

<p>Item 1 09/00494/FUL Asda Priory Chase Rayleigh</p>	<p>Head of Environmental Services</p> <p>The Head of Environmental Services reports that if Members are minded to approve the application, the following conditions should be attached to any consent granted:-</p> <p>Each individual non-residential unit will require the following conditions:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) A mechanical extraction system shall be provided (to the kitchen area) in accordance with details submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Such agreed works shall be fully implemented prior to the commencement of any use hereby permitted and shall be maintained in the approved form while the premises are in use for the permitted purpose.2) Prior to the commencement of any development, details of all fume extraction and ventilation equipment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The equipment shall be installed as approved and shall be maintained in the approved form while the premises are in use for the permitted purpose.3) Prior to the commencement of any development, details of any external equipment or openings in the external walls or roofs of the building proposed at any time in connection with the permitted use, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA before the machinery is installed or the opening formed. The equipment shall be installed or the openings formed as approved and shall be maintained in the approved form while the premises are in use for the permitted purpose.4) Before the use commences (the unit envelope) shall be insulated against the egress of internally generated noise, in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and agreed in writing with the LPA. Such agreed works shall be fully implemented prior to the commencement of any use hereby permitted and shall be maintained in the approved form while the premises are in use for the permitted purpose.5) Details of the proposed sound insulation scheme for the development, including predictions of the noise level at the boundary of the application site, in accordance with Planning Policy Guidance PPG24, Planning and Noise, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the LPA. Such agreed works shall be fully implemented prior to the commencement of any use hereby permitted and shall be maintained in the approved form while the premises are in use for the permitted purpose.
---	--

Informative:

In order to prepare the scheme referred to in Condition (insert condition No), the applicant will need to make an assessment of:

- a) the pre-existing background noise levels at the site, taking into account the permitted hours of operation;
 - b) the noise levels likely to be generated from activities at the premises (including the use of any amplifying equipment, music, singing, dancing or other activity);
 - c) any proposed method of ventilation/extraction.
- 6) Prior to any such use commencing details of any proposed facility for the teaching of music or the playing of amplified sound shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the LPA.
 - 7) No amplified speech or music shall be broadcast on the open areas of the site.
 - 8) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, details of the proposed method of storage and disposal of waste shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the LPA. Such agreed works shall be implemented prior to the commencement of any use hereby permitted and shall be maintained in the approved form whilst the premises are in use for the permitted purpose.
 - 9) Prior to any such use commencing, details of any proposed A3, A4 or A5 establishment shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the LPA.

Informatives to be applied:-

- 1) SI 16 (A&B) Control of nuisances
- 2) SI 25 Contaminated Land
- 3) The applicant is advised to contact the Head of Environmental Services at the earliest opportunity to discuss the requirements necessary to meet current food hygiene legislation.

Additionally, there will be a need to condition delivery/collection hours, etc.

It is noted that there is a lack of reference to sustainable materials, renewable energy and other climate change mitigation factors, as per the Asda store application.

One further letter has been received in response to the public notification, which makes the following comments and objections in addition to those set out in the report:-

- Understand that affordable housing intended for this site is actually social housing
- Do not think that social housing in this small development is a feasible concept in terms of trying to reduce anti-social behaviour in this neighbourhood
- The majority of the homes in this area are privately owned or part owned flats
- The few houses in this development that are owned by private landlords are generally speaking an eyesore, poorly maintained, shabby exteriors, overgrown gardens and wheelie bins kept in the front of houses
- The ground works that are supposed to be kept as part of a leasehold agreement such as parking areas are also overgrown and poorly maintained
- If these are the standards that are already set, then an addition of social housing flats will only undermine the values of the privately owned homes
- The likelihood of social tenants causing more anti-social activity in the area is disproportionately high.

One letter has been received from the applicant, which makes the following comments in response to the officer recommendation and consultations received:-

- Whilst pleased with the ultimate recommendation for approval, we feel it appropriate to express that this positive position is reflective of the significant amount of hard work by all those involved. The application has been considered in detail by all parties and positive steps taken to revise the scheme to overcome initial concerns raised by the County Urban Designer who is now entirely satisfied, including the level of amenity space and the ability for future residents to utilise the nearby public open space and leisure facilities.
- The applicant has agreed to provide private balconies, which has increased the cost of the development although the scheme is maintained as 100% affordable and such lengths the applicant has gone to is not covered in the officer report.
- Concern at the accuracy of the report, which states that the 24 units would usually require 42 spaces. It has, however, been established with the County Highway Authority that only 33 spaces would meet the Council's standards. As such, the proposals are considered to meet the Council's standards.
- It is a key consideration that the development will also be served by the adjoining neighbourhood centre car park.
- Despite changes to the scheme, the offer to provide 100% affordable housing is maintained. The applicants are also prepared to provide a significant contribution to early years child care of over £11,000, which will be incorporated within the unilateral undertaking. Express concern that, without having set out the positive benefits and lengths taken, we might potentially risk a situation where the application is not supported by members or deferred.
- The implications for this are significant and very serious. The prospects of Sanctuary obtaining an HCA grant to offer 100% affordable units is largely dependant on obtaining planning consent in October. Further delay may

	<p>undermine the viability of the scheme with control of the site reverting to Asda.</p>
<p>Item 2 09/00511/FUL 80 West Street Rochford</p>	<p>Since the application was submitted the applicant has again met with Ward Councillors and officers and revised the application along the following lines:-</p> <p>The house at the rear (Block C) has been reduced to two bedrooms by providing an en-suite. As now revised this detached house would have satisfactory garden/amenity area for the dwelling. Whilst potentially this room could be later converted to a bedroom, a condition to protect against this would be necessary to any approval given.</p> <p>Condition:</p> <p>The detached house identified as Block C shall be implemented and retained as a two-bedroomed dwelling, as shown on the approved plan Drg. No. 1205 / C / 300 / J.</p> <p>The building proposed to the front of the site and identified as Block A has been amended further to revise the access to a new door on the western side with open porch. This change removes the previous reliance on a false front door to give the appearance of a pair of houses. Subject to a condition ensuring the suitability of the design of the external front railings, officers consider these changes to be acceptable.</p> <p>Condition:</p> <p>Notwithstanding the requirements of condition 9, the applicant shall provide details of the design and appearance, including materials and finish for the railings enclosure to be provided to the front of Block A, as shown on drawing No. 1205 / A / 300 / J. Such details shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of the building identified as Block A. The development shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of Block A in accordance with such details as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>The rear turning area has been increased in size, taking the surplus garden area to the end terraced unit down to the standard of 50 square metres and improving the radius and turning possibilities to this part of the site.</p> <p>The refuse store to the front has been deleted in favour of a refuse collection point to be used temporarily on collection day and for bins to be returned to household gardens at other times. An additional visitor parking space is now proposed to the former bin store area and a further space provided adjacent to the collection point that on collection day can provide overspill bin storage. This revised layout will result in two visitor parking spaces being formed to provide a space for each unit and two visitor spaces.</p>

The County Highway Authority has raised objections at the layout originally provided on the basis that the turning area at the rear would be too restricted and that their copy of the plan was undersized giving inadequate parking spaces.

The County Highway officers have considered the revised layout and still express concern that the siting of the refuse collection point would frustrate the manoeuvring out of the parking space for end of terraced House No. 3. The County Highway officers, however, have considered the latest revised plans which increase the amount of car parking on site with their support. Whilst maintaining their objection regarding manoeuvrability, consider that modification to the layout effectively moving the refuse collection point and parking spaces to the eastern side slightly northwards would remove that failing from the development. In these circumstances District and County officers consider this detail can be the subject of the following conditions to any approval that might be given:-

Condition:

The two parking spaces to the eastern side of the site and refuse collection area shall be re-positioned to the north by one metre to allow vehicles parked in the parking space shown for house No. 3 to reverse and leave the site in forward gear, details of which shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of any of the dwellings hereby approved. The development shall be implemented in accordance with such details as may be agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

Condition:

A 1.5m x 1.5m pedestrian visibility splay shall be provided on the western side of the access with no obstruction above 600mm in height within the area of the splay.

Rochford Parish Council:

Members understand that amendments have been made to the scheme, which appear to comply with regulations. Therefore have no objection to make.

Environment Agency:

Advise that the site falls within floodzone 2 defined as medium probability flood risk. The sequential test evidence now supplied by the Local Planning Authority passes the sequential test such that the agency no longer objects on sequential test grounds.

Recommend the following conditions to ensure the measures detailed in the Flood Risk Assessment are implemented:-

Condition:

Block A and Block C shall be constructed with a minimum finished floor level of 6.00M AOD.

Condition:

Block B shall be constructed with a minimum finished floor level of 5.35m AOD.

Condition:

Before occupation of the development the surface water drainage scheme, including the use of permeable paving and an attenuation tank, shall be implemented in accordance with the drainage strategy (referenced 40482 and dated March 2009). The surface water outfalls draining from the site into the Anglian Water Sewer shall be restricted to a maximum combined total of 8.2 litres per second.

Condition:

Prior to occupation of the development details of the adoption and maintenance of the surface water system shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

One letter has been received in response to the neighbour notification, which makes the following comments and objections:-

- Our property The Milestone Public House and Restaurant is directly beside the proposed development. We have been in business since 1992.
- The three bedroomed house at the rear of the development is too close to our building
- We have a window that will be blocked by the roof of the three bedroomed house.
- We enjoy a late night licence and indoor and outdoor music. The live music is essential to our business.
- We are concerned that new residential buildings built in close proximity will bring into question the granting of existing licences, effectively killing our trade. Therefore seeking guarantees that having contributed to the Rochford business culture and having run the business responsibly for over 17 years, that our licences will be allowed to continue unchanged.
- Would like to see prospective buyers made aware of late night venue on their doorstep.

	<p>REVISED RECOMMENDATION is APPROVAL, subject to the conditions as set out in the report and those set out in the addendum and to the following informative to be attached to any consent.</p> <p>Informative: The applicant is advised to draw to future occupiers' attention that the licensed premises adjoining the site has existing licences to play outside and inside music and provide entertainment. Future occupiers of the development to which this application relates should bear in mind this existing situation before occupying the premises.</p>
<p>Item 4 09/00547/FUL 206 London Road Rayleigh</p>	<p>Rayleigh Town Council :</p> <p>Objects to this application due to insufficient parking, amenities and over development of the site.</p> <p>Essex County Council Urban Design</p> <p>We note the change of architects and slightly different approach to the site. In this respect, this is our first chance to comment on their design. There are some minor and more fundamental issues we have with the scheme, supported by policy presented in the Essex Design Guide (EDG), including some newly arising since the previous application. Issues are discussed as follows:</p> <p>The main flaw is the lack of frontage to London Road which is the main road. The Essex Design Guide is quite clear on the principle of 'Continuity of Frontage'. The priority for street corners is normally frontage to the higher order street, i.e. London Road in this instant. We understand the gable/garage proposed arrangement to London Road was a direct response to maintenance issues relating to the nearby TPO trees. Whilst acknowledging this as an issue, we would normally strongly advise against the proposed solution, which will contribute to a very inward looking development, which is particularly unattractive from the main road and provides no natural surveillance to help self-police London Road. Normally the ideal solution would be to provide proper frontage to London Road set back sufficiently from the trees and designed (foundations etc) to minimise the need for later maintenance to the trees. The only other acceptable solution we can see for this site (though not preferred in terms of urban design) is to exceptionally articulate the gable ends of plots 1 and 14 with windows and detailing so that they are also perceived as active and attractive frontage (gateway buildings) from London Road, with garden wall re-aligned so that this new frontage is not hidden at ground level. Unfortunately, Plot 1 rules this out given that the garage is the nearest building to London Road.</p>

A challenge for this site has always been the dimensions which are narrow and deep. The long straight cul-de-sac approach submitted increases the challenge. Therefore development needs to try extra hard to address the key vista running through the site and articulate the design to give interest and variation to spatial and visual aspects. Sadly, the key vista is weakly terminated by the wall of Plot 7, whereas we previously recommended the need for a building acting as vista-stopper. A possible alternative solution would be to have the TPO'd tree as the suitably attractive vista stopper. However, for this to work sufficiently requires the tree to be in the public realm and not in a private garden surrounded by walls or even railings. Another possible solution would be to provide a focal point associated with the publicly viewed boundary treatment to Plot 7. However, for this to work sufficiently it would need to be of exceptional quality, e.g. include sculptural focal point, and not just a high quality 'wall' as previously proposed.

Looking at the housing types and resulting street-scene, the design of properties is not exceptional and we would question the obsession with semis and detached homes which do not exactly create the 'Continuous Frontage' envisaged in the EDG (pg59). However, the architecture might be just about acceptable with some minor changes and with suitable materials to pull-off sufficient quality. Examples:

1. Gables to deep plan buildings should be orientated toward the street (i.e. plots 12 and 1) on current scheme, to avoid overlarge roof – see UDG pg 81.
2. Plot 6 and 9 – symmetrical affect calls for matching bay windows either side of the front door (not just one) – the current arrangement looks awkward and unbalanced.
3. The 'floating' roofs above in-curtilage car parking look weakly defined and structured (e.g. between plots 11&12) - would suggest need for well expressed supporting columns.
4. Dormers might be reduced to reduce impact and feeling of top-heaviness.

Lack of information on materials prevents comment – if information cannot be obtained these should be conditioned and samples provided for approval. Similarly, any rear garden boundary treatments facing London Road or the development's own public realm, should be robustly designed (e.g. using brick and definitely not wooden fencing as currently implied by the drawings).

Another issue is the proximity of plots 7 and 8 to the approved development to the north of the site. The main concern here is unreasonable shadowing from the two storey building of neighbouring private amenity space (pg 73 EDG) / impact on mature trees, which a different layout could easily avoid. Notwithstanding this, to address privacy issues we would recommend a condition requiring obscured glass for bathroom windows directly overlooking neighbouring gardens, i.e. affecting plots 7 and 8 unless set back substantially more.

In terms of garden provision against the EDG, Plot 7 has inadequate provision and what little there is would be so overshadowed as to be practically un-useable.

In summary, unfortunately the development provides insufficient quality for us to recommend approval even with attached conditions – the lack of relationship to the main road being the key issue which cannot be addressed by conditions. A key stumbling block appears to be the applicant's stubborn desire for exactly 14 semi-detached and detached homes, maximising the number of executive homes whilst avoiding the social housing threshold. Whilst we do not object to this objective, we do object to the resulting compromising of quality standards given the constraints of the site. We would welcome the opportunity for further dialogue with the applicant, perhaps in partnership with the tree officer.

Essex County Highways – No objection subject to the following conditions being attached to any grant of consent:

1. Before development is commenced details of the estate road to be submitted.
2. A footway linking London Road and the development shall be provided with a minimum width of 1.8m.
3. A type 5 Minor Access Way shall be constructed up to and including base course surfacing to ensure that each dwelling prior to occupation has a properly consolidated and surfaced carriageway between the dwelling and the existing highway.
4. The estate road junction on to London Road shall be provided with clear to ground sight splay with dimensions of 2.4m by 120m to the north and 2.4m by 120m to the south.
5. The proposed bell mouth junction with the existing highway inclusive of cleared land necessary to provide sight splays shall be constructed with 7.5m radius kerbs to both sides returned to a width not less than 7.5m.
6. Prior to occupation the development visibility splays with dimensions of 2.4m by 20m as measured from along the nearside edge of the carriageway shall be provided on both sides of the private access.
7. Prior to occupation each vehicular access shall be provided on both sides a 1.5m x 1.5m pedestrian visibility sight splay.
8. No unbound material shall be used in the surface finish of the driveway within 6m on the highway boundary.
9. Vehicular hard standing shall have minimum dimensions of 2.4m x 4.8m.

10. Any garage with its vehicular doors facing the highway shall be sited a minimum of 6m from the highway boundary with minimum internal dimensions of 6m x3m.
11. A size 3 side turning head shall be provided details as shown in Essex Design Guide shall be constructed to allow fire appliances, refuse and all other large vehicles to manoeuvre.
12. Provision and implementation of a Transport Information and Marketing scheme for sustainable transport approved by Essex County Highways, to include vouchers for 12 months free bus travel, for each eligible member of every residential household.
13. Sufficient parking shall be provided on site:

3 bed roomed house – minimum 2 spaces
4 bed roomed house – minimum 3 spaces

Notes:

1. The Applicant should provide for agreement information regarding drainage proposals.
2. Each dwelling shall be served by a system of operational street lighting.
3. Steps should be taken to ensure the developer provides sufficient turning and off loading facilities for delivery vehicles.
4. All works affecting highway should be carried out to satisfaction of Area Highway Manager South.

Anglian Water:

Water Service - The site of this application is outside the area of Anglian Water Resource Zone. Therefore views of Essex and Suffolk Water should be sought.

Foul sewerage – The foul flows from the development can be accommodated within the foul sewerage network system that at present has adequate capacity. If the developer wishes to connect to system they should serve notice under Section 106 of the Water Industry Act 1991.

Surface Water – The applicant has indicated on their application that their method of surface water draining is not a public sewer. This is outside of Anglian Water jurisdiction

Water Treatment – The foul water will be treated at Rayleigh West Sewerage Treatment Works that have capacity for these flows.

Environmental Health :

No adverse comments in respect of this application subject to the standard informative SI16 (noise) and SI25 (contaminated land) being attached to any consent granted.

Essex County Council – Schools :

As the unit mix has not been altered Essex County Councils request for an education contribution remains unchanged at £46489 towards secondary school places.

As always should the number or types of dwellings planned be altered I reserve the right to also amend the sum requested. Should the Council be minded to turn down the application I would be grateful if the lack of secondary school places can be noted as an additional reason for refusal.

Natural England :

The ecological survey identified a small population of Anguis Fragilis (Slow Worms) within the proposed site.

No objection is raised to the development provided the mitigation recommendations suggested in the survey are implemented. Natural England prefer to keep reptiles on site rather than translocation. Key to this development is to ensure sufficient habitat remains support the existing population to allow movement. Due to the current suitability of the site for birds, any demolition/vegetation clearance works must be undertaken outside of the bird nesting season (1st March – 31st August).

Due to current timing of the application it appears 2010 will be the next available opportunity to undertake the slow worm migration.

Pleased that the design and access statement recognises and encompasses opportunities to improve ecological value of the site.

Two further neighbour letters have been received which in the main make the following comments:-

- Live opposite the site and view will change from an expanse of trees and vegetation to multiple dwellings
- This vegetation supported a great deal of wildlife which as a result of the development will lose their habitat
- The access road is proposed on the busy London Road. London Road has a very high volume of traffic
- This development will generate further traffic and increase likelihood of serious road accidents

- Parking is already an issue for residents along this stretch of London Road
- Housing development in this area will lead to more people attempting to park outside our home
- Rayleigh has already been over developed and many of its resources cannot cope with the increase in population size
- This development will have a negative impact on the neighbourhood and Rayleigh as a whole
- Will the hedge be extended as to hide the light which shines directly in to the front of our houses from cars leaving Pope John Hall and also the new proposed development site
- Find this a far more acceptable scheme than that previously proposed.

One letter has been received from the applicant and which makes the following comments in response to the officer recommendation and responses to consultation:-

We note that the Highways Team have now proposed the imposition of a condition (their Number 12), which imposes a highly onerous requirement to underwrite the costs of public transport for all residents of the scheme for 12 months. The specific obligation is to provide vouchers for 12 months free bus travel for each eligible member of every residential household. This amounts to a potential total of over £22,000 for bus passes for the number of persons likely to occupy these 3 and 4 bedroom houses, given the cost of annual bus passes in the Southend Metro Area which includes the site.

We consider this is onerous in this case for the following reasons:-

1. We have been obliged by both your Council and the County Highways Authority to provide a high ratio of parking spaces to dwellings – indeed the same ECC Highways response requires a MINIMUM of 2 spaces per 3 bed house and 3 per 4 bed house, with all garages at least 6m back from the highway, effectively creating a further 1 or 2 parking spaces per dwelling for single or double garages respectively. This very generous parking provision has inevitably reduced the number of houses that can be accommodated on the site to a very low 36 dwellings per hectare, which has the effect of reducing the site profitability, since the extra value of the larger plots with more parking does not match the overall drop in income from the omission of an additional house.
2. People's decisions whether to own a second or third car are strongly influenced by whether they will have anywhere safe and convenient to park them, and in this case both questions can be answered in the affirmative. Thus the provision of 3 or 4 parking spaces per dwelling, as required, will inevitably have the effect of encouraging multiple car ownership by the households in the scheme, since they will have the ease of parking them on their own properties. This is bound to encourage greater use of those cars at the expense of public

transport, irrespective of how cheap the latter is, since the costs of using a car for a journey are a small proportion of the fixed costs of owning the car in the first place.

3. People's decisions on whether to use a bus for a specific journey in place of a car are influenced strongly by whether it is more convenient to not have a car at their destination compared to merely stepping off a bus. For example it may be easier to take the bus to the station or a town centre and alight exactly where desired than to have to park elsewhere and walk the last part of the journey. Conversely a car park at one's destination by comparison to a long walk from and to the nearest bus stop will encourage car use over taking the bus. This remains the same again irrespective of whether the bus journey is free or not, so merely providing free bus passes will not increase bus usage if it is inconvenient by comparison to the car.
4. The comments at paragraphs 2 and 3 above would apply all the more to households with the financial capabilities of buying 3 and 4 bed private housing (the scheme is below the affordable housing threshold), since the fixed costs of running several cars will be a smaller part of their income, and the incentive of free bus passes less significant to them.
5. The reason given by the Highways Team for the proposed condition is "To provide accessibility for all residents to cycling, walking and Public Rights of Way facilities in the area." We contend that free bus passes will not encourage the residents to walk or cycle, which are transport modes that again have their own justifications and attractions, irrespective of whether there is a bus pass incentive.
6. Overall therefore the Highways team is seeking to provide free bus passes to a group of residents who will have chosen their home because of the ample parking provision and who can afford to run several cars. It is simply misguided to believe that the free bus passes will alone change their approach to public transport, even if it is free, and yet this is an onerous additional cost for the developer.

Accordingly we would advise that we will not agree to this additional charge which was not raised by the County Council when we forwarded a draft of the S106 Unilateral Obligation covering other County infrastructure costs, and has been added at the end of a process to address the issues that caused the last application to be refused.

Officer comment:

The current application and layout has arisen from the need to retain the preserved trees particularly to the frontage of the site and to allow these frontage trees to develop unhindered by the development. Whilst the County Urban Designer is critical of the inward looking result,

	<p>District officers consider this to be a satisfactory approach in order to reduce future conflict between residential use and the retention of those trees. In these circumstances District officers cannot in this case support the Urban Designer's objections.</p> <p>The County Highway Authority requests at condition 12 of its recommendation, the provision of a travel information and marketing scheme. Officers understand this to equate to a 12 month free bus travel scheme reliant on the provision of vouchers. The applicant would only pay for those vouchers used over the period.</p> <p>The precise costs are unknown but County officers advise that one voucher per person would equate to some £480. If applied to the fourteen households the maximum cost based on two adults in the house taking advantage of the scheme would be £480 x 2 x 14 = £13,440.</p> <p>County officers advise that current take up is around 25%. The expected cost based on this performance of the scheme to the developer would be approximately £3,360.</p> <p>This matter was not raised previously in the consideration of the earlier application on this site. District officers consider this request to be unreasonable and do not support it's inclusion as part of any approval that might be given.</p>
<p>Item R6 09/00530/COU The Old Bakehouse, Back Lane, Rochford</p>	<p>Further to the two petitions received and noted within the officers report a further three petitions have been received, signed by a total of 138 people. The main objections/comments are as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are already enough Indian restaurants in Rochford • Unwanted smells in Back lane • Increase in cars in Back Lane • Already a congested area • No where to park on site • More English restaurants needed <p>A letter has also been received from the applicant, the details of which are as follows:-</p> <p>I am aware that a number of objections have been received. I would like to clarify the situation in order that I may be of as much assistance as possible.</p> <p>The site is currently a members club serving food and alcohol from 10am until 12am for up to 180 diners in total, 90 in the main area and 90 in the function room. It was formerly a French restaurant.</p> <p>I am therefore not proposing any real change of use other than the technical description. The building is amply provided with 2 large car parks very nearby, less than half a mile walk.</p>

The one area of contention is that I have considered offering a takeaway service. I appreciate peoples' concern regarding Back Lane, its restrictive nature, etc, and parking issues. I want to work with the local community and the Council on this. In order to alleviate any such concerns I am proposing that I will accept a planning condition preventing the business from offering such a service. We will offer an eat out service but only on the basis of delivery, we will not allow collection. I felt hat by offering this condition there is therefore no change at all to the current business activity.

I currently operate an award winning restaurant business in Southend and I wish to bring the same quality and standards to Rochford. This will therefore enhance the choice, quality and overall restaurant offer in Rochford.