

<p><b>Item 6</b>  <b>17/00582/FUL</b></p> <p><b>Land West of Oak Road and North of Hall Road, Rochford</b></p>	<p><b>1. Clarification to Officer's Report</b></p> <p>With reference to paragraph 5.2 to the officer report for clarification in respect of the position with regard to land supply:-</p> <p>The applicant states that the last housing supply position statement (July 2016) is currently being revised. Paragraph 4.27 to the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires an annual target of 250 dwellings to be delivered each year. A South Essex Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) was published in 2016, which set out the Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) for housing in the district of between 312 and 392 homes per year. As noted in the Council's last housing land supply position statement published in 2016, the Planning Practice Guidance is clear that although weight should be given to more up-to-date evidence, caution is advised as this is untested and has not been moderated against relevant constraints. The applicant argues that the last housing position statement (July 2016) concluded that the district cannot identify a five year land supply as at the lower end of the range (i.e. 312 homes per year) a supply of 4.5 years equates to a shortfall of 166 dwellings, dropping to a 3.15 years supply equating to a shortfall of 726 dwellings at the higher end. The uplift proposed will help address this potential shortfall.</p> <p><b>2. Comments from Southend Borough Council School Development manager</b></p> <p>As the buildings are all in Essex the education requests will come from them. My question is what are the size of the new dwellings and are any of the currently approved ones being reduced? Any positive increase of bedroom numbers will increase demand on local education, especially given the current issues over secondary pupil numbers from next September.</p>
<p><b>Item 7(1)</b>  <b>17/00928/COU</b>  <b>11 West Street,</b>  <b>Rochford</b></p>	<p><b>1. Two Additional Neighbour Representations</b></p> <p>31 East Street</p> <p>I wish to object to this application, which does not address the failures identified with the previous very similar application for this site. The new plans, while including some increase in commercial space, still result in a significant reduction of space for this use as, in its previous life as the Kings Head public House, the entire ground floor was used for commercial purposes.</p>

	<p>The sub-division of the remaining commercial space into 3 small units is also extremely inflexible and prevents any opportunity for use by a major commercial tenant or bar/restaurant/café use. In addition it appears that the shop units won't even have direct entrances onto West Street but would be accessed through hallways - this makes them a highly unattractive option for potential tenants.</p> <p>On these grounds I still consider that this application will be of significant detriment to the viability of the Market Square as a commercial space and that the application should therefore be rejected for policy reasons. At a minimum, the application needs to retain the current level of commercial space at ground floor level, with residential use limited to the upper floors.</p> <p>Finally, I agree with many of the other responses regarding the nature of the proposed development. There are already other HMO properties in the immediate vicinity, including those on South Street and East Street. The area has also seen a number of new residential developments (primarily 1/2-bed flats) either completed or in progress, including the old Delivery Office on East Street, as well as projects proposed/in development on North Street and South Street. I have not seen evidence of the need for further accommodation of this type, and agree that it will create further pressures on infrastructure which should not be welcomed, as well as detracting from the atmosphere of the town centre.</p> <p>The Milestone, Union Lane</p> <p>I cannot believe this application is being given any sort of consideration. This is the wrong thing to do for Rochford's Market Square. There are enough new developments going up in and around Rochford. The Market Square should be promoted as a place where people can gather, shop, eat, drink and enjoy Rochford. Converting the landmark building into bedsits is surely madness. We should be following Leigh's example by actively promoting Rochford's daytime/night time economy, and making Rochford a real destination for people to shop/eat/drink. There is a huge development going up in Hall Road, and countless other residences being built in and around Rochford. All of these new residents will be looking for somewhere to go. The Square should be a focal point. A building of bedsits in the town centre sends out entirely the wrong message, and will create a dark void in the middle of town. If bedsits are needed, and people need this type of accommodation, there surely must be more suitable locations.</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------