

<p>Item 6(2)</p> <p>15/00241/FUL</p> <p>81 High Street Rayleigh SS6 7EJ</p> <p>Change Of Use Of Pavement To Provide Outside Seating Areas In Connection With Ground Floor Of No. 81</p>	<p>Contents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Neighbour Comments Received2. Inaccuracy Identified3. Officer Comments and Recommendation <p>1. Neighbour Comments Received</p> <p>Comments have been received from Rudds at first floor of No. 81, which can be summarised as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ We have concerns because our offices are immediately above Greggs and we would like to know what terms and conditions the Council is proposing to impose if the planning application is granted, particularly bearing in mind this is a very busy section of public footpath, particularly on market days.○ We consider the use of part of the pavement as a seating area will increase the noise level, give rise to litter and, more importantly, if customers sitting outside of Greggs premises are allowed to smoke this may impact upon the health and well being of our members of staff, particularly in the summer months when we have our windows open.○ In our view, the seating area, particularly as it will be screened off from the pavement, is an extension of Greggs premises themselves and, as such, smoking should not be allowed.○ We are not making a formal objection to the planning application because we are pragmatic enough to realise that other premises in Rayleigh High Street have seating outside their establishments and this is probably a natural progression of their business and the way in which Rayleigh High Street is developing.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Our concern is to ensure the Council imposes reasonable and realistic conditions so that any disruption or disturbance to other premises and other users of the footway in question in the close vicinity of Greggs is kept to a minimum. <p>Comments have also been received from CMIS, 83 High Street, which can be summarised as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The proposal will create a considerable noise problem for offices above the premises. The moving of their metal furniture over the pavement and clanking of the barriers is likely to disturb us in the offices above. As will the noises of the chatter - no one speaks quietly or with consideration of others.○ Much rubbish will be created, which will make the area look scruffy and may even be off putting to our potential clients.○ Additional problem of the pigeons, which we have gone to considerable effort to get rid of. Food waste left by customers and that deliberately thrown down for the pigeons will attract even more pigeons and other vermin.○ Smoke will drift into our open windows, which we will find unacceptable. <p>2. Inaccuracy Identified</p> <p>The Council has been alerted to the fact that the inaccurate ward has been quoted on this application. The correct ward is Wheatley, not Whitehouse.</p> <p>3. Officer Comments and Recommendation</p> <p>Whilst the concern with regard to the potential impact on the first floor premises is noted, a similar development could take place here without the need for planning permission with very similar impacts. On this basis, it is not considered that this alters the officer recommendation, which remains that of approval.</p>
--	---

	<p>It is not reasonable to impose conditions preventing smoking from occurring outside or requiring rubbish to be collected; there is nothing to suggest that the operator would not collect and dispose of any rubbish appropriately.</p>
<p>Item 6(3)</p> <p>15/00284/COU</p> <p>12A Purdeys Way Rochford SS4 1NE</p> <p>Proposed Change of Use From B8 (Storage/Distribution) to D2 (Assembly and Leisure)</p>	<p>Contents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Neighbour Comments Received 2. Inaccuracy Identified 3. Officer Comments and Recommendation <p>1. Neighbour Comments Received</p> <p>Further comments have been received from Rollacity:-</p> <p>With reference to the above change of use application I would like to raise further concerns over the facts described within the officer's report.</p> <p>1) The report states: At present there are 34 parking spaces in the car park at the front of the two units with 17 spaces formally allocated to each of the two units.</p> <p>This fact is incorrect. The site currently has 40 car parking spaces, 23 of which are formally allocated to Rollacity within the lease and as per approved planning application.</p> <p>2) The report states: Officers accept that the rear yard would not be suitable for visitor parking, which would then leave 17 spaces for parking at the front of the building. This provision is the same as available for Rollacity and it is considered unreasonable to require a new leisure operation, occupying a smaller unit, to provide a higher level of parking spaces than that of the existing leisure use.</p> <p>These facts are incorrect. Unit 12a has a total sq. footage of 11115, including mezzanine floor. Unit 12 (Rollacity) has a total sq. footage of 11075, including mezzanine floor.</p>

	<p>This clearly shows that the buildings are virtually the same size and therefore could require the same parking levels. The maximum number of available customer spaces for unit 12a is 17 (including 1 disabled space) whereas Rollacity currently has 23 spaces (including 1 disabled space), which is over 35% higher.</p> <p>2. Inaccuracy Identified</p> <p>At present there are 40 parking spaces in the car park at the front of the two units, with 17 spaces allocated to unit 12a and 23 allocated to Rollacity.</p> <p>3. Officer Comments and Recommendation</p> <p>It is not considered that the greater level of parking provision at Rollacity alters the officer recommendation, which remains that of approval. The size of the two units is based on the floor space stated on the application form.</p>
--	--