

<p><b>Item 6</b>  <b>16/00731/FUL</b>  <b>Land West of</b>  <b>Little</b>  <b>Wakering</b>  <b>Road and</b>  <b>South of</b>  <b>Barrow Hall</b>  <b>Road, Little</b>  <b>Wakering</b></p>	<p><b>Contents</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Clerk of the Great Wakering Community Council</b></li> <li><b>2. Officer changes</b></li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Clerk of the Great Wakering Community Council</b></li> </ol> <p><b>Items Which are Out of Date</b></p> <p><b>1.1 Buses</b></p> <p>Paragraph 2.5 - The statement regarding the bus routes is out of date. There have been considerable changes and there have been many complaints that journeys are taking much longer. There is now no service along Southchurch Road from Wakering.</p> <p><b>1.2 Doctors</b></p> <p>Page 6.34 Paragraph 6.47 The information regarding the doctors in Great Wakering is out of date. The practice covers a much larger area than the two Wakerings; it also includes Thorpe Bay and at the PPG meeting on 18 May it was announced that 2 doctors were going part-time and the surgery's complement of doctors would be 5 full time equivalents. The patients are now approximately 10,450.</p> <p>Extract from PPG minutes – Lorraine is the Practice Manager</p> <p>“Lorraine explained that the Practice was funded by NHS England and that we are now GMS practice. We were previously a PMS practice; because of this change we have lost funding for our salaried GP, which equates to an annual GP salary. Because of this situation the following has taken place:-</p> <p>From June 2016 Dr J Freel has reduced his hours to part-time. From July 2016 Dr Rothnie has reduced her hours to part-time. Then in July 2016 Dr S Ozturk will become a full-time partner. The practice will still have 6 doctors, but this actually equates to 5 whole time doctors.”</p>
--	--

	<p>Since then Dr Ozturk has resigned and from 1 November 2 part-time locums are filling in until they can recruit a new doctor.</p> <p>Assuming the full complement of 5 full time equivalents – this is 2090 patients per doctor.</p> <p>This has an impact on the calculations in paragraph 6.48. This means that Wakering Medical Centre has 148 more patients per doctor than the average calculation of 1942.</p> <p><b>Reference incorrect</b></p> <p><b>2.1</b> Reference Page 6.8 under Heading and Traffic Matters in the Planning Officer’s Response “Paragraph 6.18 refer” - this reference is incorrect.</p> <p><b>Number Incorrect</b></p> <p><b>3.1</b> Maximum number, page 6.29, paragraph 6.10 ... that the proposed maximum 180 – this should be 120.</p> <p><b>Items Relevant to SER9bnot SER9a</b></p> <p>These were difficult for the officer to recognise, as our comments covered both SER9a and SER9b.</p> <p><b>4.1</b> SER9b Page 6.11, Comment starting “Land surface heights...It would be helpful to know” refers to SER9b, so should not be included in this document.</p> <p><b>4.2</b> SER9b Page 6.14, Drainage Issues, Paragraph starting Pond 11.....anti-social behaviour” refers to SER9b, so should not be included in this document.</p> <p><b>Apparent Conflict</b></p> <p><b>5.1</b> Foul Drainage, Page 6.9, Foul Drainage – the response from the Planning Officer seems to conflict with page 6.21, paragraph 3.37, Foul Drainage Network, “The proposed development will lead to an unacceptable risk of flooding downstream...”</p>
--	---

	<p><b>OFFICER COMMENTS</b></p> <p><b>1.1</b> is noted. The information provided in the report reflects the position at the time of the application submission. The changed situation cannot influence or change the adopted allocation document.</p> <p><b>1.2</b> is noted. The information in the officer's report reflects the information supplied at the time of the application submission. This does not change the position in respect of the housing allocation. The mitigation of £47k requested by the NHS, which was calculated in November 2016, takes into account the up to date situation.</p> <p><b>2.1</b> Reference to Paragraph 6.18 should read: Paragraph 6.21.</p> <p><b>3.1</b> 7<sup>th</sup> line down should read 120.</p> <p><b>4.1</b> Remove (this comment related to another site).</p> <p><b>4.2</b> Remove.</p> <p><b>5.1</b> Foul sewerage network - Anglia Water confirms that there is spare capacity following the submission of a development impact assessment.</p> <p><b>2. Officer Changes</b></p> <p><u>Paragraph 7.4 Section 106 Agreement</u></p> <p>Whilst the obligation Heads of Terms address the mitigation required in respect of the current outline application, contributions may be required in respect of the subsequent reserved matters application for the following:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On site public open space and management;</li> <li>• waste receptacles;</li> <li>• public transport; and</li> <li>• youth and community facilities.</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p><u>Page 6.52 Condition 38</u></p> <p>The design of the splay has been amended in order to take account of the Local Highway Authority comments.</p>
<p><b>Item 7</b>  <b>16/00515/FUL</b>  <b>289 Ferry</b>  <b>Road,</b>  <b>Hullbridge</b></p>	<p><b>New Information Received from the Essex Badger Protection Group on 21 October 2016</b></p> <p>After the recommendation for this application had been published on the Weekly List, officers received further information from the Essex Badger Protection Group relating to badger activity on the site, summarised below.</p> <p><b>Essex Badger Protection Group</b></p> <p>The group was surprised to notice that there are some documents provided by the applicant, which mention that there is no evidence of badgers foraging in the garden and that it is very likely they are not entering the garden. The Essex Badger Protection Group was called out by the owner of the property in January of this year (2016) because they were complaining about the damage badgers were doing to their garden by digging and foraging. On visiting the site they found that badgers were indeed using the property as a foraging ground. There is in fact a large badger sett in the adjoining Kendal Park Reserve running along the fence line of the garden at 289 Ferry Road. In some places badger entrance holes can be seen leading under the garden itself. We have reason to believe that any development on this site will have an impact on the badger population in the area.</p> <p><b>Officer Comment</b></p> <p>During the process of the application the applicant submitted a bat and badger survey carried out by a consultant ecologist, which was considered and supported by the Council's ecologist. This stated that there was no evidence of badger digging in the garden of the property. The new information received, as summarised above, which was received after the report was published on the Weekly List, conflicts with this report and assumptions and now raises some doubt over the considered effect of the development upon the adjoining badger population and possible impact upon the nearby sett.</p>

	<p>As a result, concerns have been raised by the Council's ecologist over the adequacy of the report and it is not considered that the impact of the development on the badger population on site and upon the subterranean chambers of the sett can be accurately assessed without a further survey being carried out. As such, a further reason for refusal is now recommended for this application:-</p> <p><b>REVISED RECOMMENDATION - additional reason for refusal:-</b></p> <p>3. The application, by way of further and conflicting information received in relation to the badger report submitted, has resulted in cause for concern regarding the adequacy of the badger report supporting the application and the ability of the Local Planning Authority to accurately determine the impact of the development on the nearby badger sett, contrary to Policy DM27 of the Rochford District Council Development Management Plan. If allowed, it is no longer clear to the Local Planning Authority as to whether the proposed development would harm protected species, in this case badgers, and the Badger Sett adjoining the site, and as such the Local Planning Authority is not in a position to adequately consider the harm that might arise from the development proposed upon those protected species.</p>
--	--