

<p>Item R1 09/00334/FUL Land between 48 and 52 Waxwell Road, Hullbridge</p>	<p>1 Additional Consultation Response</p> <p>Hullbridge Parish Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Object as it was considered this is over-development and out of character with the area, which is mainly semi-detached houses, chalets and bungalows. The proposed building is of a significantly larger size than those around it.- Parking, which is already a problem, will be made worse. The road is a very busy residential street used as a cut through to avoid unadopted roads in the area; the parking problems will become worse and make the busy road more dangerous. <p>Additional information has been received from the applicant:-</p> <p><i>Ecological Assessment</i></p> <p>An ecological assessment has been carried out at the site. The submitted report states that protected slow worms could be present on the site and that it is unlikely that any other protected species would be present.</p> <p>There was no evidence of badgers at the site and it is considered likely that runs found on the site were made by foxes or cats.</p> <p>The site contains suitable habitat for nesting birds but no protected bird species.</p> <p>As the site might possibly contain a population of protected slow worms the report recommends that before any development commences a survey for reptiles, including slow worms, is carried out. If reptiles are found, the report recommends that animals are captured and translocated to a suitable receptor site.</p> <p>The report also recommends that any removal of vegetation should be carried out outside the bird nesting season to avoid disturbance to nesting birds. In addition, vegetation should be cut by hand to avoid disturbance of any reptiles.</p> <p>The report also recommends that if any mature/semi-mature trees are to be retained these should be protected during development by appropriate fencing.</p> <p>Woodlands Section Ecological Responses: Advises that, in the light of the information now available, permission should be refused because from an ecological point of view further survey work is now suggested to establish the presence of slow worms.</p>
---	--

This survey should be carried out before the Council can allow development, as advised in PPS9 and Circular 05/06.

Car Parking Provision

The applicant has submitted supplementary information following the completion of the officer's report relating to the car parking provision at the site.

It is the applicant's opinion that the application site should be considered a main urban area/good access to public transport and therefore requires a maximum of 1 car parking space per dwelling according to Policy TP8 of the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan 2006.

The applicant also considers that a precedent has been set as other multiple unit developments have been approved in Hullbridge with 1 car parking space per unit and note that Essex County Council Highways Authority does not object to the proposed car parking provision.

Officer's Comment

In respect of the four application sites that the applicant has drawn attention to the following comments have been made:

No. 289 Ferry Road (07/00085/FUL) – 12 x 2-bed and 2 x 1-bed flats, 14 on-site car parking spaces provided. The two 1-bed flats do not have an additional room that could be used as a second bedroom. Site very close to a public car park, which could accommodate additional residents' car parking and visitor car parking. Double yellow lines on highway to front of site prohibit on-street parking arising from the development.

No. 283 Ferry Road (06/00672/FUL) – 8 x 1-bed flats, 8 on-site car parking spaces provided. The 8 x 1-bed flats do not have an additional room that could be used as a second bedroom. Site very close to a public car park, which could accommodate additional residents' car parking and visitor car parking. Double yellow lines on highway to front of site prohibit on-street parking arising from the development.

No. 234 Ferry Road (03/01126/FUL) – 5 x 2-bed flats, 5 on-site car parking spaces provided. Site very close to a public car park, which could accommodate additional residents' car parking and visitor car parking. Double yellow lines on highway to front of site prohibit on-street parking arising from the development.

No. 236 Ferry Road (02/00905/FUL) – 5 x 2-bed flats, 5 on-site car parking spaces provided.

Site very close to a public car park, which could accommodate additional residents' car parking and visitor car parking. Double yellow lines on highway to front of site prohibit on-street parking arising from the development.

All four examples above are of sites in Hullbridge where flats have been approved with a car parking provision of 1 space per flat. However, these sites are all located very close to a large public car park that can accommodate any overflow parking from residents of the individual sites or their visitors so that any additional vehicles would not give rise to on-street parking. In addition, all four examples referred to are on Ferry Road where double yellow lines prohibit on-street parking. The application site on Waxwell Road does not benefit from a large public car park close to the site and Waxwell Road is not subject to any on-street parking restriction. Any additional car parking arising from the application site at Waxwell Road, by residents of the site or their visitors, is therefore likely to be on-street.

In addition, as the proposed on-site parking provision at the application site is to the front of the site the ability to park on-street in front of the application site is reduced as this would cause the access to the on-site parking to be blocked. On-street parking arising is therefore likely to be displaced to other areas of Waxwell Road.

It is understood that no objection has been made to the proposed provision of car parking at this site on the basis that the County Council's car parking standards are under review. It is understood that the car parking provision from the Highways Authority is likely to be increased, rather than reduced. In any case, whilst advice is taken from the Highways Authority it is for the Local Planning Authority to determine the application, taking into consideration planning policy and any other material considerations.

The REVISED RECOMMENDATION is REFUSAL on the basis of the recommendation as set out in the report but to include a revised reason 2:-

2. The information submitted in support of the application and as contained in the Extended Phase 1 Survey carried out by Ecological Sustainability Limited and dated September 2009 identifies suitable habitat for slow worms on the site. No survey information has been provided to establish the presence of the species and the assessment of the development upon any resident populations that might be found. As such the Local Planning Authority cannot be satisfied that the proposed development would not have any adverse impact on protected species.

<p>Item 2 09/00382/FUL 36 High Road Rayleigh</p>	<p>Additional Second Round Consultation Response</p> <p>Rayleigh Town Council: Objection to the application, as previously stated.</p> <p>Essex County Council Environment, Sustainability and Highways: No objection.</p> <p><i>Officer comment: The Highway Authority does not maintain its objection and is now satisfied with regard to safety, accessibility, efficiency/capacity, road hierarchy and parking standards of the revised proposal. In light of the withdrawal of Highway objections it is recommended that the reason four for refusal is deleted. The revised recommendation is therefore that application is refused for reasons 1, 2 and 3, as set out in the Committee Report.</i></p> <p>Woodlands Section: The Arboricultural Officer advises that his comments remain unchanged, i.e., that further arboricultural information is required before the development is permitted.</p> <p>13 additional letters of objection have been received from residents and 1 letter of objection signed from 'Friends of Rayleigh House'.</p> <p>Summary of main points includes:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Superficial changes do not satisfy previous reasons for refusal○ Presence of protected bats in attic○ Further flat development should be restricted to outskirts of Rayleigh○ Current infrastructure unable to cope with more development○ Original objections to scheme remain○ Rayleigh House should be protected to prevent demolition○ Rayleigh House is a very attractive Victorian building that sits well within its surroundings○ Loss of protected trees○ Out of scale and character with the surrounding dwellings○ Proposed access from Ridgeway too narrow○ Inadequate width of access drive and turning space for all types of vehicles entering site, including refuse carts.○ Proposed access will lead to cars reversing onto Ridgeway○ Inadequate parking provision on site for number of flats proposed○ Applicant erroneously labelled a number of protected trees as fruit trees○ Ridgeway already a rat run○ Number of dwellings proposed is over-development○ Waste removal process questioned○ Sight splays for access inadequate
--	---

- Rayleigh House should be listed and refurbished
- New parking arrangement will cause major disturbance to neighbours
- What is to prevent replacement of obscure glazing with clear glass
- Overlooking to Ridgeway and High Road
- Invasion of privacy
- Width of proposed access does not meet legislation
- Poor/restricted visibility of access drive would result in potential for accidents
- Concern regarding environmental impact of demolition and new construction
- Thorough investigation of arboricultural issues required
- Three storey building will reduce light to adjacent property
- Increased risk to pedestrians as already a number of blind driveways in Ridgeway

2 letters of objection have been received from Rayleigh Town Councillors. Summary of main points includes:-

- Excessive flat and housing developments in Rayleigh
- Presence of protected bats in attic
- Infrastructure and road not able to cope with more development and increased numbers of cars

- Too many old buildings already demolished and lot of Rayleigh's character thereby lost
 - Over-development
 - Not in keeping with other homes in the surrounding area.

In addition three additional letters have been received from the Member of Parliament for Rayleigh:-

The first encloses a copy of correspondence from a constituent expressing, amongst other things, that Rayleigh House is largely unaltered and in a reasonable state of repair. That demolition is motivated by profit and consideration should be given to the existing numbers of flats in the town.

The second letter encloses copies of letters from the Victorian Society and Save Britain's Heritage with regard to concerns about the future of Rayleigh House and its proposed demolition. These letters are the same as those sent directly to the LPA from these organisations and have been previously reported.

The third letter encloses a copy of a letter from the Chairman of Rayleigh Through the Looking Glass.

	<p>Amongst other things he expresses concern at the loss of one of the few remaining family homes of note in Rayleigh and the view that the only reason the developer wants to demolish the property is that the current structure does not allow re-arrangement of the internal layout. A view is also given that, whilst not every building can be of listed building status, Rayleigh House is an integral part of Rayleigh's architectural heritage and should not be allowed to disappear.</p> <p>The REVISED RECOMMENDATION is therefore that the application is REFUSED for reasons 1, 2 and 3, as set out in the Committee Report, with reason 4 deleted.</p>
<p>Item R3 09/00407/FUL Stambridge Football Club</p>	<p>The following comments have been submitted which suggest inaccuracies within the officer's report.-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location - there is no such place as Stambridge United Football Club. The land referred to is trust land left to the residents of Stambridge for general recreational use. <p><i>Officer Comment: Whilst this is true in the legal sense concerning the entitlements regarding the land, in planning terms it is essential that the football club location is identified in the officer report because this is fundamental to the consideration of the team shelters ancillary to football games.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The report states the site is remote from the residential envelope of Stambridge and Great Stambridge. This makes no sense since the parish of Stambridge comprises of Great Stambridge and Little Stambridge. <p><i>Officer Comment: It is important to locate the application in terms of the built up area of the village, which is residentially allocated. The extent of the built up area is commonly termed the 'envelope'. By this the officer is referring to the location of the housing and other main buildings in Stambridge village.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The comment that the site is currently in operation as a playing pitch for Stambridge United FC is misleading. The club has a lease to use the pitch only for matches and training. The rest of the site is retained at all times for Stambridge residents and the pitch itself is also used by residents when a match or training is not taking place. <p><i>Officer Comment: It is the most relevant fact that the site is in use as a playing pitch. The site is in use as a playing pitch, used by Stambridge United FC. This statement is fundamental to the use of the site in relation to the planning application.</i></p>

The terms of the lease are not known to the planning department nor are they a material consideration in the determination of this application.

- The report states that the Memorial Hall is located in the north eastern corner of the site. This building is the football clubhouse. The hall is located to the north of the site.

Officer comment: It is excepted that the more recent clubhouse building is more specifically related in the north eastern corner whereas the Memorial Hall neighbours this and would be better described as located on the northern boundary. The description of the building was taken from the Council's Uniform system, which describes this building as a Memorial Hall. No further information was provided within the application with regard to the use of this building.

- The report states the playing pitch shares access with the Memorial Hall. This implies users have equal rights. It should state users of the club have right of access.

Officer Comment: There is only one access to the site and as such traffic associated with the football club has no alternative but to share/use this access with any other uses/users of the site. Again the legality and divide in entitlements on the site has little or no relevance to the impact of the small shelters in Green Belt terms.

- There is not plentiful off street parking. The club's parking is limited to behind the Memorial Hall. The rest of the parking is for the exclusive use of users of the hall and ground.

Officer Comment: There is no demarcation on the site to distinguish differing parking priorities. The shelters at issue would accommodate existing team members and would not give rise to additional parking need. The site as a whole provides plentiful off street parking that does appear to be available rightly or wrongly to teams and spectators alike. The application does not highlight that only specific parking spaces are designated for the football club use. As such, on site observations show adequate parking available within the site for the football club use.

- The report refers to the white painted metal barriers surrounding the pitch. It implies these are permanent, which they are not. The club's lease requires them to be removed when the pitch is not in use.

Officer Comment: The site analysis determined the presence of white painted barriers surrounding the pitch.

	<p><i>These barriers clearly have some permanence where the grass has been cut around them, indicating a degree of permanence, perhaps for the duration of the playing season. The reference to the barriers is important in considering the visual impact of the shelters at issue in this application. The planning department are not aware of the terms of the lease and as such this statement refers only to the on site observations.</i></p>
<p>Item R4 09/00458/FUL Willow Pond Farm Lower Road Hockley</p>	<p>Two letters have been received from contractors who were employed to undertake and supervise the foundation construction and which in the main make the following comments in support of the application:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write, at the request of the applicant, to confirm the events that took place at the site. • The brief history of the site is that it had been used as a dump and with several persons living in separate temporary dwellings laid over the entire site. • Applicant obtained planning permission and commenced works on implementing the consent. • Work in the local area as a groundwork contractor forming thousands of foundations over the years. Were asked by the applicant to form foundations for his new home in August 2007. • In virtually every position we went to pull a foundation trench we found what seemed to be the remnants of extremely large bonfires and not something that would be considered normal ground conditions. • It was found that the entire area had previously been used as a dump and several metres deep at the lower level burnt out remains of caravans and contents were found. • The structural engineers were called to advise further and who advised that the strip footing could no longer be used and that the burnt materials and rubbish must be totally removed. • The removal works revealed chassis and wheel axles identical to the mobile home then on site and it was then clear the site contained two burnt mobile homes and their contents. • This left a huge hole and it was decided by all parties that the best option would be to construct a cellar below the building involving the construction of a large raft / slab located at the reduced level. • The applicant proposed a fully reinforced slab with reinforced concrete walls to ground level, all inspected and approved by N.H.B.C. in accordance with building regulations. • It would not have been sensible to get a large piling rig in, as to enable the rig to get in, the entire area would have to be filled with crushed concrete to take the weight of the machine. • The applicant's thoughts were also on the welfare of the environment and as paddocks for horses so all debris was removed.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider that the decision of the Council planners is totally unfair, given the situation the applicant was faced with. • The applicant has improved the site no end and the lake constructed has attracted lots of wildlife. The site and surrounding area have been greatly improved by the cleansing works and landscaping. • The applicant's judgment has kept various trades in employment in these uncertain times and personally appraise him for that. • In my view this development has no more impact on the environment than that of the dwelling, which was first proposed. • Recently viewed the site and feel great sadness that the progression of these good works have now halted.
<p>Item R5 09/00477/FUL 16 Eastern Road Rayleigh</p>	<p>Four additional letters of objection received of which the main points are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact on the character of the area. • Will affect the outlook of at least nine properties. • Will cause on street parking. • Access on blind corner. • The effect that building would have on the movement of local wildlife and on local habitats. • There is also the question of egress from the area. In the Great Wheatley area there are in excess of 250 homes and they all have to come and go through Great Wheatley Road. • The proposals are totally inappropriate and blatant backland development.
<p>ItemR6 09/00282/FUL Land North Of Sunnyview Old London Road Rawreth</p>	<p>Two letters have been received which in the main make the following comments in support of the application:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On behalf of Armada Sports Football Club write with regard to impending application to provide water facilities at the site. • Armada Sports has a pitch booking for the forthcoming football season at the site but this is dependant on planning permission being granted for the connection of a water supply to the site. • The Basildon and District Sunday Football league, to which we are affiliated, rules state that any facility used by the teams who affiliate to their league must have changing rooms, toilet facilities and running water. • Changing rooms have been installed on site, but as yet there is no fed water supply and we are currently unable to comply with league rules. • If permission is not granted the club will be forced to look for an alternative site for this team to play, which may be difficult so close to the start of the new 2009/2010 season.

- | | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• writing to ask the Committee to look sympathetically at the request to grant planning permission to connect water to the site.• Write as Chairman of the Sceptre Sunday Football league (The largest Sunday Football league in Essex) to urge the Committee to give favourable consideration to the provision of changing facilities at the above venue.• Several of our clubs have pitches at Rawreth and we as a league try to improve our own league and provide football for over 2,000 people.• Also like to see improvements in the facilities accorded to our clubs.• The management at Sporting Events Ltd are happy to do their best to provide good quality facilities, but would also try to make sure those facilities blend in with surroundings.• Sure would be agreeable to some form of planting to detract from the starkness of the buildings even though the buildings would be painted green to blend in with surroundings.• Hope the Committee can accept the thanks of our league clubs and players if such approval is granted. |
|--|--|