

<p>Item 2 11/00520/FUL Land North of the Pavilion, Connaught Road, Rayleigh</p>	<p>Contents</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Comments from Local Residents2. Consultation Response from Essex & Suffolk Water3. Consultation Response from Natural England4. Consultation Response from London Southend Airport5. Consultation Response from the Highways Authority <p>1. Comments from Local Residents</p> <p>Five additional objections have been received (20 Lancaster Road, 12 Kent Way, 1 Gloucester Avenue, 12 Gloucester Avenue and 4 Blackmore Walk), which can be summarised as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Connaught Road is a busy residential street with a high volume of traffic and parked cars already and we do not need extra traffic using the road.○ Vehicles will pose a risk to other users as it is a path through woodland along most of it. I would ask that the proposal includes appropriate safeguards to protect these users and the wildlife in the woods, which are not aware of the highway code.○ RDC is unable or unwilling to properly maintain the existing car park located within 75 metres of this proposed car park.○ The expenditure involved with this proposal cannot be robustly justified during times of reduced budgets and anticipated further reductions in budgets.○ Suggested refurbishment of existing car park.○ Provision of another car park will only provide another area to encourage the anti-social use of vehicles and ASBO to further challenge the work of the current Community Safety Team and the Community Safety Partnership.○ I understand that there have been changes made to the passing bays; this is not an issue.○ Is the BMX track going to be demolished? Lots of children use the track. It would be a disgrace if this was taken away from them; there isn't enough for the children to do as it is!○ I understand that there will only be 25 parking spaces. When these spaces are full up people will begin to park in the surrounding roads, which will impact on spaces for people visiting the houses. <p>Officer comments: These comments repeat the concerns already raised by other residents as part of this application, which were considered in making the recommendation for approval. It should again be highlighted that the proposal does not involve demolition of the BMX track, as stated in 2.32 of the report.</p>
---	--

2. Consultation Response from Essex & Suffolk Water

Comments as follows:-

- We have water mains, which appear to be within the vicinity of the proposed development.
- We cannot accept any buildings or structures within 6m either side of our main, which is protected by an easement and or the Water Industry Act 1991.
- There should be no trees, hedges, shrubs or non-boundary fences erected within 3m on either side of the outside edge of the water main, nor should the level of the surface of the land be altered.

Officer comments: These comments differ slightly to those received previously, which advised that there should be no buildings or structures within 3m either side of their main, rather than 6m, as now advised. This could still be sufficiently addressed by including an informative on a grant of planning permission.

3. Consultation Response from Natural England

Comments as follows:-

- Natural England raises no objection to the proposal being carried out according to the terms and conditions of the application and submitted plans on account of the impact on designated sites.
- The proposed amendments to the original application relate largely to the location of the passing bays and are unlikely to have significantly different impacts on the natural environment than the original proposal.
- Natural England has previously commented in relation to this proposal and made comments to the Authority in our letters dated 26 May 2011 and 8 September 2011. Although the letters raised no objections, the letter dated 8 September did not refer to the requirement for reptile mitigation, and we advise that appropriate conditions should be included in any planning permission.

Officer comments: As both letters referred to were considered within the recommendation, the additional comments made do not affect the recommendation made.

4. Consultation Response from London Southend Airport

Comments as follows:-

- No safeguarding objections

	<p>Officer comments: These comments mimic those previously received for this application.</p> <p>5. Consultation Response from the Highways Authority</p> <p>The Highway Authority has confirmed their response that they have no objection to the application with or without speed humps.</p>
<p>Item 3 11/00560/FUL 1 Burrows Way, Rayleigh</p>	<p>1. Consultation Response from Rayleigh Town Council</p> <p>Comments as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Based on the information provided to this Planning Committee the Town Council has no objection to this application. <p>2. Comments Received from the Applicant/Agent</p> <p>Comments as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ There have been no changes in ground level undertaken. The site has been cleared, but apart from trial pits by the proposed patio and sitting room there have been no further excavations to the rear of the property.○ In respect of the area immediately adjacent to the garages, the soil has eroded over a number of years and this is why the foundations are visible. Furthermore, it is evident that these footings have not been recently exposed.○ The applicant has offered, at his expense and without being compelled, to provide a small retaining wall in his land to protect the already exposed foundations of the garage up the hill.○ This wall isn't shown on the plans and would be outside the current planning process - but would probably be 'PD'. <p>Officer comment: It is considered that an informative could be placed on an approval suggesting that a retaining wall is constructed.</p> <p>3. Conclusion</p> <p>The recommendation remains a RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL with the suggested informative.</p>

<p>Item 4 11/00552/FUL Cock Inn, Hall Road, Rochford</p>	<p>Members will note that this application has been referred from the weekly list.</p> <p>For information this public house was extended by approximately 114 square metres in floor space in the 1930s from its existing size at this time of approximately 121 square metres. It was then extended on several occasions mainly throughout the 1980s by a further approximately 77 square metres. Therefore, since the 1930s the premises has more than doubled in size via extensions by some 157%.</p>
--	---