

<p>Item 4</p> <p>14/00576/OUT</p> <p>Land known as Brocksford Green, Brocksford Avenue, Rayleigh</p>	<p>1. Revised Relevant Planning History</p> <p>The site is contained within the Copford Park Estate for which the following application relates:-</p> <p>RAY/137/52 Erection of 57 pairs of bungalows. Application withdrawn.</p> <p>The layout for this application proposed 6 properties (three pairs of bungalows) on the land that is the subject of this proposal.</p> <p>RAY/62/53 (1) Erection of 55 pairs and 7 detached bungalows. Approved 22 December 1953.</p> <p>The layout for this application left the current application site undeveloped as an amenity space with two pairs of bungalows and a detached bungalow facing towards its eastern side.</p> <p>RAY/62/53 (2) Erection of 56 pairs and 7 detached bungalows. Approved 14 April 1954.</p> <p>This revised layout has again the current application site left undeveloped as an amenity space with Nos. 10 and 12 Copford Avenue and Nos. 34 and 36 Brocksford Avenue orientated towards their respective roads and away from Brocksford Green. The development has been constructed according to this layout with the only minor difference being the designs for Nos. 2-8 Copford Avenue that were permitted on 18 December 1954.</p> <p>The following application was specific to the site:-</p> <p>ROC/86/80 Outline application to erect four bungalows (Wiggins Homes Limited). Refused 26 November 1980 for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The proposal would result in a loss of an attractive area of public open space, which forms an integral part of the adjoining residential area.2. The development of the site would deprive the local residents of a valuable recreation and amenity area within easy walking distance of a large number of dwellings and where there is considered to be a shortage of public open space.
---	--

2. Amendments

On page 4.6, at paragraph 5.18 - insert 'being lost' at end of first sentence.

3. Further Neighbour Representations

Additional objections have been received, which can be summarised in the main by the bullet points in paragraph 4.2 of the report, from the occupants of the following dwellings:-

8 Milne Close, Letchworth
Brocksford Avenue – 35
Copford Avenue – 18
Bull Lane – 142
Trinity Road – 96
The Chase – 14, 54, 74
Oakley Avenue – 36
Whitehouse Chase – 2
Whitehouse Court, Eastwood Road – Flat 7
Eastwood Road – 78
Louise Road - 15

4. Consultation Response from Essex County Council (Highways)

No objection subject to the following conditions:-

1. Prior to commencement of the development, all details regarding the proposed means of vehicular and pedestrian access shall be agreed with Highway Authority.
2. Prior to occupation of the development a 1.5 metre x 1.5 metre pedestrian visibility splay, as measured from and along the highway boundary, shall be provided on both sides of all vehicular accesses. Such visibility splays shall be retained free of any obstruction in perpetuity. These visibility splays must not form part of the vehicular surface of the access.
3. Prior to commencement of the development, the areas within the curtilage of the site for the purpose of loading / unloading / reception and storage of building materials and manoeuvring of all vehicles, including construction traffic, shall be identified clear of the highway, submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
4. Prior to commencement of the development details showing the means to prevent the discharge of surface

	<p>water from the development onto the highway shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be carried out in its entirety prior to the access becoming operational and shall be retained at all times.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">5. No unbound material shall be used in the surface treatment of the vehicular access within 6 metres of the highway boundary.6. Prior to commencement of the proposed development details of a wheel cleaning facility within the site and adjacent to the egress onto the highway shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The wheel cleaning facility shall be provided at the commencement of the development and maintained during the period of construction7. Any new boundary planting shall be planted a minimum of 1 metre back from the highway boundary and any visibility splay.8. The provision of two parking spaces for each dwelling. Each parking space shall have minimum dimensions of 2.9 metres by 5.5 metres.9. Any single garages shall have a minimum internal measurement of 7 metres by 3 metres.10. Any double garages shall have a minimum internal measurement of 7 metres by 5.5 metres.11. Prior to occupation of the proposed development, the developer shall be responsible for the provision and implementation of a Residential Travel Information Pack for sustainable transport, approved by Essex County Council, to include six one day travel vouchers for use with the relevant local public transport operator. One Residential Travel Information Pack shall be provided for each dwelling. <p>5. Consultation Response from Essex County Council (Arboriculturalist)</p> <p>Following my site visit yesterday most of the trees on the northern boundary are poor specimens due to asymmetric crown and multi stem habit caused by past management. The tree central within the site on the northwestern aspect is a good specimen (leyland cypress) with few defects, it is likely to mature into a fine tree, it is approximately 12m in height with a</p>
--	---

	<p>crown spread of 3m, it provides good visual amenity and likely to score B1 following a BS 5837 survey.</p> <p>6. Relevant Development Plan Policies and Proposals</p> <p>For clarification Policy DM3 of the Development Management Submission Document referred to in paragraph 5.17, and the other policies in this document, are emerging policy and yet to be formally adopted.</p> <p>7. Officer Recommendation</p> <p>To remain as approval, as set out in the report, but subject to the following additional heads of conditions as set out above by Essex County Council Highways numbers 6, 7, 9, 10 and 11.</p>
<p>Item 5</p> <p>12/00252/FUL</p> <p>Star Lane Brick Works, Star Lane, Great Wakering</p>	<p>1. ECC Urban Design response</p> <p>The layout is generally acceptable however; there are a number of issues which still need to be resolved, which I have detailed below.</p> <p><i>Elevations</i></p> <p>The side and end elevation treatments to plots 21, 25, 15, 56, 90 and 96 need to be reconsidered due to the prominent corner positions these dwellings have within the proposed layout. In most cases the redesign/positioning of fenestration, including additional windows, would be sufficient.</p> <p>The repetitive use of bridging over at first floor level (for example plots 21, 20, 19, 18, 17, 16 and 15) to allow space for parking begins to dominate the street scene, especially where double width entrances occur. To reduce the amount of void to mass, I would like additional options to be explored including providing timber garage door insets, building set-backs and the use of screening tree planting.</p> <p><i>Street Hierarchy and Public Realm</i></p> <p>The generic treatment of the carriageway and road surfaces could be greatly improved by designing a street hierarchy which suitably defines the type of street and its characteristics. For example, the treatment for raised tables, shared surfaces, parking courts, parking squares and pedestrian areas needs to be carefully designed to reflect the use, quality and function of the space.</p>

Parking and Parking Courts

The design and location of the parking courts has created a number of issues specifically around the distance and access from the parking spaces to dwellings.

In a number of cases, (for example plots 66, 67, 35, 36 and 31) the distance from the parking space to the associated dwelling is impractical and unreasonable. The likelihood is that these spaces will rarely be used and residents will inevitably park on street outside their properties creating a number of access issues and disputes. Where possible I would like the connections between dwelling and parking space to be re-explored, in particular the plots I have listed above.

There are a number of unresolved access issues between the parking courts and the dwellings which also needs to be reconsidered.

Landscaping

Landscaping throughout the proposed development is sporadic with very little consideration for street trees, site boundary and public spaces.

There are opportunities to provide street trees along the main street network especially within the parking squares which would help to define the space and control parking. Tree planting should also be used to help break up the long elevations between plots 65 and 75.

Boundary treatments

There are still a number of unresolved issues around the boundary treatments, especially in areas where existing hedging exists. There is a need to preserve the rural characteristics of the site, including views to the development from the south and east and as such, planting should be used to help screen any new boundary fence line externally and also help screen the fence in key areas within the site.

If the above matters can be resolved then I would raise no objections to the application.

	<p>I would recommend that the following conditions are applied to any consent granted –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Details of all external materials together with samples when requested should be submitted and agreed by the LPA prior to development commencing○ The location and detailed design of all boundary walls, fences, railings, car port doors and gates adjoining/facing the public realm (streets and spaces), shall be submitted to and agreed by the planning authority prior to construction.○ Details of the green screens are to be provided including plant species and spacing. A maintenance plan for the green screening should be submitted and agreed by the LPA. Any plants, within a period of five years of planting date, which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season or sooner, with others of similar size and species as those originally planted, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.○ Details of all ground surface finishes including kerbs, channels, manhole covers and tree surrounds shall be submitted and approved by Local Planning Authority prior to their installation.○ The detailed design of the public realm including all ground surfaces finishes, lighting columns, fences, railings and street furniture both within adoptable highways and unadopted areas on public frontages shall be submitted and approved by Local Planning Authority prior to their installation.○ No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a scheme of landscaping, which shall include indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the site and those to be retained, together with measures for their protection in the course of development and a programme of maintenance. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved scheme shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following commencement of the development (or such other period as may be agreed in writing by the local planning authority) and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from occupation of the development die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting
--	---

season with others of similar size and species unless the local planning authority gives written consent.

2. ECC Highways response

From a highway and transportation perspective the impact of the proposal is acceptable to the Highway Authority subject to the following mitigation and conditions:

All housing developments in Essex which would result in the creation of a new street (more than five dwelling units communally served by a single all-purpose access) will be subject to The Advance Payments Code, Highways Act, 1980.

The Developer will be served with an appropriate Notice within 6 weeks of building regulations approval being granted and prior to the commencement of any development must provide guaranteed deposits which will ensure that the new street is constructed in accordance with acceptable specification sufficient to ensure future maintenance as a public highway.

All the conditions suggested by ECC Highways are as specified in their first consultation response except for the following new/amended conditions (suggested condition 14 within the first consultation response which related to the agreement of cycle parking facilities has also been removed):-

1. Prior to commencement of the development, The proposed bellmouth junction with the existing highway, inclusive of cleared land necessary to provide the visibility splays, shall be constructed up to and including at least road base level and be available for use prior to the commencement of any other development including the delivery of materials. The junction shall be maintained with a clear to ground visibility splay with dimensions of 4.5 metres by 215 metres to the south and 4.5 metres by 198m to the north, as measured from and along the nearside edge of the carriageway. Such vehicular visibility splays shall be provided before the road junction is first used by vehicular traffic and retained free of any obstruction at all times.

14. Prior to occupation of the proposed development, the Developer shall be responsible for the provision and

implementation of a Travel Plan including the initial commitments and amended and supplemented under the provisions of a yearly report to include the results and analysis of the Staff Travel Survey approved by Essex County Council. A £3000 Travel Plan Monitoring fee is payable to ECC prior to the commencement of the development, towards the online travel survey, monitoring and review of the Travel Plan.

15. Prior to occupation of the proposed development, the Developer shall be responsible for the provision and implementation of a Residential Travel Information Pack for sustainable transport, approved by Essex County Council, to include 6 (Six) All Essex Scratch card tickets.

CONTRIBUTIONS

19. A contribution of £3,000 (three thousand pounds) towards the advertising, creation and if successful, the implementation of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to implement waiting restriction on Star Lane along the site frontage.

3. NHS England Response

There is a capacity deficit in the catchment practice and a developer contribution of £28,400 is required to mitigate the 'capital cost' to NHS England for the provision of additional healthcare services arising directly as a result of the development proposal. NHS England, therefore requests that this sum be secured through a planning obligation linked to any grant of planning permission, in the form of a Section 106 Agreement.

4. Great Wakering Parish Council Response

1. The affordable housing element is set at 11 dwellings from a total of 116. About 9.5% against a norm of 30-35%. We appreciate many factors are taken into consideration here. We would like to see an increase in this percentage of approximately 9.5%.
2. We note Essex Highways have said the main access road

through the site will not take the full traffic expectancy of the site. This may mean another access route into and out of the site will in all probability be required. Should this be deemed to be via Great Wakering High Street, given existing traffic conditions we would consider this to be totally unsuitable.

5. Great Wakering Primary School Response

I am the Headteacher of Great Wakering Primary School which would be the catchment area school of any development on the Star Lane site. I have been reading through the planning documents as some of our parents had advised me that these documents reported that our school would have no difficulty in accommodating several new children. This is not accurate.

When I read the Officer's report dated 18.9.14 I was very surprised to read a section that looked like an interview with the school. I would like to make it clear that I have not had any communication from anyone regarding this development and the information in that officers' report is inaccurate. We currently have 407 pupils on roll and this number is already due to rise as a result of another housing development in the area. We have a published admission number of 420 so we do currently have 13 spaces however 9 of these are in year 4 which means that most other year groups are already full.

When I spoke to you on Friday 19th September 2014 you advised me that planning officers would have also taken advice from Essex County Council and that they felt they would not have any problems finding primary school places in the area. On Friday afternoon I spoke to Neil Keylock in the commissioning team for school places and he told me that their team were not even aware that the planning consent for this development had been resubmitted since the initial submission in 2012.

I understand that the planning committee are meeting on 25th September 2014 to discuss this matter again and I would appreciate it if you could pass on to them my comments. Our school would not be in a position to take a large number of additional children without significant investment to redevelop our site. I would also like to pass on my concerns that planning

officers appear to be making decisions based on information that is inaccurate.

6. Further Neighbour Consultation Responses

Two responses received (Vimpex Ltd., Star Lane Industrial Estate and 64 Alexandra Road) which can be summarised as follows:-

- My main concerns are with regard to potential for interruption of telephone and broadband services during construction and the increase in road traffic after construction has ceased.
- Whilst I am sure that no telecommunications disruptions would be planned can we be certain that the businesses operating are to be protected from contractor errors?
- I am also worried about the provision of enough bandwidth for the existing and new properties.
- We already struggle with bandwidth at certain times of the day. Any greater demand after construction of many more residential properties could negatively effect the businesses operating there. Have BT been consulted on the potential issues?
- With respect to the inevitable affect of construction and more housing on the amount of road traffic, can we be sure that provision has been made to improve the junction of Star Lane and Pointers Lane to avoid accidents and bottlenecks forming?
- Any incidents causing holdups or closure to Pointers Lane would negatively affect the businesses operating in the town.
- I have no objection to this development and welcome the reuse of this redundant industrial land.
- I welcome the revised design which includes a pavement along the Star Lane frontage of the development. This will significantly improve the safety of the development for both pedestrians and drivers.
- Regarding the introduction of double yellow lines along Star Lane, it is unclear whether it is being proposed to put these on BOTH sides of Star Lane. It would seem pointless merely to put them only on one side (the east side) as people will just park on the west side of Star Lane. Suggest this be clarified in the relevant planning

documentation.

- Thought needs to be given to the pavement on the west side of Star Lane, especially around the bus stop on that side opposite the Industrial Estate. At present this pavement is very narrow. It would not provide sufficient capacity for an increased level of use introduced by this development and could potentially be dangerous, especially should that side of Star Lane be used as a pick-up / set-down point for secondary students being bussed to and from King Edmunds School in Rochford. Suggest this be clarified in the relevant planning documentation.
- With regard to the development envisaged to the South of Great Wakering High Street under Allocations SER9b, I note that in their letter of 4th September the developers mention the provision of additional access to this other development to / from Great Wakering High Street. It is unclear how far the feasibility and practicality of this suggestion has been modelled or tested based on actual traffic analysis of situation in the High Street. Surely the most practical answer would be to future proof the situation by upgrading the road through the Brickworks development site to support the traffic needs of this other development.
- Such future -proofing of the Brickworks development would also remove the possibility raised in the Report presented to the Planning Committee meeting of 5th June suggesting that an access road be driven through the Local Wildlife Site. This suggestion raises serious concerns about the integrity of the Local Wildlife Site as well as running counter to the conclusion documented in the Allocations Inspection Report i.e. that access to the SER9b development should not be through the wildlife site. It should be strongly resisted.

7. Letter from Agent

The contents of which state as follows:-

'Please take this letter as confirmation that, following Taylor Wimpey taking over this application, we have undertaken all planning and consultation work directly through officers. Taylor Wimpey have not had any direct discussions or contact with ward members. For clarity, you will be aware that a meeting did

	<p>take place some six weeks ago at your office with Councillor Hudson and other planning officers and representatives of the Council.'</p> <p>8. Other Matters</p> <p>Officers have now been advised that the total cost for bins is £168 per unit which includes both flats and housing.</p> <p>The agent has advised that the 3No. three-bedroomed affordable units would be K house types located in the centre of the development.</p> <p>9. Officer Comments</p> <p>Great Wakering Primary School raise concern with regards to some of the statistics relating to the primary school referred to within the officer report. This is particularly in relation to paragraph 4.1 (page 5.10). It should be noted that this section of the report represents the consultation response of Great Wakering Parish Council provided on 1st August 2012. The Council have been in direct contact with the Infrastructure Planning Officer at ECC Education who has provided advice on capacity independently of the consultation response from the Parish Council. The responses received are visible at paragraph 4.13 (pages 5.30 and 5.31) of the officer report. These advise the Council of sufficient provision at Primary School level and officers reached a view on the basis of this professional advice, not on the consultation response from the Parish Council in relation to this particular matter.</p> <p>The positioning of the 3No. three-bedroomed affordable units within the site, occupying K house types, is considered acceptable.</p> <p>A utility report was provided with the application. With regards to BT Open Reach this advised that 'records indicate that joint boxes are present to both the northern and southern ends of the site, off Star Lane and that some Open Reach equipment is present to the northern end of the site. Further investigation will be required prior to commencement of construction activities'. This would be a private matter between the developer and BT and not a reason for refusal of this application or something</p>
--	--

	<p>that could reasonably be controlled by planning condition.</p> <p>In relation to the ECC Urban Design consultation response officer comments are as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ <i>Elevations</i> – two further planning conditions should be attached:-<ol style="list-style-type: none">51. Details to be agreed for side and end elevation treatments to plots 21, 25, 15, 56, 90 and 96.52. Details to be agreed for other design methods to reduce repetitive bridging over at first floor level across the development.○ <i>Street hierarchy & public realm</i> – improvement to surface finishes could be controlled by planning conditions 3, 4 and 6 which required details to be agreed.○ <i>Parking & parking courts</i> – some access ways could be reduced as advised by Essex Police and controlled by planning condition 16. One further planning condition should be attached:<ol style="list-style-type: none">53. Parking layout to be agreed incorporating improvements to distances between dwellings and parking spaces.○ <i>Landscaping</i> – improvements to landscaping could be controlled by planning condition 6. Any trees within the adoptable highway would need to be agreed with ECC Highways and a contribution towards future maintenance would need to be agreed.○ <i>Boundary treatments</i> - improvements to boundary treatment could be controlled by planning condition 21.○ <i>Suggested planning conditions</i> - wording 'a maintenance plan for the green screening should be submitted and agreed by the LPA' to be added to planning condition 21. All other suggested conditions are already included in the officer report. <p>In relation to the ECC Highways response, the revised visibility splays of 4.5 metres by 215 metres to the south and 4.5 metres by 198m to the north were referred to within the report and are considered acceptable and could be controlled via planning condition 41. ECC highways are now suggesting a condition relating to submission of a travel plan. Such a condition does</p>
--	---

appear within the officer report at condition 24. However, they are also suggesting the need for a £3000 contribution towards the online travel survey, monitoring and review of the Travel Plan. This would need to be addressed by legal agreement and a further head of term could be added in relation to this. The applicant has confirmed that they would be prepared to fund this contribution. The Travel Information Pack now includes 6 rather than 10 All Essex Scratch card tickets which is considered acceptable. The £3000 contribution towards a TRO with reference to waiting restrictions along Star Lane is referred to within the report.

In relation to the NHS England response, they are now suggesting a lesser financial contribution based on a further assessment of capacity. The officer report refers to a £33,600 contribution, a contribution of £28,400 will now be sought from NHS, the heads of term can be amended to reflect this.

10. Officer Recommendation

To remain as approval, as set out in the report, but subject to the following revised/additional heads of terms to the legal agreement and additional planning conditions below:-

Heads of terms of Legal Agreement

1.d. £3000 contribution towards the online travel survey, monitoring and review of the Travel Plan.

6. Healthcare - £28,400 mitigation towards capacity deficit.

Heads of Conditions

21. Boundary treatment to be agreed incorporating green screens and walling to all public vistas. A maintenance plan for the green screening should be submitted and agreed by the LPA.

51. Details to be agreed for side and end elevation treatments to plots 21, 25, 15, 56, 90 and 96.

52. Details to be agreed for other design methods to reduce repetitive bridging over at first floor level across the development.

	53. Parking layout to be agreed incorporating improvements to distances between dwellings and parking spaces
<p>Item 6</p> <p>14/00580/FUL</p> <p>58 Sutton Road, Rochford, SS4 1HL</p>	<p>1. Further Neighbour Representations from 54 Sutton Road</p> <p>I have reviewed the actual drawing plans diagram and sizes and these seem to be somewhat confusing. Section 5.2 and 5.6 differ in depth and width quoted. I seems the width and depth are not just approximate but also misleading – the garden in depth seems to include the conifer trees but the length would be from the house bricks to the end at 13 metres and the width in not 13metres but 5 to 6metres wide... confused that this error would look beneficial to the proposed build. Also the plans do not reflect well with regard to No.60's use of his plot and garage, and also no consideration of notes on past objections have been amended to become more acceptable to the neighbours – i.e. window still overlooks No.56 IE – right to Privacy Act. The plot still has a shortfall for the number of car park spaces and still no suitable waste area is reflected. Nor the surface water waste provision or change of dwelling to a business seems to be mentioned.</p>
<p>Item 7</p> <p>14/00600/FUL</p> <p>34 Station Crescent, Rayleigh, SS6 8AU</p>	<p>1. Neighbour Representation from 32 Station Crescent</p> <p>I would request that the guttering and drainage to the front elevation is addressed. Currently the roof guttering drains into my gutter and on to my front lawn when this is excessive it overflows. This is causing a damp problem in one of my rooms. Drainage from number 34 should drain on to their own property. The additional flat roof may increase the amount of water needing to drain away.</p>
<p>Item 8</p> <p>14/00567/ADV</p> <p>Street Record, Bradley Way, Rochford</p>	<p>1. Essex County Council Historic Buildings and Conservation Advice</p> <p>I have no objection to this proposal.</p>