

**SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS TOWN COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

MINUTES of an online Meeting held on Wednesday 31st March 2021
at 7p.m.

Present:

Councillor Roberts as Chairman
Councillor John as Vice-Chairman

Councillor Ferry	Councillor Sismey
Councillor Birch	Councillor O'Brien
Councillor Humphrey	

In attendance: Town Clerk, Town Clerk Assistant and fourteen members of the public.

P281 Apologies for Absence

No apologies were received.

P282 Dispensation Considerations

None received.

P283 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Shearring announced a non-pecuniary interest to the Marsh Farm application which was accepted since Councillor Shearring is not a member of the planning committee and therefore holds no voting rights at the meeting.

P284 Confirmation of Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 22nd February 2021 were agreed as a true record of the meeting.

Proposed: Councillor Roberts

Seconded: Councillor O'Brien

Vote: Carried

P285 Bradwell B Questions and Answers

Stephen Bray and Tim Miller from the Bradwell B team gave an update to the Bradwell B development and gave the attached answers to the questions submitted to them.

P286 Public Questions

Fourteen members of the public were present which were interested in the planning application for 21/00218/FUL at Marsh Farm who had many concerns which are summarised as:

- Noise disruption.
- Visual impact.

- Loss of green space as required in Neighbourhood Plan.
- Traffic congestion due to inadequate road and lack of footpaths.
- Lack of emergency vehicle access in busy periods.
- Inappropriate car parking.
- Retrospective planning application.

P287 Previous Planning Difference Decisions Considered

No planning differences were noted.

P288 Current Planning Applications

21/00218/FUL Marsh Farm Visitor Attraction, Marsh Farm Road

The use as a substantial retail and event location represents a very substantial change from its previous use as the previous use of a Farm Park for visitors with a significant educational content.

The location is inappropriate for the scale and type of use intended. Marsh Farm Road is a lane without a footpath for part of its length so pedestrians visiting the seawall, country park, Frankland Fields Nature Reserve, and the Allotments use the road. The heavy traffic generated by Marsh Farm visitors particularly for events is a danger to those pedestrians. During events there has also been significant traffic congestion on Inchbonnie Road and the two Inchbonnie Road/Ferrers Road roundabouts. There is also a significant noise impact of the site. In addition to the marquee mentioned in the application there are three other marquees that have been in a fixed location for 6 and 7 months. These are not included in the application because they are meant to be non-permanent structures that do not remain in place for more than 2 months at a time. The marquees and other changes that have been made to the site represent an adverse visual appearance to users of the country park and seawall. The change of use represents an inappropriate use for a location neighbouring a country park, Site Of Scientific Interest, nature reserve to the South, East and West and residential properties to the North. The hard surfacing of the overspill car park is in-appropriate to the location and will allow more frequent and intensive use. The Town Council have every sympathy with hospitality businesses that have had to be innovative during the pandemic however this application is not a temporary or time limited application but intended to be a permanent change.

To summarise Planning Committee **OBJECTS** to this application for the following principal reasons:

- Impact, visually and by noise on the Country Park, seawall and other footpaths and on local residents
- Traffic impact
- Represents a substantial change and scale of use from former use

21/05038/TPO 38 Finchland View

T4 - Oak - in rear garden of property - crown reduction cutting to previous growing points and crown lift leaving a clear trunk - one main cut back of a branch growing directly towards the conservatory/house - reason: size of tree would suggest roots will soon be nearing foundations of the house

therefore work advised as soon as possible. Comments agreed by Town Clerk and submitted prior to meeting due to time constraints.

It was agreed that SWFTC has **NO OBJECTIONS** to this application.

21/05042/TPO 7 Starboard View

Oak T7 Fell - This tree has grown significantly in size. The tree is a poor specimen and its loss will not affect amenity value.

It was agreed that the Planning Committee **OBJECTS** to this application and recommends a reduction rather than felling of the tree.

21/00383/FUL 10 Elronds Rest

Single storey side extension and replacement of conservatory roof.

It was agreed that the Planning Committee has **NO OBJECTIONS** to this application.

21/05058/TPO 5 Charlotte Court

T9 Robinia - Fell to ground level - Reason: Tree is in state of decline; T10 Robinia - Crown reduce by 1-2m - Reason: Tree is very large and overhanging footpath and touching neighbours property.

It was agreed that the Planning Committee has **NO OBJECTIONS** to this application.

21/00488/FUL 48 Ormesby Chine

Single storey rear extension & garage alterations.

It was agreed that the Planning Committee has **NO OBJECTIONS** to this application.

21/05050/TPO Champions Lodge, Burnham Road

Area G1 - Large Oak - located at front of Champions lodge - Crown reduction (both in height and sides) by 2.5/3m (dictated by growth points), remove dead wood, remove any rubbing branches, remove lower epicormic growth over neighbouring property - Reason: To stop bird faeces around pool and garden.

It was agreed that the Planning Committee has **NO OBJECTIONS** to this application.

21/05093/TPO 22 The Spinnaker

T5 Oak - Front of Property- Crown reduce by 2m, Prune back from property - 2m maximum clearance (previous issues with squirrels) Crown lift over road to 5.2m and prune back from lamp post to allow proper lighting to road, general tree maintenance to safeguard future life of tree

It was agreed that the Planning Committee has **NO OBJECTIONS** to this application.

21/05086/TPO 89 Hamberts Road

T2 Silver Birch - in front garden. Crown reduction, cutting to suitable growing points and shaping over to leave natural profile.

It was agreed that the Planning Committee has **NO OBJECTIONS** to this application.

21/05070/TPO 5 Brace Walk

T5 - Oak - prune back to previous points - Reason: Due to excessive shade over property and that of two adjoining neighbours.

It was agreed that the Planning Committee has **NO OBJECTIONS** to this application.

21/00167/FUL 11 Mount Pleasant

Construction of three front roof dormers. Conversion of front store to habitable area with change to fenestration. Changes to external material finishes.

It was agreed that the Planning Committee has **NO OBJECTIONS** to these changes.

21/00059/FUL 28 King Edwards Road

Demolish existing conservatory, construction of single storey rear extension. Alteration to front fenestration. Loft conversion with front, rear dormer windows and first floor side windows. Addition of 2 front roof windows. (Amended application).

It was agreed that the Planning Committee has **NO OBJECTIONS** to these changes.

21/00498/FUL 13 Mount Pleasant

Loft conversion with pitched roof to replace flat roof, dormer windows, side window and Juliet Balcony to rear.

It was agreed that the Planning Committee has **NO OBJECTIONS** to this application.

21/00513/FUL 2 Chadwick Road

Demolish existing garage. Part single, part two storey side extension. Addition of roof windows.

It was agreed that the Planning Committee has **NO OBJECTIONS** to this application.

21/00342/FUL 25 Paston Close

Construction of three front roof dormers. Conversion of front store to habitable area with change to fenestration. Changes to external material finishes.

It was agreed that the Planning Committee has **NO OBJECTIONS** to this application.

21/00427/FUL 13 Helena Court

Single storey rear extension.

It was agreed that the Planning Committee has **NO OBJECTIONS** to this application.

21/00352/FUL 85 Gandalfs Ride

Demolition of existing shed and single storey side extension.

It was agreed that the Planning Committee has **NO OBJECTIONS** to this application however have slight concerns over the side storey construction having direct access to the private road.

21/00452/FUL Blenheim, 7 Broughton Road

Conversion of existing garage to habitable area with minor reduction in size. Construction of two storey side extension with integral garage. Re-construction of garden wall to match height of existing wall in place.

It was agreed that the Planning Committee has **NO OBJECTIONS** to this application.

21/00341/FUL Faramir House, 140 Celeborn Street

Single storey and two storey front extensions.

It was agreed that the Planning Committee has **NO OBJECTIONS** to this application.

21/00542/FUL 17 The Bight

First Floor front infill extension, single storey rear extension. Extension to existing rear balcony and alterations to fenestration.

It was agreed that the Planning Committee has **NO OBJECTIONS** to this application.

21/00393/FUL 17 Longfield Road

Single storey rear extension. Single storey front extension. Pitched roof over existing garage and front canopy.

It was agreed that the Planning Committee has **NO OBJECTIONS** to this application.

21/00415/FUL 6 Green Mead

First Floor rear extension over previously constructed Ground Floor extension.

It was agreed that the Planning Committee has **NO OBJECTIONS** to this application.

21/00411/FUL Holly House, 231 Hullbridge Road

Single storey rear/ side extension.

It was agreed that the Planning Committee has **NO OBJECTIONS** to this application.

21/00413/FUL Fenn Brook House, Old Wickford Road

Single Storey UPVC conservatory.

It was agreed that the Planning Committee has **NO OBJECTIONS** to this application although have concerns that the areas has a history of flooding.

21/00276/FUL 42 Kings Way

Change of use from D1 (non-residential institutions) to C3 (residential) to create 1 dwelling.

It was agreed that the Planning Committee has **NO OBJECTIONS** to this application.

21/00470/FUL 18 Willow Grove

Single storey side and rear extension.

It was agreed that the Planning Committee has **NO OBJECTIONS** to this application.

21/00516/FUL 15 Willow Grove

Remove existing Orangery pitched roof. Construction of replacement roof with roof window.

It was agreed that the Planning Committee has **NO OBJECTIONS** to this application.

P289 Non-Material Amendments

The following applications for non-material amendments were noted:

19/01334/NMAT/1 21A Ormesby Chine

Non-material amendment to planning permission 19/01334/FUL - (Single storey rear extension and two storey side extension. New hardstanding to the front). Amend the design of the roof from having 2 pitches to only featuring 1 pitch. Alteration to part of the external materials used from render with a brickwork plinth to front of extension.

18/01876/NMAT/1 189 Hullbridge Road

Non-material amendment to planning permission 18/01876/FUL - (Part single, part two storey side and rear extensions, two storey front extension and creation of second floor with a rear balcony within the proposed loft space). Alteration to height of ground floor rear extension with flat roof over and parapet wall. Addition of 2 Juliet balconies to rear 1st floor level. Addition of 2nd floor rear windows and doors and 1.2m balcony screens to roof terrace.

P290 Essex Minerals Local Plan Review

A working group was formed to create a response to be discussed and agreed at the planning meeting on 28th April and for submission to Essex County Council on 29th April 2021 as per the attachment included with the agenda.

**P291 Site at Bushy Hill Communications Station, Edwins Hall Road –
Appeal reference APP/W1525/W/20/3266141, application
reference 20/00856/OUT**

The appeal for the outline application for the demolition of the existing buildings, structures and masts with redevelopment to provide seven detached dwellings together with landscaping, roads, footpath and other infrastructure and ancillary works was noted.

It was proposed that Councillor Sismey be the representative Councillor if required at an enquiry and that existing comments, as attached to the agenda that were submitted be to Chelmsford City Council be retained for the Planning Inspectorate.

Proposed: Councillor Sismey

Seconded: Councillor Roberts

Vote: Carried

P292 Report to Council

Bradwell B questions.

Bushy Hill application appeal.

Marsh Farm application objections.

P293 Media Coverage

It was agreed that no items are required for media coverage.

P294 Next Meeting

The next meeting agreed as 28th April 2021 at 7.30pm.

There being no further business to discuss, the Chairman closed the meeting at 9.36pm.

Signed

Chairman of the Meeting

Date: 28th April 2021

Answers to questions provided by South Woodham Ferrers Town Council

23 April 2021



The following are written answers in response to questions proposed by South Woodham Ferrers Town Council to Bradwell B, in advance of the meeting held on 31/03/2021. These are provided at the request of the clerk, and reflect the answers given in the meeting, and include some useful reference points for further information.

For any further information, please contact stephen.bray@cg nuk.co.uk.

1. Trips per day – Interpretation and routing

- a) In any 24-hour period Monday to Friday, what is the minimum number of single trips that are to be expected to travel by road from West to East (To the Bradwell site from the rest of the UK) along the B1012 Burnham Road through South Woodham Ferrers?
- b) In any 24-hour period Monday to Friday, what is the minimum number of single trips that are to be expected to travel by road from East to West (From the Bradwell site to the rest of the UK) along the B1012 Burnham Road through South Woodham Ferrers?
- c) Same question as (a) but for 48 hours of the weekend?
- d) Same question as (b) but for 48 hours of the weekend?
- e) How long will the period be in terms of years and months be based on average tonnage per day (see question 2) in conjunction with the number of trips.

We remind you that the proposals are early stage, with various options to be considered. As the project develops we will consult our key stakeholders, including members of the public again. Our current plans are to undertake further public consultation before we apply for permission (through a development consent order) to the Planning Inspectorate and Secretary of State. We will also undertake engagement (outside of formal consultation) with key groups, including town and parish councils. As discussed in our recent meeting there has been limited development of our proposals and the development that has been undertaken has been associated with planning for additional work that will provide further output data that we will be able to share with you at a later stage. While we recognise the purpose for the question about weekends, but for the same reason, we are not yet at the point where the detail is available.

Since there is no further information at this stage we refer you to the information presented in the working number given in the Stage One consultation materials, of between 500-750 return trips per day, to the Bradwell site on the highway network, in the peak period of construction (par 4.6.10, page 104 of the [Stage One consultation document](#)). The consultation proposed a number of possible options for routes and highways interventions for both early years and peak years.

The return leg of the early years proposals, and all options for both legs in peak years proposals currently run along the B1012 Burnham Road through South Woodham Ferrers (please see page 110 and page 112 of the [Stage One consultation document](#)).

We are continuing to develop our proposals, and are developing a traffic and transport model for the project. This development may lead to revised proposals at future consultation, which will take into account (where possible) stakeholder feedback received at the Stage One consultation.

Average tonnage per day is not a determining factor for the duration of the project or the number of trips (i.e. that it will take x days to deliver y tonnage of materials), because all loads will be different, and will be needed at different stages of the project.

2. Movement of Freight – Road Haulage Tonnage

- f) What is the total tonnage of construction material that is to be expected to travel by road from West to East (To the Bradwell site from the rest of the UK) along the B1012 Burnham Road through South Woodham Ferrers?
- g) What is the total tonnage of construction material that is to be expected to travel by road from East to West (From the Bradwell site to the rest of the UK) along the B1012 Burnham Road through South Woodham Ferrers?
- h) How long will the period be in terms of years and months be based on average tonnage per day (see question 2) in conjunction with the number of trips. If this answer is different from question (e), please explain the rationale.

The answers to the top three questions are covered in the answers to the previous section. To add to that, at least 50% of bulk materials will be transported by marine and/or rail, with the ambition remained that this percentage will be higher. Discussions with relevant organisations, such as Network Rail continue in order to identify opportunities.

We re-iterate the earlier point, which is that taking 50% of the 6,000,000 tonnes estimate, and distributing it through the project period to derive ‘tonnage by road by days’ calculations, because the loads would be diverse (e.g. abnormal indivisible loads, steel and aggregates). This is discussed in more detail in Section 4.6. Movement of Freight on page 104 in the [Stage One consultation document](#).

3. Traffic Management Facilities – Location and Trips

- i) When will the final decision be made on the final location of this Freight Management Facility?
- j) How many additional single journeys will be made to and from the Freight Management Facility between the Freight Management Facility and Bradwell B? (a round trip is two single journeys). Additional means in addition to the answers given in Question 1.
- k) How many additional single journeys will be made to and from the Freight Management Facility between the Freight Management Facility and the rest of the UK? (a round trip is two single journeys). Additional means in addition to the answers given in Question 1.
- l) How many extra months / years will the Freight Management Facility be operational above the answers given in question 1(e) and question 2(h)?

Freight management facilities will be built to both manage HGV movements on local roads, and to ensure reliability of deliveries for the project. Three search areas are being considered for one or more facilities in the west Latchingdon / east Cold Norton area, the east Latchingdon / south Mayland area, and the west South Woodham Ferrers area near the junction with the A130.

The movements per day quoted in the consultation materials are inclusive of trips to and from the freight management facility/ies. No decision had been taken on the number of facilities or the locations - search areas currently indicated *might* be down-selected by the next consultation and would be further consulted on.

We anticipate that any freight management facility/ies would be temporary and removed after they are no longer required and the land restored to existing use. We will engage with any stakeholders on any suggested potential beneficial after-use, but any proposal to retain or reuse of the facilities would need consultation with the local authority and separate planning applications.

Freight Management is covered in more detail on page 105 of the [Stage One consultation document](#).

4. Pollution & Health Mitigation

- m) What measures have been taken to safeguard the residents of South Woodham Ferrers from all forms of pollution and protect their health?
- n) How many vehicles engaged in journeys to Bradwell that pass along the B1012 Burnham Road through South Woodham Ferrers meet the ULEZ standards being implemented by London? namely
 - Euro 4 (NOx) for petrol cars, vans, minibuses and other specialist vehicles
 - Euro 6 (NOx and PM) for diesel cars, vans and minibuses and other specialist vehicles
 - Euro VI (NOx and PM) for lorries, buses and coaches and other specialist heavyvehicles (NOx and PM)

The Environmental Impact Assessment process forms a core part of the application for a development consent order, through which any health effects of the proposals would be identified and understood, together with the action which would be taken to address them

Exact numbers / split of different types of Euro Engine classifications for vehicles could not be confirmed at this time, because we are only at the early proposals stage, but also because vehicle standards will change between now, the time at which an application for development consent order is made, and the time at which these vehicle movements would happen. These points in time are several years away and it is difficult to predict what the reference vehicles might look like when the construction (and therefore construction traffic) begins. Nevertheless, BRB will comply with any national or local rules/regulation regarding emissions standards

5. Power line cables through South Woodham Ferrers

- o) Do the current over-head wires and their route through the parish of South Woodham Ferrers have the capability to handle the output being proposed by Bradwell B?
- p) Will any changes be required to the power lines that pass through the parish of South Woodham Ferrers?
- q) By which date will any changes required to the power line infrastructure that passes through the parish of South Woodham Ferrers be confirmed and published? This should include any plans to bury or divert the distribution powerlines in the South Woodham Ferrers residential development area, or indeed in other areas of environmental sensitivity along the parish route.
- r) Which recognised medical reports will be used as reference to re-enforce any decision that proposes to use the current power lines that pass through the parish of South Woodham Ferrers close to the existing and new residential sites?

Infrastructure for the transmission of power from Bradwell B would be dealt with under a separate development consent order, applied for by National Grid, which is in common with how other nuclear new build projects have approached the task. It would therefore be for National Grid to take this work forwards, including the proposal of routes, and as the organisation responsible for transmission, it is better placed to answer specific questions when it initiates its work on the connection, and its public consultation.

It is unlikely that the existing connection infrastructure would be sufficient for Bradwell B, which would have different requirements to the original Bradwell station, not least because it has a significantly higher output than the original station. National Grid will be carrying out this work on BRB's behalf, under a contractual relationship and both BRB and National Grid would develop their respective proposals in cognisance of the other, and would be mindful of cumulative impacts.

Answers to questions provided by South Woodham Ferrers Town Council

In reference to health effects of power lines, again National Grid is the responsible organisation and has published information on its website (www.nationalgrid.com) which may be helpful for anyone with questions.

6. Five further questions submitted by members of the public

- 1) Please define the 'South Woodham Ferrers Ring Road'.
- 2) Can they confirm that the entrance and exit lanes at the Sainsbury's roundabout, crossing 3 and the new crossing 1 at Fenn Farm are suitable and safe for the length, weight and quantity of the proposed HGV traffic. (see locations in extract from Masterplan Document below).
- 3) Will they confirm that the planned 500 to 700 HGV's per day plus the addition of up to 6 additional signalised crossings and a roundabout on the B1012 will not cause unacceptable congestion, gridlock and pollution along this route.
- 4) Is there any plan for an alternative route that will be suitable for 500-700 HGV movements per day around rather than through an expanded South Woodham Ferrers.
- 5) Will HGV drivers be forced to use the B1012 (with all the crossings) to prevent damage to the railway bridges and embankments on Ferrers Road.

At the time, and arguably still, for instance as no planning permission has been granted for the new housing development to the north of South Woodham Ferrers, the B1012 Burnham Road operates with Ferrers Road as a *ring road*, so was therefore referred to as such in the [Stage One consultation document](#).

In relation to the question about the Sainsbury's roundabout, and to the crossings, these traffic systems currently are understood and changes to them would be factored into our planning, as it develops in the way described in the earlier questions.

Traffic impacts of the proposals, as both other schemes come along, and as the Bradwell B requirement develop, will be fully modelled and understood, and the proposals which come forward will take these impacts into account. In addition, in relation to pollution, this will be examined through the environmental impact assessment discussed earlier. More detailed proposals, based on out advanced modelling information will be published and further consulted on in future formal consultation.

In relation to the possibility of an alternative plan to the South Woodham Ferrers route, many options are being examined; while Stage One proposals are early stage, and not final proposals, it is improbable that the BRB plans could avoid using a route through South Woodham Ferrers.

The proposed use of the B1012 is not to 'prevent damage to the railway bridges and embankments on Ferrers Road', but because the model indicated it was a better route. The model will continue to be developed in the light of the various other developments, input from stakeholders and highways authority, and the changing requirements of BRB.