| Item 1  | Contents:   |
|---|---|
| 11/00219/FUL  | 1. Rawreth Parish Council Comments  |
| The   | 2. Amendment to Condition 2   |
| Chichester,<br>Old London<br>Road, Rawreth            | 3. Note of Pre–Application Meeting with Members   |
|   | <ol> <li>Rawreth Parish Council – No observations or comments to make.</li> </ol>   |
|   | 2. Condition 2 now reads:-  |
|   | 'The development hereby permitted shall be constructed<br>entirely of the materials, details of which are shown on plan No.<br>3350/3 Revision D as date stamped 7 April 2011 and as<br>specified on page 14 of the Design and Access Statement also<br>date stamped 7 April 2011, unless alterative materials are<br>proposed. Where alternative materials are to be used, no<br>development shall commence before details of those<br>alternative external facing and roofing materials to be used in<br>the development have been submitted to and approved in<br>writing by the Local Planning Authority. Where materials other<br>than those materials specified on the plans and within the<br>Design and Access Statement date stamped 7 April 2011 are<br>agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the materials<br>agreed shall be those used in the development hereby<br>permitted'. |
|   | 3. Following the decision on the first application the applicant met<br>on 2 March this year with The Leader, The Portfolio Holder for<br>Planning and Transportation, Ward Members and the Head of<br>Planning and Transportation to discuss the issues and clarify<br>Members' concerns. The current application has been<br>submitted after those discussions.   |
| Item 2<br>11/00174/COU<br>12 Purdeys<br>Way, Rochford | <ul> <li>Contents</li> <li>1. Essex County Council Highways Consultation Response</li> <li>2. Correspondence from Agent</li> <li>3. Letter of Support</li> <li>4. Revised Recommendation</li> </ul>   |
|   | <ol> <li>Essex County Council Highways Consultation Response<br/>Essex County Council as the highway authority does not wish<br/>to raise objection to the proposals, subject to the following<br/>conditions being attached to any permission granted.</li> </ol>  |

## DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE - 26 May 2011

| 1  | . Prior to the occupation of the facility, the applicant shall enter<br>into an agreement to provide a sum of £5,000 towards the<br>implementation of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) close to<br>the junction of Rochehall Way with Purdeys Way.  |
|----|---|
| F  | Reason: To ensure that the junction of Rochehall Way and<br>Purdeys Way is kept clear of parked vehicles in the interests of<br>highway safety.   |
| 2  | Prior to occupation of the facility the parking area shall be laid<br>out as shown on the revised site plan, Drawing No.<br>00610175/01.  |
| 3  | <ol> <li>Prior to occupation the cycle racks, as shown on the revised<br/>site plan, Drawing No. 00610175/01, shall be provided.</li> </ol>   |
| 2  | 2. Correspondence from Agent  |
| (i | <ul> <li>The applicant agrees to the planning condition imposed by<br/>Essex County Council for a £5,000 contribution.</li> </ul>   |
| (i | <ul> <li>Copy of e-mail from RDC Building Control Manager to Agent<br/>confirming that draft plans would appear to comply with<br/>Building Regulations 2010.</li> </ul>  |
| 3  | . Letter of Support   |
|    | A letter has been received from the owners of the application site, to support the officer's recommendation to approve this application, which makes the following points:-   |
|    | <ul> <li>Despite comprehensive marketing, this property has been unable to attract a viable, occupational tenant.</li> <li>The whole warehouse scheme originally had consent to be used for retail purposes but this use has never been implemented. Subsequently, we were approached by Electrothermal Engineering Ltd who only required half of the building for industrial use and they took a lease on part (now known as 12a) from March 2008. We understand that they employ over 40 people. The remaining half is the subject of this application.</li> <li>We understand that an objection has been lodged on 3 grounds.</li> </ul> |
|    | 1 Parking provision. We feel that there is adequate private<br>parking for both visitors and staff to meet the needs of the<br>proposed use. The applicant is willing to segregate the<br>parking areas so as not to confuse visitors as to what<br>spaces belong to whom.  |

|        | There are also adequate footpaths surrounding the unit and Highways have raised no objections.  |
|--------|---|
|        | 2 Site security. Both parts of the original warehouse are now self-contained. The shared service yard to the rear is adequately protected by electric security gates and only staff, not the public, will have access to this area.   |
|        | 3 Noise and disturbance. Following the previous refusal, the<br>applicants have gone to considerable time and expense in<br>employing expert acoustic consultants to advise and specify<br>what mitigation measures are appropriate so as not to<br>cause any disturbance to their neighbours. One must<br>remember that this is an industrial estate and many<br>industrial uses create a certain element of noise. In any<br>event, their occupation of the premises is governed by a full<br>repairing and insuring lease, which contains covenants not<br>to cause a nuisance or disturbance. Those covenants will<br>be strictly observed. |
| 0      | The applicants have committed considerable effort and financial investment to this project, which should be applauded and we hope it will provide a valuable social facility to the people of Rochford & create new employment.   |
| 4. F   | Revised Recommendation  |
| ר<br>£ | The revised recommendation is <b>APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO</b><br><b>THE APPLICANT ENTERING A LEGAL AGREEMENT</b> for<br>25,000, as required by the Highways Authority and the<br>conditions listed in the report.   |
|        |   |