

<p>Item 1 11/00429/FUL Long Acres, Lower Road, Hockley</p>	<p>Contents:</p> <p>(1) Officer Declaration of Interest (2) Response from Hockley Parish Council (3) Further letter from the applicant's agent (4) Officer comment in response to agents letter</p> <p>(1) Officer Declaration of Interest</p> <p>It should be noted that the applicant has provided copies of four redacted letters and that it was the case on a previous application considered earlier this year that letters submitted included support from a relative of an employee of the Council working outside the Planning and Transportation department. As no addressee details are shown it may be the case that these letters include views from a relative of that officer.</p> <p>(2) Hockley Parish Council: Comment received.</p> <p>No objection.</p> <p>(3) Letter from the applicant's agent</p> <p>This letter is understood to have been copied electronically by the applicant's agent to Members on the evening of 24th August 2011 (yesterday). Accompanying the letter are the following attachments;</p> <p>(A) Aerial photograph (dated 2007) showing units 5 and 6 prior to replacement.</p> <p>(B) Current site plan showing footprint of units 5 and 6.</p> <p>(C) Site plan showing where units can be rebuilt in the adjoining garden (Option 2 agreed with Mike Stranks).</p> <p>(D) Four letters of strong support from local residents. The key points are;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Units 5 and 6 have existed historically and were originally domestic buildings within the curtilage. 2) The new units 5 and 6 are the same footprint in the same position. 3) The new units could be replaced in the adjacent garden and using the same materials which represents our fall back position. 4) The fall back position is only a few metres away but sits outside the existing group of buildings and would be more obtrusive.
--	--

	<p>5) The Theatre prop storage could go into unit 4 and the domestic storage use of unit 4 could go into a new curtilage building (as in point 3 above).</p> <p>6) When the Committee granted permission for the replacement of Units 2 and 3 on 24th February 2011 they said;</p> <p>“...the proposal is considered to amount to very special circumstances due to the sites history including non–agricultural businesses that have existed for a number of years such as not to cause undue detrimental harm to any development plan interest or other material considerations such as to justify refusing the application.”</p> <p>7) Units 2 and 3 are bigger and taller than units 5 and 6, they contain slightly more aggressive uses related to car repairs and are in a more visible landscape position than units 5 and 6. It is illogical to grant planning permission for units 2 and 3 and not units 5 and 6.</p> <p>8) The officer’s report does not acknowledge the non–agricultural businesses that have existed for a number of years which were fundamental to the previous acceptance of units 2 and 3.</p> <p>9) There have been no objections about the existence or use of any of the buildings on this site including Units 5 and 6.</p> <p>10) On the contrary there is consistent support for what has taken place as evidenced by four letters which are strongly worded.</p> <p>11) At the Committee on 24th February the officer was asked how this matter had come to the attention of the Council he answered that there had been “numerous complaints”. In fact there has been an alleged anonymous telephone complaint and no written objections whatsoever. It is outstanding to note that not one person objects to this proposal.</p> <p>12) National policy does support replacement of buildings rather than refurbishment on the basis that it can be more sustainable, cost effective and result in a better environment.</p> <p>Expressed previously to the Committee how regretful the applicants are that they replaced the buildings rather than simply refurbished them. However, the finished effect is almost identical (though cheaper through replacement)</p>
--	--

	<p>and hence it is reasonable to grant planning permission.</p> <p>The four letters make the following summarised comments in support of the application;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Frequently use lower road and note the likeable change to the character of the bungalow and outbuildings. ○ Pleasing to the eye and no ill effect on the countryside. ○ Applicant should be encouraged. ○ As residents of 30 years do not see what all the fuss is about. ○ The property has always existed with commercial buildings and is extremely tidy and attractive. ○ Have known the property for many years and purchased vehicles from it from the late 1990's from a finance repossession company based there. Site then looked more like a scrap yard. ○ Site now much improved and the refurbished buildings are in keeping with the area. ○ Was good friend with the previous owner and the site became run down in latter years. The new owner has turned what was an eyesore into a pleasant property. <p>(1) Officer response to agent's letter.</p> <p>(C) Officers confirm (paragraphs 1.31 – 1.33 to the officer report) that a building could be reconstructed under permitted development rights, lower in height than this building within the curtilage of the dwelling without planning permission if used for purposes ancillary to the use of the dwelling.</p> <p>(D) The four letters received from the applicant were submitted for the previous applications determined and/or withdrawn. They each date from February 2011. No letters have been independently received on the current applications.</p> <p>1) Officers are satisfied that the building forming Units 5 and 6 has not existed for the four years required. Whilst the aerial photograph provided by the applicants' agent is dated 2007 it is not specific enough to show the existence of the same building</p>
--	--

	<p>now on the site for four years. It is also not proven that the building was part of the curtilage to the bungalow. The site has been in common ownership and footpath links as shown in the aerial photograph would not be uncommon despite the use being distinct from residential use. Officers are satisfied that the existing building forming Units 5 and 6 is unlawful.</p> <p>6) Officers have taken into account Members reasons for allowing the new building to units 2 and 3 as set out at paragraph 1.28 - 1.30 to the officer report.</p> <p>8) Same as above (paragraph 6).</p> <p>12) National policy in the Green Belt does not support the replacement of buildings (other than reasonable sized replacement or extension of existing dwellings). Planning Policy Statement 7 does advocate replacement buildings in rural areas but this applies to such areas outside of the Green Belt and does not override the presumption against inappropriate development embodied in Planning Policy Guidance 2. The construction of new buildings such as proposed in this application is inappropriate development.</p>
<p>Item 2 11/00430/COU Long Acres, Lower Road, Hockley</p>	<p>Contents:</p> <p>(1) Response from Hockley Parish Council</p> <p>(2) Response from Rochford District Council's Head of Environmental Services</p> <p>(3) Further recommended condition</p> <p>(1) Hockley Parish Council: Comment received.</p> <p>Object to this change of use considering that the local road infrastructure would not support extra traffic.</p> <p>(2) Rochford District Council Head of Environmental Services: Comment received.</p> <p>No adverse comments in respect of this application subject to the standard informative SI 16 (Control of nuisances) being attached to any consent granted.</p> <p>(3) Further recommended condition</p> <p>Notwithstanding the provisions of Classes A, B and C of Part 8,</p>

	<p>Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (England) Order 2010, no extensions or alterations shall be erected to the building nor any further hardstanding be provided.</p> <p>REASON: In order to give the Local Planning Authority control over the further extension of the building and hardstandings in the interests of maintaining the open character of the Metropolitan Green Belt.</p>
<p>Item 3 11/00431/COU Long Acres, Lower Road, Hockley</p>	<p>Contents:</p> <p>(1) Response from Hockley Parish Council (2) Further recommended condition</p> <p>(1) Hockley Parish Council: Comment received.</p> <p>No objection.</p> <p>(2) Further recommended condition</p> <p>Notwithstanding the provisions of Classes A, B and C of Part 8, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (England) Order 2010, no extensions or alterations shall be erected to the buildings nor any further hardstandings be provided.</p> <p>REASON: In order to give the Local Planning Authority control over the further extension of the buildings and hardstandings in the interests of maintaining the open character of the Metropolitan Green Belt.</p>
<p>Item 4 11/00432/COU Long Acres, Lower Road, Hockley</p>	<p>Contents:</p> <p>(1) Response from Hockley Parish Council (2) Further recommended condition</p> <p>(1) Hockley Parish Council: Comment received.</p> <p>Object to this change of use considering that the local road infrastructure would not support extra traffic.</p> <p>(2) Further recommended condition</p> <p>Notwithstanding the provisions of Classes A, B and C of Part 8, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (England) Order 2010, no extensions or alterations shall be erected to the building nor any further hardstanding be provided.</p>

	<p>REASON: In order to give the Local Planning Authority control over the further extension of the building and hardstandings in the interests of maintaining the open character of the Metropolitan Green Belt.</p>
--	---