

<p>Item 2 11/00128/COU 57 South Street Rochford</p>	<p>Essex County Council Historic Buildings and Conservation Advice</p> <p>This is an application for change of use only. Not aware of any physical alterations proposed for the exterior of this building.</p> <p>As the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would not be affected; do not consider there are any conservation issues and have no observations to make on this application.</p>
<p>Item 3 11/00037/FUL Halcyon Caravan Park Pooles Lane Hullbridge</p>	<p>This application has been WITHDRAWN by the applicant. Consequently a decision will not be issued on this application.</p>
<p>Item 4 10/00823/COU Unit 1 68 - 72 West Street Rochford</p>	<p>1. Consultation Response from the Head of Environmental Services</p> <p>No adverse comments to make in respect of this application.</p> <p>2. Response to Neighbour Notification</p> <p>One letter has been received from the following address:-</p> <p>The Milestone Public House, Union Lane</p> <p>And which in the main makes the following comments and objections:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Devaluation of property ○ Noise and disturbance ○ Over-development ○ Parking ○ Policy objection ○ Poor layout / over-development ○ Traffic generation access ○ Object because Rochford has plenty of such establishments ○ The nature of the establishment will change the nature of the area completely. There are already two pubs in extremely close proximity and with the creation of the Sainsbury's Local, this would make the area extremely busy and noisy at night.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ With less of a Police presence in Rochford there would be no control over this area making it an anti-social place to be. ○ The area is not a town centre location of the sort that would support three pubs close together. The new pub would also be in a drinking control area which does not fit with this plan at all. ○ There is also a Psychiatric ward in very close proximity housing people with drink and drug problems. A new pub would create problems in this area. ○ When Sainsbury's building was going through the planning process there were huge points raised about preserving the "Gateway to Rochford" with its medieval view. Allowing a new pub to open in this location would not be in keeping with this argument. ○ There are more flats and houses in this area and a new pub would not make this a desirable area to live in at all devaluing all the properties around it. ○ As an old market town, Rochford has a unique blend of pubs and restaurants. Another pub is not needed and would harm established businesses. ○ Surely there is another use for this building that would add diversity and enhance the area? ○ Would like to know if the person running the pub would be living on the premises or not. If not living in the area the manager would care little for the area and the interest would be pure profit rather than creating a business to enhance the area. <p>2. Letter from Applicants</p> <p>Confirm that the reasons why previous application for A3 / A5 use was refused will not impact upon the proposed use to A4.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) There will be no fume extraction from the building as no food will be cooked on the premises. 2) All waste will be stored and removed from parking bay No. 1 in the car park. 3) All vehicle deliveries will be made via the rear car park. 4) There will be no structural alterations to the building as we respect the Conservation Area but we will be taking down all signage, repairing the windows and generally tidying up.
--	--

<p>Item 5 10/00647/OUT York Bungalow, Little Wakering Hall Lane, Great Wakering</p>	<p>Contents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revised Plans Received 2. Additional Consultation Response from ECC Highways 3. Officer Comments 4. Comments from Agent Received 5. Conclusion <p>1. Revised Plans Received Following publication of the recommendation on the weekly list the applicant has submitted revised plans that make the following changes to the proposal:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reduction in overall width of the proposed terraced block towards the eastern boundary of the site by 1.5 metres, achieved by a reduction in width of the end of terrace property to the north by 1.5 metres. This has resulted in an increase in size of the turning area provided to the parking bays in the north-east corner of the site and has resulted in a reduction in the garden area for the reduced width property by 18 square metres. ○ The property that has reduced in size has also changed from a 4-bed property to a 3-bed property. ○ Provision of 2 bin store areas within the site. ○ Relocation of the proposed cycle store to the north-east corner of the site. <p>2. Additional Consultation Response from ECC Highways The concerns regarding the parking area in the north east corner of the site (Points 3 and 4 of my recommendation dated 28 March 2011) have been addressed. The parking area is acceptable. The other points contained in my recommendation will need to be addressed.</p> <p>3. Officer Comments As a consequence of the revisions, the proposal is now for: '3 x 2-bed, 7 x 3-bed and 3 x 4-bed dwellings' and the description of development will be amended accordingly. The increase in number of 3-bed properties and the corresponding decrease in 4-bed properties is not objectionable.</p>
---	---

The revisions to the application do not overcome the recommended reason for refusal no. 1 as the amenity space provided to 4 of the 7 x 3-bed dwellings and the 3 x 4-bed dwellings now proposed would still not meet the policy requirement for a minimum depth of 2.5 x the width of the dwelling to a minimum of 50 square metres with respect to the 3 bed properties or for 100 square metres with respect to the 4 bed properties.

The revisions to the application do not overcome the recommended reason for refusal no. 2 as no visitor parking is proposed.

The revisions to the application would, however, overcome the recommended reason for refusal no. 3 as the area available for the manoeuvring of vehicles has increased in the north-east corner of the site such that the spaces would be useable.

Although 2 bin store areas within the site have been proposed, it is not considered that the provision of communal bin stores for the houses proposed is acceptable. Each of the dwellings proposed would have to accommodate provision for the on-site storage of the 3 waste bins that would be issued by the Council. Officers still consider, however, that the required space to accommodate bins at each proposed dwelling could be dealt with at the Reserved Matters stage, as detailed in the published recommendation.

4. Comments from Agent Received

The applicant's agent has commented on the relevance of the Ministerial Statement issued by the Government in March 2011 to the determination of the application.

This statement states that Local Planning Authorities should support enterprise, economic and other forms of sustainable development whilst having regard to all material planning considerations, considering fully:-

- o the importance of national planning policies aimed at fostering economic growth and employment, given the need to ensure a return to robust growth after the recent recession ensuring that they give appropriate weight to the need to support economic recovery, that applications that secure sustainable growth are treated favourably (consistent with policy in PPS4), and that clear reasons are given for their decisions.

- o the range of likely economic, environmental and social benefits of proposals, including long term or indirect benefits such as increased consumer choice, more viable communities and more robust local economies (which may, where relevant, include matters such as job creation and business productivity).

Officers remain of the view that the development proposed is objectionable for the reasons stated when all material considerations relevant to the application are considered, which include having regard to the content of the Ministerial Statement and the need to support the economic recovery.

The applicant's agent has also put the Council on notice that an application for a full award of costs would be made if the application were refused planning permission on the basis of a lack of sufficient parking. The applicant's reasoning for this is the opinion that the Council's adopted parking standards are contrary to national planning policy advice contained within Planning Policy Guidance 13, as they give minimum rather than maximum criteria.

Officers do not take the agent's view that the Council's adopted parking standard conflicts with national planning policy advice contained within Planning Policy Guidance Note 13: Transport PPG 13 as this advice was amended in January 2011 to remove reference to Local Authorities being advised to set maximum parking standards. The Council's minimum parking standards are not considered to be contradictory to PPG13.

The requirement for visitor parking provision remains as stated in the published recommendation, namely 4 spaces.

5. Conclusion

The officer recommendation is revised following receipt of the revised plans and is now a **RECOMMENDATION FOR REFUSAL** for the following two reasons only:-

1. The proposal, by way of the substantial under-provision of private amenity space throughout the site, would not meet the Council's minimum garden space provisions, as detailed in Supplementary Planning Document 2: Housing Design and would result in a layout detrimental to the residential amenity of future occupiers and contrary to the aims of HP6 of the Replacement Local Plan. The inability of the site to accommodate the required amenity space is indicative of a proposal that amounts to an over-development of the site.

	<p>2. The proposal would result in inadequate parking provision for the number of dwellings proposed by virtue of the lack of visitor parking provision, which would not meet the Council's parking standard requirements as detailed in Parking Standards Design and Good Practice Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted December 2010) which is likely to give rise to parking on the highway outside the site to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety. The inability of the site to accommodate the required parking provision is indicative of a proposal that amounts to an over-development of the site.</p>
<p>Item 6 11/00085/COU 239-241 Eastwood Road, Rayleigh</p>	<p>Contents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Correction to Published Report 2. Additional Neighbour Consultation Responses 3. Additional Comments Submitted by Agent 4. Conclusion <p>1. Correction to Published Report</p> <p>At paragraph 6.5 of the published report the previous application 10/00748/FUL is referred to as having been recommended for refusal for 1 reason but withdrawn by the applicant before a decision was issued.</p> <p>The planning history shows that the previous application 10/00748/FUL was not withdrawn but was determined. This application was refused planning permission for the reason stated at paragraph 6.5 of the published report.</p> <p>At paragraph 6.20 of the published report reference is made to a report submitted by the applicant that addresses the issue of need for the retail store. The issue of assessment of need was contained within the report submitted with the previous application (10/00748/COU) rather than within the report submitted with the current application. The applicant did not repeat the need assessment in the report submitted with the current application as this issue did not form a reason for refusal of the previous application.</p> <p>2. Additional Neighbour Consultation Responses</p> <p>4 No. additional responses received from:- 1 Poplars Road, Rayleigh, 32 Tudor Way, Eastwood</p> <p>Summary of comments made:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A further retail unit at the site is not a good plan.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Traffic is an existing problem with speed limits not adhered to and the road being too narrow for the amount of traffic using it. ○ We do not need more vehicles crossing the footpath to enter and exit another shop. It is an unpleasant area in which to walk already with traffic so close to the footpath and travelling at speed. Concern that children use the adjacent crossing. ○ The nearby retail store serves the community well. ○ Tesco should not be built in this residential area. <p>3. Additional Comments Submitted by Agent</p> <p>A summary of the comments raised in a letter submitted by the applicant's agent, which he asks be shared with Members are provided below:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Application 10/00748/COU was not refused on retail grounds. The Council has accepted the principle of a retail unit of the size proposed. ○ Only 1 letter of objection was received in relation to application 10/00748/COU, which was for the same sized retail unit. ○ The 'end-user' or occupier is not a material consideration and competition is not a land use planning matter. The planning application must be determined on the merits of the application proposal only. ○ No objection has been received from the Highway Authority who is best placed to determine the likely level of impact upon the highway arising from a particular proposal. Discussions with the Highway Authority in relation to both the current and refused applications have helped form a proposal that has been deemed acceptable in terms of parking provision and layout, deliveries and any subsequent safety or amenity issue that may arise as a result. ○ In determining 10/00748/FUL, no reason for refusal was imposed relating to impact on residential amenity or with regard to the proposed opening hours. The proposal in terms of land use and quantum of floor space remains unchanged and the applicant considers that the associated impact on residential amenity also remains unchanged. ○ No heating or air-conditioning ducting systems are proposed as part of the current application. It would be premature to refuse this application upon matters that do not form part of the application. ○ The application seeks 2 ventilation extract ducts to the rear, which have been considered in the recommendation. ○ No extension of the existing building is proposed. The proposal is for change of use only.
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The external alterations to the building were considered acceptable in 10/00748/COU and are proposed to be the same and therefore wholly acceptable again.○ Members are encouraged to grant planning permission as there are no supportable planning reasons to override the recommendation for approval. <p>4. Conclusion The officer recommendation has not changed and remains a RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL, as detailed on the published officer recommendation.</p>
--	--