

<p><b>Item 4</b></p> <p>14/00568/FUL</p> <p>Land Between 35 and 43 Victoria Drive Great Wakering</p>	<p><b>Contents:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>1. Revised Section 8 to Application Form Received</b></li><li><b>2. Further Environment Agency Response</b></li><li><b>3. Response from Qinetiq (MOD)</b></li><li><b>4. Officer Comments</b></li></ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>1. Revised Section 8 to Application Form Received</b><p>This now correctly confirms that one of the applicants is a member of staff at Rochford District Council.</p></li><li><b>2. Further Environment Agency Response</b><p>Following the email from Graham Browne, dated 3 October 2014 and our subsequent telephone conversation with you, we confirm our position is as follows:-</p><p>We note that the intention of the above development is to locate all habitable space on the first floor. However, in our previous response we raised the issue that a fairly large area of floor space on the ground floor was intended to be an open plan gym/reception hallway. We would generally consider a gym to be a habitable living space and therefore to be an inappropriate use of the ground floor. In addition, there is the potential for this and the large reception hallway to be used as habitable living space, and there is no way of preventing it being used as that in the future.</p><p>Our previous response clearly sets out the consequences for this dwelling in a flood event. We therefore have no further comments to make on the flood risk to the property. The downstairs floor space could in future be converted, resulting in living space which is below the 1 in 200 year flood level. If you have taken this into account, and you also consider that the downstairs floor space is appropriate for a gym, then we will not pursue our objection.</p><p>We trust this advice is useful.</p></li><li><b>3. Response from Qinetiq (MOD)</b><p>Surface area of glazing is proportionate with all other dwellings within this Vulnerable Building Distance.</p></li></ol>
--	---

	<p>As this is currently unused land the head count will increase, however this figure is not significant enough to raise concern.</p> <p>As this is a house, it is a double storey building, which is proportionate with all other dwellings within this area.</p> <p>If and when planning approval is given I would like to be notified if additional planning applications/amendments are submitted for this land.</p> <p>As discussed prior, I have checked the regulations on the glazing anti-shatter film and this is only applicable for buildings within IBD (Inhabited Building Distance which is the Permit Line, indicated in yellow on the safeguarding map) therefore there is no requirement for this to be affixed to the glass for this building.</p> <p><b>4. Officer Comments</b></p> <p>The additional information received does not alter the recommendation made by officers.</p>
<p><b>Item 5(1)</b>   14/00365/FUL   Makro Self Service Wholesalers Ltd  Rawreth Lane  Rayleigh</p>	<p><b>Letter and Enclosures from Agent in Response to Recommendation</b></p> <p>Since the preparation of the revised recommendation one letter has been received from the applicant's agent with attached e-mail correspondence that has been circulated to Members and which makes the following comments: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ I understand that my client's application was placed back on the Council's "weekly list" following the applicant's request that the proposed condition 1 be amended to remove the limitation of the use to a temporary period. Following this amendment, I understand the application has now been called to the Development Committee for determination.</li> <li>○ The case officer's report does not explain why the applicant requested the condition be amended and I suspect this may have played some part in the application being referred to the full Development Committee. Accordingly, I would be grateful if you could provide Members with a copy of this letter and the enclosed email correspondence between myself and the Case Officer, which should assist their understanding.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ In short, Government guidance on the use of planning conditions states that temporary planning permissions would rarely be appropriate and that all conditions must be necessary and reasonable. In this case, the submitted Noise Assessment concludes that there would be no adverse impact on nearby residents. The conclusions of the Assessment have been fully accepted by the Council's Environmental Health Officer. Given that the Council's officers accept there will be no impact on the amenity of nearby residents, there could be no justification for imposing a condition that limited the life of the permission.</li> <li>○ Having regard to the above, I hope you and the Members of the Development Committee agree that the planning application does not raise any concerns over residential amenity and should be granted planning permission in accordance with the Case Officer's recommendation.</li></ul>
--	---