

**PLANNING SERVICES COMMITTEE**  
**7<sup>th</sup> MARCH 2002**  
**ADDENDUM**

<p><b>Schedule Item R1</b></p>	<p>On further consideration of this matter and given the length of time that has elapsed since the submission of the application, it is considered that a shorter time period to that specified in the report would be appropriate if permission is granted. This is appropriate given that the building is temporary in nature and to allow re-assessment of the matter in the short, rather than longer term future.</p> <p>A period of three years therefore is suggested, from the date of application, with permission expiring on 10 September 2003. (This date then to be inserted in the condition in the schedule)</p>
<p><b>Schedule Item 2</b></p>	<p>This application has been <b>WITHDRAWN</b></p>
<p><b>Schedule Item 3</b></p>	<p>The <b>Essex Badger Protection Group</b> comments that it has carried out an extensive survey of the site and although there are signs of entry to the site, these have not been used for sometime. The applicant has agreed to incorporate suggestions from the Group to assist the local animal population and therefore have no objections. (Comment – these suggestions are to be incorporated in terms of the boundary treatment and covered by the suggested conditions).</p> <p>In addition to the comments set out in the report the <b>Woodlands and Environmental Specialist</b> confirms that he has found no sign of any protected animal sett or activity. The proposed development would not restrict animal movement or dispersal across the site.</p> <p>The applicants have submitted an initial tree report but this was considered to be inadequate. The Woodlands &amp; Environmental Specialist verbally confirms that an additional report does sufficiently address the issue of the impact of the development on the trees on or adjacent to the site and the following additional condition head is suggested:</p> <p>18 The works on site to be carried out in accordance with a method statement to be submitted and agreed by the LPA.  19 Details of the method of piling foundations to be submitted and agreed by the LPA.</p> <p>Following the discussion details set out in para 3.22 of the report the <b>Highway Authority</b> have confirmed their comments as already set out in the report.</p>

<p><b>Schedule Items 4 and 5</b></p>	<p>Revised drawings have been received which show the retention of the telephone kiosk and re-siting of the ramp to the left of the entrance door (as approached).</p> <p>The applicant claims to have exhausted the options for rear access, describing these as 'not practical or possible' due to changes in level and internal stairs. Concern is also raised regarding the loss of dignity for any disabled visitor who would be directed to the rear of the building.</p> <p><b>County Planner (Historic Conservation)</b> - reports verbally that he is of the opinion that rear access could be secured. He is of the view that the revised proposal for a ramp to the front of the building would ruin the central focus of the door, its surround, and the 'stepped approach'. These are an integral part of the building's importance, and form part of the list description for the building.</p> <p><b>Environment Agency</b> - No comment.</p> <p>One additional <b>neighbour</b> letter has been received. The writer does not object to the proposed works providing that there is no obstruction to the access to the Bank.</p> <p>Comment – Whilst it is anticipated that access to the rear is not without its difficulties, it is considered that further consideration should be given to this matter. Individual dignity needs to be carefully weighed in the balance but it is considered that options to overcome potential problems, such as directing all access to the rear, have not been sufficiently addressed.</p> <p>Given that the scheme has been revised, it is suggested that the recommendation is amended to remove reference to the removal of the telephone kiosk but to retain objection to the proposals on the basis of their harm to the appearance and integrity of the building. The objection to retain the issue in relation to the exploration of alternatives.</p>
<p><b>Schedule Item 6</b></p>	<p>The <b>Highway Authority</b> has no objections but requests that all development is kept clear of the highway at all times.</p> <p>One additional response to neighbouring consultation has been received commenting that the use is considered to be inappropriate as it is adjacent to the Primary School and close to the library. There are already sufficient public house/ restaurant facilities.</p>