>	<u>Proposed Development</u>
08/01882/ FUL and 08/01883/LBC (APPROVED)	Kelvedon	Lanswood Ltd	Rear extension to farmhouse, construction of new outbuilding, construction of B1 Office space and conversion of existing silos to B1 Office. Removal of agricultural tie to paddock cottage. Demolition of non listed buildings and C20 addition to listed barn. Extinguishment of commercial operations, Clarks Farm Cranes Lane.

Application no. 08/01882/FUL had been approved, subject to a Section 106 Agreement being entered into under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to regularize at least two passing spaces on Cranes Lane. Subsequent to the meeting, discussions had taken place with Essex County Council which had concluded that the proposed spaces were within the publicly maintainable highway and that they could be provided via a Section 278 Agreement under the Highways Act 1980. This procedure was considered to be more expedient, but it would require a change to the Committee's resolution and the amendment of the draft decision notice by adding a 'negative' condition and Information to Applicant.

DECISION: That the Planning Committee's decision with respect to application no. 08/01882/FUL be amended from an approval subject to a Section 106 Agreement, to an approval subject to the conditions set out in the original report and to the following additional condition and Information to Applicant:-

Additional Condition

15. The commercial B1 office units located within the site edged red on the plan returned herewith shall not be occupied until the passing bays have been constructed to a specification and at a location to be agreed to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority.

Information to Applicant

In respect of condition 15 above, you are advised that the works should be carried out in accordance with the County Council's Specifications and to the satisfaction of the County Surveyor, and subject to a Section 278 Agreement under the Highways Act 1980.

INFORMATION: Consideration was given to a report on Essex County Council's Revised Vehicle Parking Standards and Good Practice' consultation document.

It was reported that the District Council currently applied Essex County Council's parking standards, which had last been reviewed in 2001, to new developments and proposals to change the use of buildings. The standards had been reviewed in 2001 in response to a shift in national transport policy to promoting a change in travel behaviour from private car use to the alternatives of public transport, cycling and walking. At that time, the standards set maximum rather than minimum standards for car parking provision for all categories of land use.

The proposed revised standards distinguished between the origin of journeys (residential) and the destination of journeys (for example workplaces, leisure and shopping). This acknowledged the fact that limiting parking availability at trip origins did not necessarily discourage car ownership and could push vehicle parking onto adjacent public highways causing obstruction to emergency and passenger transport vehicles and detracting from the general quality of the residential environment. The proposal was to set minimum car parking standards for residential developments and maximum standards for destination-type uses.

Whilst, the proposed revisions to the parking standards were supported in general, concern was expressed that the re-introduction of minimum residential standards could discourage higher density development at locations where this would be the most appropriate form of development in urban design terms and could be justified on the grounds of there being excellent access to public transport. It was considered also that information about the sites visited during the review would be helpful in understanding the findings reached and that the document provided no real evidence for its assertion that cycle parking standards were too onerous.

DECISION: That the general approach of the Revised Vehicle Parking Standards be supported, but Essex County Council be advised of the following two issues which have not been fully recognised in the draft document:-

The standards could discourage residential development at higher densities in locations within urban centres where the availability of a range of public transport alternatives is optimum and where this would represent the most sustainable form of development.

There is insufficient evidence within the document to support the assertion that the existing cycle parking standards are too onerous.

The Chairman agreed to consider the following item as a matter of urgent business in order to enable the matter to proceed without further delay.

Urgent Item

14 TREE PRESERVATION ORDER - THE ASHES PUBLIC HOUSE, ASHES ROAD, CRESSING

INFORMATION: Members of the Committee were informed that a Tree Preservation Order had been made with respect to two trees situated in the car park of The Ashes Public House, Ashes Road, Cressing.

At the time of the making of the Order the Agent for the property had indicated verbally that he objected to the Order and he had been advised in writing to submit a formal objection. However, a formal objection had not been received and the Council had confirmed the Order.

The Agent had indicated subsequently that he had not received the Council's letter, but that he wished his objection to stand. Members were informed that advice had been sought from the Council's Legal Team who had advised that the Order should be revoked and re-served giving an opportunity for any objections to be submitted and heard in the proper way.

DECISION: That the Tree Preservation Order in respect of The Ashes Public House, Ashes Road, Cressing be revoked and re-served.

At the close of the meeting, reference was made to the recent decision by Essex County Council regarding an application for an integrated waste management facility at Rivenhall Airfield. It was reported that the Secretary of State had decided to 'call in' the application for determination and that Braintree District Council had sent a letter to the Secretary of State requesting that a Local inquiry be held.

At 10.15pm, in accordance with the Code of Conduct, it was moved, seconded and agreed that the meeting should continue until all business on the Agenda had been dealt with.

PLEASE NOTE: The full list of standard conditions and reasons can be viewed at the office of the Head of District Development, Council Offices, Causeway House, Bocking End, Braintree, Essex CM7 9HB.

(Where applications are marked with an * this denotes that representations were received and considered by the Committee).

The meeting closed at 11.05pm.

MRS W D SCATTERGOOD

(Chairman)

APPENDIX

PLANNING COMMITTEE

28TH APRIL 2009

PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Summary of Questions Asked / Statements Made During Public Question Time

1. Statement by Mr Don Stedman, 9 St Peter's Road, Braintree
Agenda Item 5 - Tree Preservation Order No. 14A/2008 1 St Peter's Close, Braintree

Mr Stedman queried the accuracy of the scores set out in the TEMPO assessment. Mr Stedman referred also to a letter dated 12th September 2006 which his Insurance company had sent to the owners of the tree advising them of the findings of two consultants' reports which had concluded that damage to Mr Stedman's house was caused by movement of foundations, with the ground being influenced by the water demand of the walnut tree and the physical growth of the tree's roots.

2. Statement by Mr Shaun McGrath, Indigo Planning, Swan Court, Worple Road, London SW19 4JS
Application No. 08/02126/FUL – Tesco Stores Ltd, Clay Pits, Braintree and
Application No. 08/02104/FUL - Tesco Stores Ltd, 1 The Square, Notley Green, Great Notley

Mr McGrath stated that he was speaking on behalf of Sainsbury's PLC. Mr McGrath made reference to Sainsbury's planning application to extend its Braintree store which had been withdrawn prior to its consideration at the last meeting of the Planning Committee. With respect to the applications by Tesco, Mr McGrath referred to a letter submitted by Sainsbury's Solicitor expressing concern about the Committee report and the findings of the Council's consultant. Mr McGrath stated that if the Committee decided to grant the two applications submitted by Tesco there were sufficient grounds to justify a judicial challenge. Mr McGrath considered that the Committee did not have the correct information on which to make a decision and he suggested that the applications should be deferred until this information had been provided.

3. Statements Relating to Application No. 08/02104/FUL - Tesco Stores Ltd, 1 The Square, Notley Green, Great Notley
 - (i) Statement by Mr Dennis Gale, 8 Wood Way, Great Notley

Mr Gale stated that he was not against the application, particularly as the perimeter of the store would be no bigger than it was at present. Mr Gale supported the provision of an entrance opposite The Cricketers Public House. However, Mr Gale expressed concern for the safety of residents using Cuckoo Way and he asked if a round-about could be provided at the end of this road.

(ii) Statement by Mr Mark Hagger, 21 Highclere Road, Great Notley

Mr Hagger questioned the findings of the Council's consultants who had concluded that the new store would not have an adverse impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre. Mr Hagger stated that the area adjacent to the existing Tesco store was a focal point for anti-social behaviour and he felt that the provision of a larger car park would escalate this problem and that the car park would become a race track causing noise and nuisance to neighbours. Mr Hagger stated that he objected to the scale of the proposed development. Mr Hagger indicated that originally a village store had been proposed, but it could now become a superstore, which he considered would spoil the village.

(iii) Statement by Mrs Louise Ford, Tesco Stores Ltd (Applicant)

Mrs Ford stated that, as required by the Council at a previous meeting, Tesco had decided not to appeal against the non-determination of Tesco's applications to enable the Council to obtain further information. Mrs Ford indicated that the information had now been obtained and this had confirmed the original findings of the Council's consultant. Mrs Ford stated that the terms of the proposed Section 106 Agreement had been agreed and that this would provide for improvements to the town centre and ensure that improvements were made to the Tesco store in the Market Place, Braintree, before either of the extended stores at Clay Pits, Braintree and Great Notley were opened.

Mrs Ford indicated that improvements to the value of over £1million were being proposed by Tesco as part of these proposals and that they would generate over 200 new jobs. Mrs Ford stated that, following discussions with the District Council and Essex County Council, the Great Notley scheme had been amended to provide a round-about and that it would incorporate a mezzanine floor within the relocated independent retail units.

4. Statement by Mr David Poole, Andrew Martin Associates, Croxton's Mill, Little Waltham (Agent)
Application No. 09/00306/OUT – Threshelfords Business Park, Inworth Road, Feering

Mr Poole stated that a similar scheme was currently the subject of an appeal, but that discussions had taken place with Council Officers to overcome previous concerns and this application had consequently been submitted. Mr Poole stated that if the application was approved, the appeal would be withdrawn. Mr Poole stated that none of the existing units were empty, or suitable for sub-division and that there were limited growth opportunities for businesses wishing to expand. Mr Poole stated that there was an extant permission for a building on the proposed site which could be developed and converted. Mr Poole indicated that it was proposed to develop a building of a high specification to meet the needs of a modern business, and to prevent out-commuting by the local workforce.

5. Statements Relating to Application Nos. 09/00229/FUL and 09/00230/LBC – Shellards, Shellards Lane, Wickham, St Paul

(i) Statement by Mrs Barbara Sharp, Shellards Cottage, Shellards Lane, Wickham St Paul

Mrs Sharp expressed concern about access arrangements and about vehicles having to be reversed along the access lane. Mrs Sharp indicated that several garden gates opened onto the lane and that there was a public footpath and no lighting. She felt that there would be major problems for users of the lane. Mrs Sharp expressed concern about the effect of the proposal on Shellards Cottage which was a thatched, Grade II listed building.

(ii) Statement by Ms Nicola Bickerstaff, Strutt and Parker, Coval Hall, Chelmsford (Agent)

Ms Bickerstaff stated that the listed building was currently redundant, but capable of conversion for commercial purposes which was the preferred use. Ms Bickerstaff indicated that the proposed design of the conversion was simple and that it would provide a modest office and meetings room. Ms Bickerstaff stated that the site was accessed by a narrow lane which would limit the use of the site, but that Essex County Council Highways had not objected to the proposal. Ms Bickerstaff stated that the proposal would provide the necessary investment which would secure the future survival of the building.