



Rochford District
Council

**SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE CONSIDERED BY
PLANNING SERVICES COMMITTEE 26th May 2005**

All planning applications are considered against the background of current Town and Country Planning legislation, rules, orders and circulars, and any development, structure and locals plans issued or made thereunder. In addition, account is taken of any guidance notes, advice and relevant policies issued by statutory authorities.

Each planning application included in this Schedule is filed with representations received and consultation replies as a single case file.

The above documents can be made available for inspection as Committee background papers at the office of Planning Services, Acacia House, East Street, Rochford.

If you require a copy of this document in larger print, please contact the Planning Administration Section on 01702 – 318191.

PLANNING SERVICES COMMITTEE 26th May 2005

REFERRED ITEM

R1	04/01131/FUL Demolish Existing Dwelling and Industrial Units and Construct One Detached and Thirteen Terraced Houses, One Flat, Garages and Access Road With 2.2m High Fence Along Rear Boundary of Plots 6-10. Quest End 37 Rawreth Lane Rayleigh	PAGE 5
----	---	--------

SCHEDULE ITEMS

2	05/00217/ADV Free Standing Non-Illuminated Industrial Estate Sign. Riverside Industrial Estate South Street Rochford	Sophie Weiss PAGE 12
3	05/00237/ADV Externally Illuminated Sign and Non Illuminated Directional Sign and Coat Of Arms Located at Open Archway to Front of Building. 3 - 15 South Street Rochford	Mike Stranks PAGE 16
4	05/00238/LBC Externally Illuminated Sign and Non-Illuminated Directional Sign and Coat Of Arms Located at Open Archway to Front of Building. 3 - 15 South Street Rochford	Mike Stranks PAGE 21
5	05/00188/GDPNC Proposed Hardening of Grass Area. MOD Private And Confidential Bridge Road Foulness	Mr Leigh Palmer PAGE 25
6	05/00255/REM Details of 128 Dwellings Comprising 38 No.Four Bedroomed Houses, 33 No.Three Bedroomed Houses, 11 No.Two Bedroomed Houses, 4 No.Two Bedroomed Apartments; And 29 No.Two Bedroomed Apartments and 13 No.One Bedroomed Apartments for Key Workers in a Mixed Development of Two, Two and a Half and Three Storey Form With Estate Roads. Park School Rawreth Lane Rayleigh	Mr Mike Stranks PAGE 27

7

05/00251/DP4

Mr Leigh Palmer

PAGE 40

Proposed Sensory Garden (creation of an enclosed garden and landscape that will offer a wide range of sensory experiences especially to people with disabilities)

Land Adjacent Rayleigh Windmill Bellingham Lane
Rayleigh

PLANNING SERVICES COMMITTEE - 26 May 2005

Ward Members for Committee Items

DOWNHALL AND RAWRETH

Cllr C I Black

Cllr R A Oatham

FOULNESS & GREAT WAKERING

Cllr T E Goodwin

Cllr C G Seagers

Cllr Mrs B J Wilkins

ROCHFORD

Cllr Mrs S A Harper

Cllr K J Gordon

Cllr Mrs M S Vince

WHEATLEY

Cllr J M Pullen

Cllr Mrs M J Webster

**PLANNING SERVICES COMMITTEE - 26 May 2005 Item R1
Referred Item**

TITLE : **04/01131/FUL
DEMOLISH EXISTING DWELLING AND INDUSTRIAL UNITS
AND CONSTRUCT ONE DETACHED AND THIRTEEN
TERRACED HOUSES, ONE FLAT, GARAGES AND ACCESS
ROAD WITH 2.2M HIGH FENCE ALONG REAR BOUNDARY
OF PLOTS 6-10
QUESTEND 37 RAWRETH LANE RAYLEIGH**

APPLICANT : **QUESTEND DEVELOPMENTS**

ZONING : **RESIDENTIAL**

PARISH: **RAYLEIGH TOWN COUNCIL**

WARD: **DOWNHALL AND RAWRETH**

In accordance with the agreed procedure this item is reported to this meeting for consideration.

This application was included in Weekly List no 776 requiring notification of referrals to the Head of Planning Services by 1.00pm on Tuesday 10 May 2005, with any applications being referred to this Meeting of the Committee. The item was referred by Cllr R A Oatham.

The item which was referred is appended as it appeared in the Weekly List together with a plan.

- 1.1 **Rayleigh Town Council** - Objects on the grounds that Plot 4 does not meet the required garden size as per Local Plan appendix A1.4.9.7 Plot 4 has inadequate frontage as per Local Plan Appendix A1.4.9 Car parking inadequate as per Local Plan Appendix A1.3.5.

NOTES

- 1.2 This application is to a site on the southern side of Rawreth Lane currently vacant and formerly an industrial estate. The site has access onto Rawreth lane and the single storey industrial buildings remain in various condition of repair. The site frontage is occupied predominantly by an existing detached chalet. To the perimeter of the site exist a number of trees the subject of Tree Preservation Order 15/93.

- 1.3 The site is generally rectangular in shape having a frontage onto Rawreth Lane of 29.2m and average depth of 111.2m. The site has an area of 0.346ha (0.85 acres).
- 1.4 The proposal is to demolish the existing buildings on the site and construct one detached and thirteen terraced houses and three blocks of garages including one two bedroomed flat above one of the garage blocks. The terraced dwellings would comprise mostly three bedrooms but for the end terraced units to plots 11 and 15 at the rear of the site which have four bedrooms. The development would be served from an access road making a junction with Rawreth Lane and having a combined surface area to an overall width of 5.8m.
- 1.5 The site frontage would be enclosed by a 1.2m high brick wall to be set behind the sight line to the site entrance.

Relevant Planning History

- 1.6 **03/00964/OUT**
11 terraced and 2 detached dwellings . Demolish existing buildings (outline application) Approved at Planning Services committee 25th March 2004 subject to legal agreement which remains incomplete.
No Decision yet issued
- 1.7 **04/00614/FUL**
Demolition of existing Industrial Units and construct 3 detached, 8 Semi-detached, 3 terraced Houses, 2 Flats, Garages and Access Road.
Application Withdrawn
- 1.8 The residential allocation of the site in the Adopted Local Plan and considerations of the previous outline application establish no objection in planning terms to the principle of the redevelopment of the site for residential purposes. The submitted layout is similar to that shown in the consideration of the outline application but has been refined to meet concerns of officers and the County Highway Authority. In the consideration of the previous outline application the education authority requested a contribution to be made to the provision of learning services apportioned to the development. This requirement remains outstanding and relevant to any approval that might be given to the current application. The applicant is aware of this issue from the history of the site.
- 1.9 The predominant form of the existing dwellings fronting onto Rawreth Lane comprise detached or semi detached houses and chalets. Except for the industrial nature of the site the area is residential in character with houses backing onto or adjoining the boundaries of the site. Although terraced dwellings are not a feature of this part of Rawreth Lane they however provide further variation in dwelling mix that is generally encouraged in planning terms in order to provide homes to suit varying tastes and demands.

- 1.10 The three terraced dwellings to front onto Rawreth Lane would have a frontage of 17m divided between the three units. There is variation in plot width to existing development similarly fronting Rawreth Lane ranging between 20m to the existing dwelling on the site and 7m frontage to semi-detached dwellings further east towards the junction of Rawreth Lane with Hullbridge Road. This terrace would compare in presence to the existing dwelling and notwithstanding the comments from the County Council's Principle Urban Designer would not harm the character of the street.
- 1.11 The single detached dwelling to plot 4 flanking the access to the site would repeat the style of the terrace opposite on a frontage of 7m to Rawreth Lane but which is considered necessary to the need to enclose and balance the entrance to the development. It has however an extensive return frontage of at least 32m to the new internal road. Although sited forward of the existing dwellings by some 3m–7m across the frontage of the site the siting of these dwellings proposed is not considered to prove disruptive to the streetscene which already has similar staggered building lines.
- 1.12 The remainder of the development comprises two terraces of five units fronting onto the estate road with the single two bedroomed flat unit above a block of four garages. Car parking is provided to the garage blocks and in bays alongside the access road. Parking provision for the 15 dwellings is at 24 spaces or garages equating to just over 1.5 spaces per unit. Essex County Highways Department make no objection to this level of provision or the layout of the access road subject to conditions to secure adequate visibility and highway geometry.
- 1.13 The proposal provides satisfactory isolation space between the dwellings proposed and the plot boundaries in accord with the Council's supplementary guidance.
- 1.14 The Garden Areas proposed comply with the Council's supplementary guidance but for the five three bedroomed terraced units in the middle of the site which are short in depth by between 1.6m–0.5m each but having rear gardens in the range of between 58 square metres and 65.7 square metres. The situation is also similar to the three bedroomed terraced dwelling to plot 4 fronting onto Rawreth Lane which is similarly short by a length of 2.5m but has an overall garden area of 65 square metres. Given that the gardens to each of these units exceed the Council's requirement for at least 50 square metres of garden area it is considered that the shortfall in depth would not provide an inadequate garden area for the needs of future occupiers. It would however be necessary to remove permitted development rights for future extensions to these dwellings as part of any approval that might be given.
- 1.15 The detached three bedroomed house to plot 4 has a garden area of 85 square metres. The design is a detached form of the adjoining terraced units. It is considered that this shortfall in depth is not significantly harmful to the future demands and needs of residents to the proposed houses such that it would be justified to refuse permission for this minor failing.

- 1.16 The layout and design of the individual dwellings provides for bathroom windows to the flank walls of the dwellings which can be obscure glazed by condition to any approval that might be given. Similarly a further condition is considered necessary to control future windows in these flank elevations in the interests of privacy between neighbours.
- 1.17 The flat above the garages to plot 5 shows three dormers overlooking the access road and 12.8m to the boundary with the neighbouring property fronting Rawreth Lane "St. Ives" Given the distance and siting at right angles to the neighbouring property it is considered that no conditions of loss of privacy will arise sufficiently harmful to justify withholding consent. A first floor window is shown to the rear elevation of this unit only 6m from the boundary of the site. It is recommended that this window be obscure glazed.
- 1.18 The front walls of the houses to plots 6–10 would be 10.8m and 11.5m from the western boundary of the site and the rear gardens to dwellings in Caversham Park Avenue which are to a depth of 7.2m in the case of No.11 widening to 14.7m for the remainder. It is considered that the relationship between the existing and proposed dwellings provides a satisfactory distance to maintain acceptable levels of privacy. Similarly the rear garden depths to this terraced block are to some 10.6m backing onto the flank wall of and garden to No. 8 Farmview. The relationship between the proposed and this existing dwelling is considered not to give rise to unacceptable conditions of overlooking and loss of privacy to this neighbouring property provided the fence is increased in height as requested by this neighbour. The submitted plans show amendments to the fence height and planting to reinforce the boundary treatment. It will be necessary to seek details of these features as a condition to any approval that might be given.
- 1.19 **Rayleigh Civic Society**
- Express concern at the pinch point 4.8m between the dwellings to plots 3 and 4. The front doors to these dwellings are at right angles and will be very close to the road.
 - Concern that no footpath is provided.
 - Note that red brick is specified and hope that this will be kept to a minimum
 - Urge that trees be retained
- 1.20 Essex County Council Highways - Raise no objection to the proposal subject to the applicants and owners providing a contribution of £10,000 towards improved bus stops in the vicinity of the site, details of which to be agreed with the Local Highway Authority.
- 1.21 And recommends the following conditions;
- 4.5m x 90m visibility splay to be provided either side of the new access clear to ground level
 - 7.5m radius kerbs shall be provided at the junction of the new road to Rawreth Lane returned to a carriageway width of 5.5m

- A 1.5m footway shall be provided adjacent the radius kerbs to their internal tangent point
- Measures should be taken to ensure no mud or debris are deposited on the highway associated with the development, details to be agreed by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.

1.22 Essex County Council Principal Urban Designer -

- The buildings on the Rawreth Lane frontage are set further forward than adjacent dwellings. This will expose the very deep flank gable end of plot 1
- Some of the roofs on the gabled projections have too great a pitch (58°) Traditional tiled roofs in Essex are pitched normally between 45° and 50°
- Doors in gabled porch are creating duality. One of these could be located on the Porch return

1.23 Head of Housing Health and Community Care -No adverse comments to make subject to Standard Informative SI16 (Control of Nuisances) and SI25 (Contaminated Land) being included as part of any consent granted.

1.24 Woodlands and Environmental officer - Refers to previous advice given on the outline application as follows;

- Have inspected the site when trees in leaf November 2003 and again in January 2004.
- The Poplars T1–T6 and G1 all show signs of decay and die back in the crown. Several have crown damage the result of strong winds. There has been some tree surgery but this has not been systematic through out the trees
- There is secondary insect infection at the base synonymous with decaying timber
- The trees would not be suitable for retention as part of the development of this site
- T1 the Horse chestnut has a weak fork junction between the two main stems. Reduction works to prevent encroachment onto adjacent property has and will continue to reduce the trees amenity value.
- T7 and T8 have decay in the crown with dead wood and numerous signs of mechanical weakness. T8 has been pollarded recently. Neither of these trees are suitable for retention as part of this development scheme.
- Suggests removing all of the protected trees and replacing when construction is finished with specimens that will provide quality amenity to the site

1.25 Three letters have been received from residents in the vicinity of the site and which makes the following comments and objections;

- Loss of privacy alongside driveway and to kitchen diner
- Low fences between site and existing dwellings

- Request 6' high fence topped by 2' high trellis
- Not in keeping with the area
- Will cause a shift in the area to terraced
- Number of diseased trees on the site gradually breaking down and approval should include removal/replacement of these trees with mature trees to remain
- Request trees be retained

1.26 APPROVE: subject to an Agreement under section 106 of the Act to the following heads of agreement;

- i. Contribution to the education Authority equivalent to £76,583 as at April 2004 costs index linked
- ii. Contribution of £10,000 towards improved bus stops in the vicinity of the site

- 1 SC4 Time Limits Full - Standard
- 2 SC8 Use and Buildings - Removed
- 3 SC14 Materials to be Used (Externally)
- 4 SC17 PD Restricted - Extensions
- 5 SC22A PD Restricted – Windows
- 6 SC23 PD Restricted - OBS Glazing
- 7 SC50A Means of Enclosure - Full
- 8 SC55 Hedgerow to be Retained
- 9 SC59 Landscape Design - Details (Full)
- 10 No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied beneficially before a visibility splay 4.5m x 90m has been provided either side of the access road junction with Rawreth Lane and which shall be maintained free of any obstruction above ground level.
- 11 Notwithstanding the submitted plans 7.5m radius kerbs shall be provided at the junction of the new road with Rawreth Lane and shall be returned to a carriageway width of 5.5m
- 12 Notwithstanding the submitted plans a 1.5m wide footway shall be provided adjacent the radius kerbs to their internal tangent point.
- 13 SC73 Access Ways - Surface Finish
- 14 Notwithstanding the requirements of condition 7 above a 2.2m high screen fence shall be provided between the points marked F1-F2 on the plan hereby approved. Details of this fence shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development. The fencing details as may be agreed by the Local Planning Authority shall be provided prior to the beneficial occupation of the dwellings approved to plots 6 -10 inclusive.

- 15 Notwithstanding the requirements of condition 7 above a 1.8m high screen fence shall be provided between the points marked F3 - F4 on the plan hereby approved. Details of this fence shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development. The fencing details as may be agreed by the Local Planning Authority shall be provided prior to the beneficial occupation of the dwelling approved to plot 4.

Development Plan Policies and Proposals

H11 of the Rochford District Local Plan First Review



Shaun Scrutton
Head of Planning Services

For further information please contact Samuel Hollingworth on (01702) 546366.

TITLE : **05/00217/ADV**
FREE STANDING NON-ILLUMINATED INDUSTRIAL ESTATE
SIGN
RIVERSIDE INDUSTRIAL ESTATE SOUTH STREET
ROCHFORD

APPLICANT : **ROCHFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL**

ZONING : **RESIDENTIAL**

PARISH: **ROCHFORD PARISH COUNCIL**

WARD: **ROCHFORD**

PLANNING APPLICATION DETAILS

- 2.1 Advertisement consent is sought for the installation of a free standing non-illuminated industrial estate sign sited at the entrance to the Riverside Industrial Estate next to the River Roach, to the southwest of the Fire Station and facing Southend Road.
- 2.2 The proposal is situated in an area similar to a residential area in character but with other large buildings interspersed, including a public house, Police Station, offices and open space; the industrial area is hidden behind the fire station. The surrounding buildings are domestic in style with a mixture of red brick, rendered and white wooden weatherboarding. The proposal is situated just within the Rochford Conservation Area.
- 2.3 The proposed free standing sign will replace the existing sign. The existing sign is located behind railings that protect the river culvert. The proposed sign will be a corner sign with the corner facing towards the road with the main bulk 1m north of the existing sign, away from the river. The signs will be 2.44m wide by 1.22m high and 1.83m wide by 1.22m high mounted on poles to an overall height of 3.05m. The larger sign of the two will have the same content as the existing sign, including a site map and the Rochford District Council crest. The smaller sign will have an arrow directing people towards the industrial estate.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 2.4 Prior to the application there were several enforcement cases for this site relating to a proliferation of signs being displayed on the railings, the condition of the railings; display of cars for sale. The existing sign was also of concern. Improvements have been made as the railings have been painted black and bollards have been erected to prevent parked cars. This history has led to the current application to improve the signage for the industrial estate.

CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS

- 2.5 **County Surveyor (Highways):** No objections
- 2.6 **Rochford Parish Council:** No objections
- 2.7 **Historic Building Advisor (E.C.C):** General design as previously discussed and considered acceptable. However no information is contained about construction materials and lettering therefore recommends a condition that the sign shall be constructed of timber with a painted finish and sign-painted lettering.

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Highway Safety

- 2.8 The proposal will have a minimal effect to the detriment of highway safety. Any illumination may become a problem and dazzle nearby traffic. (However, no illumination is proposed).

Amenity

- 2.9 Due to the location of the proposal, the sign needs to be fitting in design and materials to accord with the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 2.10 The proposed sign is considered reasonably appropriate in design for this location on the edge of the Conservation Area and taking account of the surrounding trees, river and buildings.
- 2.11 The proposed lettering for the main title is an acceptable serif font. The lettering for Rochford District Council is san serif similar to the corporate logo. The main body of text relating to the different businesses on the Industrial Estate is unclear on the drawing, and will require an additional submission, which can be secured via condition.

- 2.12 The existing sign is aluminium with a modern sign appearance. The proposed sign will be 3 millimetre aluminum powder coated with a standard white laminate face, to standard traffic sign quality. The slats are dibond plastic with aluminum laminate: there are no visible fixings on the front of the sign.
- 2.13 The Historic Buildings Advisor has made suggestions about the materials and appearance of the sign. The materials of the sign, although not of a heritage nature are not completely unusual to this particular part of the street scene at the edge of the Conservation Area. For example there are two large traffic signs nearby approximately 1.8m by 1.2m and the train station has various modern British Rail signs. Therefore although the materials are not the preferred choice in conservation terms, given the environmental improvements achieved at this entrance and other signage that exists, on balance, it is considered acceptable. It may be that the sign would appear more pleasing and in character if a more substantial black border can be achieved and this is being explored.
- 2.14 The proposed size although reasonably large, will appear smaller, virtually no matter the direction the sign is approached. This has been achieved by angling the sign towards the main road, in a 'V' formation which also increases the potential of people noticing the sign and therefore the presence of the industrial estate. Due to this particular placement this sign is considered to be appropriate noting it is not visible to long views in South Street.

CONCLUSION

- 2.15 The proposal is considered acceptable, although not the preferred option and extra information is required by condition to illustrate the lettering size and style of the main text.

RECOMMENDATION

- 2.16 It is proposed that this Committee **RESOLVES** to **APPROVE** this application subject to the following conditions:
- 1 SAC1 Advert Time Limits (5 Years)
 - 2 SAC3 Advert – Standard Condition
 - 3 SAC4 Illumination Prohibited
 - 4 No development shall commence until further information in relation to the exact sizes and font have been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such style as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, shall be used in the development hereby permitted.

REASON FOR DECISION

The proposal is considered not to cause significant demonstrable harm to any development plan interests, other material considerations, to the character and appearance of the conservation area or residential amenity such as to justify refusing the application; nor to surrounding occupiers in Southend Road.

Relevant development plan policies and proposals:

SAT7, SAT8, SAT9, SAT11, SAT10 of the Rochford District Local Plan First Review



Shaun Scrutton
Head of Planning Services

For further information please contact Sophie Weiss on (01702) 546366.

TITLE : **05/00237/ADV**
EXTERNALLY ILLUMINATED SIGN AND NON ILLUMINATED
DIRECTIONAL SIGN AND COAT OF ARMS LOCATED AT
OPEN ARCHWAY TO FRONT OF BUILDING
3 - 15 SOUTH STREET ROCHFORD

APPLICANT : **ROCHFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL**

ZONING : **HISTORIC CORE/OFFICE**

PARISH: **ROCHFORD PARISH COUNCIL**

WARD: **ROCHFORD**

PLANNING APPLICATION DETAILS

- 3.1 Advertisement consent is sought for the installation of an externally illuminated “Rochford District Council” sign, a non-illuminated directional sign to the reception and coat of arms located at the open archway to the front of the Main Council Offices, South Street, Rochford.
- 3.2 The signs will be attached to a listed building located within the Historic Core and Conservation Area of Rochford Town Centre but which is annotated specifically as offices within these designations.
- 3.3 The proposed Corporate sign will have separate white lettering 3.75m in length and lettering size between 0.15 m and 0.25m in height and located above the archway. The sign will be externally illuminated via a black finish trough light fitting mounted on brackets above the letterings.
- 3.3 The non-illuminated directional sign will be a black and white enamelled sign 0.2m in height and 0.275m in length located on the brick return inside the archway. The lettering will be a maximum of 30mm in height. The coat of arms will be located above the archway towards the left and will be painted in true Heraldic colours to match the corporate coat of arms.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.4 **04/00679/ADV** – one non-illuminated 0.6m diameter hanging sign and four 0.3m x 0.2m directional signs to be attached to front of building.

- 3.5 This application was withdrawn following adverse comments from the Historic Buildings Advisor (E.C.C.). The current application has been produced on the basis of preliminary design consultation sought prior to submission prior to the current application.
- 3.6 The current application follows advice sought from historic buildings advisers from Essex County Council. On receipt of this advice the design and appropriateness became the focus of this current application.

CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS

- 3.7 **Rochford Parish Council:** concern as to whether this is in keeping with the policy on illuminated signage within the Conservation area. Also concerns with the style of writing on the sign.
- 3.8 **County Surveyor (Highways):** advisory comments regarding glare and dazzle to drivers on the main road. Recommend a condition - the lighting for the externally illuminated sign should be suitably positioned and shielded to avoid unnecessary glare/dazzle to drivers.
- 3.9 **Historic Buildings Adviser (E.C.C):** no objection to the use of a limited amount of appropriate signage on this listed building, although considers this proposal unacceptable.
- 3.10 Use of individual letters acceptable but style proposed inappropriate. Typeface has no 'architectural' quality and is too informal for the wall of a listed building of 'classical' character. Lower case letters would look weak and ineffective. Capital letters, with serifs preferable.
- 3.11 Lighting would look over-dominant here and questions the necessity when the building is only open during office hours and street lighting levels are good. Should be omitted and appropriate lettering located higher up wall than proposed clear of the arch.
- 3.12 Use of coat of arms not unacceptable but no details provided. Should be slightly larger than shown and placed about level with the transoms of the windows.
- 3.13 Directional sign unnecessarily large – information could be shown on a sign half the size. Design might be acceptable if the border letters and arrow were raised.
- 3.14 With amendments an acceptable scheme could be produced but cannot recommend consent for application as it stands.

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

3.15 Highway Safety

When determining applications for advert consent, highway safety and residential amenity are the two governing factors. In relation to highway safety the proposed illumination is considered acceptable as long as the light is suitably positioned and shielded to prevent glare. The proposed light as shown on the approved plans is a down lighter style light, focusing on the lettering and is unlikely to cause dazzle to drivers since the light will be shielded from the road by the aluminium casing.

3.16

With regards to this application policy SAT 8 is relevant as it relates to illumination in Conservation Areas. The policy states that:

Within Conservation Areas the use of internally illuminated fascias and projecting box signs will not normally be permitted. Where illuminated signs are exceptionally permitted illumination shall take the form of spot lighting of hanging signs or other discreet forms of lighting. Traditional wooden, painted fascias and hanging signs will be preferred to coloured plastic fascias and boxes.

3.17 Amenity

Due to the location of the proposal the design and illumination needs to be fitting for the Conservation Area and the Listed Buildings and further needs to give weight need to inform the public of the presence in this area, which is appropriate as this area is allocated as office on the Local Plan. Therefore the Historic Building Adviser's comments need to be considered with this in mind. In addition it needs to be noted that the proposal does not face a residential area, it faces Rochford Secondary Shopping Frontage Area.

3.18

There are no objections in principle to the use of a sign in this position or to the use of individual lettering. The location is suitable. The actual position of the sign could be positioned a course of bricks higher up, although policy refers to shop adverts located directly above the entrance. The requirement is to advertise the premises for information primarily, in such a way that ideally enhances the visual character of the area. Therefore, it is considered that the lettering is best placed close to the top of the carriageway rather than closer to the window openings above.

3.19

The lettering of the sign has been criticised as appearing too informal for the conservation areas' and listed buildings' 'classical' design. The lettering however is simple and clean. Whilst the lettering is modern this does not make it necessarily inappropriate for corporate signage in a conservation area; the proposal is not considered to be detrimental to the character of the building.

3.20

- 3.21 Within the Conservation Area and attached to a Listed Building the light fittings should not be a feature in themselves but should be discreet in form. This proposed strip of lighting is considered to be discreet by continuing the brick line with a colour that blends with the character of the building. Although against the Historic Building
- 3.22 Adviser's comments, it is considered necessary to demark the entrance to the building through lighting the sign at certain times through the year in office hours. Therefore in the shorter days in winter and nights this would allow visitors and residents to Rochford and the District to easily identify the Council Offices.
- 3.23 The design has been subject to minor alterations with regard to the size and position of the crest and the size of the directional sign, which has been reduced, in response to consultation with the Historic Buildings Advisor.

The non-illuminated directional sign in the originally submitted plans was 0.3m in height and 0.4m in length, which was considered unnecessarily large. This has been reduced to 0.2m in height and 0.275m in length and the font has changed from a sans serif font to a serif font, which conforms to the advice.

The coat of arms in the originally submitted plans was nearly half the size and situated only 0.55m above the proposed illumination. This was considered inappropriate and aptly revised to enlarge the coat of arms and to relocate between the two windows above the proposed illumination, which now conforms to the Historic Buildings Advisers' advice.

CONCLUSION

- 3.24 The original proposal although delivered from the expert advice from Essex County Council faced several objections from the Historic Buildings Adviser. The scheme has been revised and is considered to be more appropriate to the area where the proposal is sited. The revised scheme has not overcome all the objections regarding the illumination. However, in this particular case where a balance between the need for information and the need to ensure that the signage would not adversely affect the visual amenities of the area, the illumination is acceptable and considered to have no detrimental effects to highway safety.

RECOMMENDATION

- 3.25 It is proposed that this Committee **RESOLVES** to **APPROVE** this application subject to the following conditions:
- 1 SAC1 Advert Time Limits (5 Years)
 - 2 SAC3 Advert – Standard Condition
 - 3 SAC5 Illumination Restricted

REASON FOR DECISION

The proposal is considered not to cause significant demonstrable harm to any development plan interests, other material considerations, to the character and appearance of the conservation area or residential amenity such as to justify refusing the application; nor to surrounding occupiers in South Street.

Relevant development plan policies and proposals:

SAT7, SAT8, SAT9, SAT11 of the Rochford District Local Plan First Review



Shaun Scrutton
Head of Planning Services

For further information please contact Sophie Weiss on (01702) 546366.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.6 **04/00680/LBC** – one non-illuminated 0.6m diameter hanging sign and four 0.3m x 0.2m directional signs to be attached to front of building.
- 4.7 This previous application was withdrawn following adverse comments from the Historic Buildings Advisor (E.C.C.). The current application has been produced on the basis of preliminary design consultation sought prior to submission.
- 4.8 This application follows advice sought from historic buildings advisers from Essex County Council. On receipt of this advice the design and appropriateness became the focus of this current application.

CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS

- 4.9 **Rochford Parish Council** – concerns whether this is in keeping with the policy on illuminated signage within the Conservation Area and concerns with the style of writing on the sign.
- 4.10 **County Surveyor (Highways)** – advisory comments regarding glare and dazzle to drivers on the main road.
- 4.11 **County Planner (Historic Conservation)** – No general objection to the limited use of appropriate signage on this listed building. The use of individual letters is acceptable but the proposed style is too informal and lower case letters are ineffective and weak on a building of ‘classic’ character. Appropriate lettering should be located higher up the wall than is proposed, clear of the archway.
- 4.12 The proposed lighting is over-dominant and should be omitted, its necessity is questionable as the building will only be open during office hours and the existing levels of street lighting are good.
- 4.13 The use of the coat of arms is not unacceptable but should be slightly larger than shown and placed about level with the transoms of the windows.
- 4.14 The directional sign is unnecessarily large; the design might be acceptable if the border, letters and arrow were raised.
- 4.15 Consent is not recommend for the application as it stands, although amendments could produce an acceptable scheme.

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Impact on Listed Building and its Setting

- 4.16 There are no objections in principle to the use of a sign in this position or to the use of individual lettering. Notwithstanding the comment from the Historic Buildings Advisor, it is considered that the lettering is best placed close to the top of carriageway rather than moving closer to the window openings above. The requirement is to advertise the premises for information primarily, in such a way that ideally enhances the visual character of the area.
- 4.17 The lettering of the sign has been criticised as appearing too informal for a Listed Building of 'classical' design. The lettering however is simple and clean and whilst modern this does not make it necessarily inappropriate for corporate signage in a Conservation Area and it is not considered to be detrimental to the character of the building. The material for the lettering of the main sign is 5mm thick white acrylic with nylon locators to the rear fixing which will allow the lettering to have a separation from the fabric of the listed building.
- 4.18 Within the conservation area and attached to a Listed Building the light fittings should not be a feature in themselves but should be discreet in form. This proposed strip of lighting is considered to be discreet by continuing the brick line with a colour that blends with the character of the building.
- 4.19 The design has been subject to minor alterations with regard to the size and position of the crest and the size of the directional sign, which has been reduced, in response to consultation with the Historic Buildings Advisor (E.C.C.).
- 4.20 The coat of arms in the originally submitted plans was nearly half the size and situated only 0.55m above the proposed illumination. This was considered inappropriate and aptly revised to enlarge the coat of arms and to relocate in the middle between the two windows above the proposed illumination, which now conforms to the Historic Buildings Advisers' advice.
- 4.21 The non-illuminated directional sign in the superseded plans was 0.3m in height and 0.4m in length, which was considered unnecessarily large. This has been reduced to 0.2m in height and 0.275m in length and the font has changed from a sans serif font to a serif font, which conforms to the advice.

CONCLUSION

- 4.22 The original proposal whilst delivered from the expert advice from Essex County Council faced several objections from the Historic Buildings Adviser. The scheme has been revised and is considered to be more appropriate for the listed building it relates to. The revised scheme has not overcome objections regarding the illumination. However in this particular case where a balance between informing the public of the presence of the premises and the need to ensure that the signage would not adversely affect the visual amenities of the area, the illumination is acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION

- 4.23 That in referring the application to the Secretary of State for his consent the Local Planning Authority recommendation is approval with the following conditions:

- 1 SC4 Time Limits – Five Years

REASON FOR DECISION

The proposal is considered not to cause significant demonstrable harm to any development plan interests, other material considerations, to the character and appearance of the conservation area or residential amenity such as to justify refusing the application; nor to surrounding occupiers in South Street.

Relevant development plan policies and proposals:

UC7 of the Rochford District Local Plan First Review



Shaun Scrutton
Head of Planning Services

For further information please contact Sophie Weiss on (01702) 546366.

**TITLE: 05/00188/GDPNC
PROPOSED HARDENING OF GRASS AREA
MOD BRIDGE ROAD FOULNESS ISLAND**

APPLICANT: QINETIQ LTD

ZONING: RURAL LAND OUTSIDE METROPOLITAN GREEN BELT

PARISH: FOULNESS PARISH COUNCIL

WARD: FOULNESS & GREAT WAKERING

PLANNING APPLICATION DETAILS

- 5.1 This application is a government department consultation under Circular 18/84. The Council is invited to submit comments on the proposal.
- 5.2 Planning permission is sought for the laying an area of hard surfacing in lieu of grass. The area of land is required in order to facilitate the operational requirements of the Avocett Battery for vehicle parking and the storage.
- 5.3 The area of land has been used for some considerable time for storage, this use is to continue if the application is permitted. The applicant claims that the hardening of the area may reduce the potential for accidents/injury to personnel.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 5.4 None relevant.

CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS

- 5.5 **The Environment Agency:-** No objections.
- 5.6 **County Highways Officer:-** De-Minimis
- 5.7 **English Nature:-** No comments to make on the application.

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 5.8 The application site is located within an area of open countryside outside of the Metropolitan Green Belt.
- 5.9 There have been no objections received from the Environment Agency, or English Nature in relation to the proposal. Notwithstanding this it is considered that the use of this parcel of land is long standing and the change of surface finish will not give rise to any material loss of amenity nor visual intrusion.
- 5.10 This proposal will not result in any material harm to the character and amenity of the site and or the surrounding area.

RECOMMENDATION

- 5.11 That the applicant be informed that Rochford District Council wish to raise no objections to the proposed development.

Relevant development plan policies and proposals

GB1 of the Rochford District Local Plan First Review



Shaun Scrutton
Head of Planning Services

For further information please contact Leigh Palmer on (01702) 546366.

**TITLE: 04/00255/REM
DETAILS OF 128 DWELLINGS COMPRISING 38 No. FOUR
BEDROOMED HOUSES, 33 No. THREE BEDROOMED
HOUSES, 11 No. TWO BEDROOMED HOUSES, 4 No. TWO
BEDROOMED APARTMENTS AND 29 No. TWO
BEDROOMED APARTMENTS AND 13 No. ONE
BEDROOMED APARTMENTS FOR KEY WORKERS IN A
MIXED DEVELOPMENT OF TWO, TWO AND A HALF AND
THREE STOREY FORM WITH ESTATE ROADS
PARK SCHOOL RAWRETH LANE RAYLEIGH**

APPLICANT: GEORGE WIMPEY

ZONING: EXISTING SECONDARY SCHOOL

PARISH: RAYLEIGH TOWN COUNCIL

WARD: DOWNHALL AND RAWRETH

PLANNING APPLICATION DETAILS

- 6.1 This application is to the site of the former Park School located on the southern side of Rawreth Lane opposite the junction with Parkhurst Drive.
- 6.2 The site received outline planning permission for a mixed development under application reference 01/00762/OUT on 18th June 2003. The current application is submitted as details pursuant to that outline consent.
- 6.3 A previous application was refused on 20 January 2005 for 129 dwellings overall comprising 38 four bedroomed houses over five different house types, 33 three bedroomed houses over four different house types, 11 two bedroomed houses between two house types and 4 two bedroomed apartments located at first floor above garages. The layout comprised a mixture of detached, semi detached, linked and terraced forms fronting the estate road and private drives.
- 6.4 That application provided key worker housing in the form of 43 No. two bedroomed apartments to buildings of three storey form located at the northern end of the site around car parking and communal amenity areas.

- 6.5 The current application is for 128 units comprising 11 No. two bedroomed houses, 4 No. two bedroomed apartments, 33 No. three bedroomed houses, 38 No. four bedroomed houses, including fourteen house types which feature accommodation in the roofspace, together with 29 two bedroomed apartments and 13 No. one bedroomed apartments for key workers. The layout has been modified by minor adjustment to siting and garden area boundaries taking where possible from oversized garden areas to supplement previously undersized plots.
- 6.6 The key worker buildings have been modified to provide accommodation in the roofspace to give a two and a half rather than three storey appearance. The design of the buildings has been improved to meet the previously expressed concerns of Members and the views of Essex County Council Principal Urban Design adviser.
- 6.7 The reduction of one unit across the development arises from the loss of a key worker unit to Block 3 above the entrance to the key worker parking area serving Blocks 2 and 3 fronting onto the Spine Road.
- 6.8 The applicant confirms that the footpaths/cycle path links would be offered for adoption and therefore lit. The amenity area and ecology strips abutting the site boundary will be adopted by the Green Belt Group subject to an adoption fee. The applicants are willing to enter into a supplemental legal agreement accordingly.
- 6.9 **Development Plan Policies**
The site is allocated as Existing Secondary School in the Rochford District Local Plan First Review (1995).
- 6.10 The site is allocated for mixed use development in the Second Deposit Draft Local Plan (May 2004).

Relevant Planning History

- 6.11 01/00762/OUT
Outline application for a mixed use development comprising housing, neighbourhood centre, public open space, Primary School and Leisure Centre.
Permission Granted 18th June 2003
- 6.12 04/00612/REM
Details of Spine Road, associated footpaths and footpath/cycleway, roundabout and turning facilities
Permission Granted 26th August 2004
- 6.13 04/00677/REM
Details of two storey building to provide Sports and Leisure Centre with outside playing areas, Skateboard Park, access and Parking Areas.
Permission Granted 21st October 2004.

6.14 04/00675/REM

Details of 129 dwellings comprising 38 No. four bedroomed houses, 33 No. three bedroomed houses, 11 No. two bedroomed houses, 4 No. two bedroomed apartments and 43 No. two bedroomed apartments for key workers in a mixed development of two, two and a half and three storey form with estate roads.

Permission refused 20th January 2005 for the following reasons;

1. The proposed key worker flats, by way of their size and bulk and predominant three storey form, would over-dominate the existing dwellings adjoining the site which, in the main, consist of two storey form. If allowed, the over-dominant form of the proposed flats would detract from the amenity that ought reasonably be expected to be enjoyed by the occupiers of those dwellings.
2. The proposal would represent an overdevelopment of the site, failing to provide satisfactory private rear gardens to a significant proportion of the dwellings proposed and which, if allowed, would result in a development lacking garden space for outside storage, recreation, outside drying and gardening for the future occupiers of those dwellings and to the detriment of the amenity those occupiers ought reasonably expect to enjoy.
3. The general massing and appearance of the Key Worker flatted element of the proposal would result in a group of buildings of poor design and overbearing in appearance at the entrance to the site to the detriment of the character and appearance of the street scene.

CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS

- 6.15 **Rawreth Parish Council** - Advise that the Council's interest in this site is the transfer of the village school to the proposed site. The piecemeal release of details make it difficult to retain the effect of one application on others. Council's concern is at the type of access to the school, loop versus spine road and its width, the pedestrian access for children to the school from Rawreth Lane and the lack of emergency access to and exit for the children in case of an emergency if the lower spine road is blocked.
- 6.16 Width of spine road is 6m and in Council's opinion does not meet the standards required by the New Roads And Street Works Act.
- 6.17 Comment that details of the design of the Housing Development are rightly the prerogative of Rayleigh Town Council.
- 6.18 As there seems to be no option but to accept the spine road design we should at least press to get the appropriate width. As Essex County Council feel unable to give advice on the width of the road it would appear that Rochford Council take the responsibility. The proposal still shows the lower road width at 6m. Therefore encourage Rochford to have the developer request a section 38.

-
- 6.19 Welcome the pedestrian access via a crossing just to the west of the entrance to the site and the footways through the estate to the lower Spine Road.
- 6.20 Welcome the additional access to the school site shown on the southern edge of the development as an emergency access only. Regular access would be unsuitable as it opens to the school car park and vehicle access road.
- 6.21 **Essex County Council Specialist Archaeological advice** - Development proposals lie within an area which has been fully archaeologically evaluated. No recommendations to make.
- 6.22 **South Essex Health Authority** - No Comment to make.
- 6.23 **Sport England** - Proposal would not affect the land proposed for playing fields or the sports centre and therefore have no comments to make.
- 6.24 **Head of Housing Health and Community Care** - Recommends conditions for the submission of a scheme for the suppression of dust, condition requiring no burning of waste materials during construction.
- 6.25 Also recommends standard Informatives SI25 (Contaminated Land) and SI16 (control of nuisances) Parts A & B
- 6.26 Recommends applicant be encouraged to attain a "Good" Rating under the Building Research Establishment EcoHomes scheme.
- 6.27 Recommends inclusion of a legal agreement to provide affordable housing as part of any permission granted.
- 6.28 *Officer comment: The Key Worker provision in this application complies with the requirement in the outline consent to allocate one acre of the residential allocation on the site to provide accommodation for Key Workers such as nurses, teachers, serving police officers, qualified social workers and other categories of workers identified by the Local Housing authority whose services are considered essential to local communities and who need to live within a reasonable travel to work distance of those communities. This addresses the concern expressed for provision of affordable housing.*
- 6.29 **English Nature** - Advise that the proposals are not likely to affect SSSI. Advise that the presence of protected species is a material consideration and that if protected species are suspected or present an ecological survey should be carried out to establish the species concerned, the population affected by the proposal and any mitigation necessary.

- 6.30 **Anglian Water** - Acknowledge consultation.
- 6.31 **Rayleigh Civic Society** - Comment that the apartments show elevations that are an improvement on the previous design offered and will match surrounding developments of two storeys.
- 6.32 Concerned that the adoptable footpath link to Rawreth Lane will need to be illuminated.
- 6.33 Enquires as to whether the railings to the footpath link could be realigned to improve the outlook from the ground floor windows to the Key Worker Apartments.
- 6.34 Enquire as to whether doors and windows are to be in timber or UPVC.
- 6.35 Offers no comments upon landscaping or surface finishes.
- 6.36 **Essex Police Architectural Liaison Officer** - Have no objections to the proposal. Minor alterations requested have been incorporated into the fencing and boundary treatment proposals. Recommend that the lighting be a white light source throughout this development.
- 6.37 **Essex County Council Highways and Transportation** - Acknowledge consultation and request an extension of time to make comments due to nature and complexity of the application.
- 6.38 **Essex County Council Principal Urban Designer** - The proposals are generally acceptable though still consider that development along the main access road is rather fragmented and that more trees are required along this edge to create a better degree of enclosure.
- 6.39 Understand that access way to the school is not required. If that is the case, the treatment of this edge may need to be amended.
- 6.40 Asks what is the boundary treatment to the school and who will provide it? Expect that walling would be provided where this edge is visible to the Public?
- 6.41 The treatment of the ground surface finishes in the parking squares should be more homogenous to reinforce the space. The vehicle way and parking area should therefore be in the same colour block and suggests a tegula block and the vehicle pathway delineated by channels or rows of setts.
- 6.42 Only plain tiles or slates should be specified for the dwellings (see Essex Design Guide Page 47) Single storey garages can be roofed in pantiles. Requests coloured street elevations so that further consideration can be given to the disposition of materials.

- 6.43 Two letters have been received from residents in the vicinity of the site and which makes the following comments and objections;
- Far too dense a number of properties for the site and Rawreth Lane to cope with
 - The Law requires that both owners of the land either side must undertake their riparian land ownership duties in respect of maintaining the ditch. The ditch floods in the winter months and spills over into gardens and up to the houses themselves if the ditch is not maintained on an ongoing basis. The 2m wide strip is of an inadequate width to allow proper maintenance access. Vital issue that cannot be ignored and will hold those responsible at law for breach of compliance with these undertakings.
 - Garage to be built on the boundary (Rear of 26 Laburnum Way) will cause demonstrable loss of direct sunlight causing the loss of notable plants and will seek compensation should the plans be approved.
 - Understood that neither the Council or Applicants are keen to take ownership of the maintenance strip due to access and management practicalities. Inadequate width will deny realistic access to remove garden rubbish and general dumping and alleyway will quickly degenerate into a den of iniquity. Proposed previously that houses in Laburnum Estate become owners. Whilst acknowledge not an acceptable solution wish to be advised what the solution is to be and to be understood by all those affected.
 - Seek notification of the proposed planting of the Ecological strip
 - Open alleyway alongside terraced housing raises concerns at potential abuse for storage and eyesore to those who live in adjoining properties. Suggests an alternative be considered or at the very least that access to the alleyway be restricted to occupiers of the terrace only.
 - Express realism about the development of the land and are only asking for practical solutions to very real issues that residents will have to live with forever if as Planners and Developers these issues are not tackled.
- 6.44 One letter has been received from an occupier of adjoining industrial premises and which makes the following comments;
- Do not oppose this planning application

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

6.45 Means of Enclosure

The applicant has submitted details of the boundary treatment and means of enclosure throughout the layout. The submitted details comprise a mixture of 1.2m high hoop top railings, 1.8m high brick walls between piers, close boarded fencing and 0.6m high double arris rail bounding the key worker apartments fronting onto Rawreth Lane. More recent revisions to these plans incorporate the advice of the Essex Police Architectural Liaison Officer. The submitted details satisfactorily discharge condition 6 of the outline consent.

6.46 Landscaping

The applicant has submitted details of both hard and soft landscaping as required by Condition 7 of the outline consent.

6.47 The main estate road would be finished in black asphalt with the raised urban squares at the internal estate junctions in brindle pavers in herringbone pattern. The parking areas at these junctions would be marked in charcoal pavers bound by cast iron bollards. At this point street trees would be located within a round grate and surround. The private drive areas would be finished in Marshalls pavers in burnt ochre colour. The parking areas within plots gardens would be finished in traffica paving forming the dual purpose areas. The mews courtyard areas would be finished in black bitMac.

6.48 The key worker apartment pathways would be surfaced in black asphalt with the car parking spaces finished in burnt ochre Marshalls pavers.

6.49 The proposed adoptable footpath link between Rawreth Lane and the estate road would be finished in black asphalt.

6.50 Throughout the layout of the housing area and the Key worker apartments the applicant proposes grass seeding of lawn areas and a mix of shrubs, ornamental hedging and native hedging in front of buildings and adjoining pathways or access points. A mixture of heavy standard containerised and standard trees are also included.

6.51 The applicant states that although the condition requires landscaping to be carried out within the first available planting season between October and March or in phasing to be agreed, the construction programme will be dependant upon sales and therefore landscaping will be implemented on all plots completed and occupied prior to the end of the planting season at the end of march each year.

6.52 The landscaping is considered acceptable in planning terms and discharges condition 7 of the outline consent.

6.53 Ecological Assessment

Condition 10 of the outline consent requires the reserved matters to be accompanied by an ecological assessment. Members will recall that a further assessment was carried out for the previously submitted application and which recommended a reduction in width to the ecological strip to 2m to permit a wildlife corridor to exist for the movement of birds, mammals and invertebrates and to provide a potential foraging feature for Bats. In consultation with the Council's Woodlands and Environmental Officer further work was undertaken to check the presence of protected species. The requirements of condition 10 are considered discharged.

6.54 Travel Plan

Condition 12 of the outline consent requires reserved matters to be accompanied by a travel plan and which was submitted with the previous application to consider both the residential and Sports Centre elements of the site.

6.55 The travel plan proposes two new bus shelters at the two bus stops either side of the access into the development, the replacement of refuge islands, pedestrian links through the estate and a cycleway to improve access to the London Road and Victoria Road areas. The plan also includes the provision of good quality and secure covered cycle parking facilities, showers, lockers and changing facilities to the commercial parts of the site to encourage future workers to cycle.

6.56 The travel plan advocates parking restraint. At the estimated maximum provision of 296 spaces for the residential element of the scheme, the plan advocates a total provision of 236 spaces. The plan further advocates parking management measures to prevent on street parking within the development. A travel coordinator will be appointed as part of a management company for the whole site. Essex County Council previously commented that the travel Plan was acceptable and it is considered that the requirements of condition 12 are discharged.

6.57 Travel Assessment

Condition 13 of the outline consent requires the submission of reserved matters to be accompanied by a travel assessment. The previous application was accompanied by an assessment addressing the Residential, Primary School and Leisure Centre elements of the overall site. Taking into account assumptions and known factors of the proposed and approved development on this site the development is forecast to add a further 721 two way movements at the point of access into the site at the AM peak hour. At school peak hour 664 two way movements at the point of access into the site are shown. Given that the scheme currently submitted does not differ to that previously submitted in highway terms, it is considered that the requirements to submit the travel assessment have been discharged by the previously submitted application.

6.58 Parking and Access arrangements

Condition 14 of the outline consent requires reserved matters to be accompanied by full details of cycle and motorcycle parking, car parking arrangements, access arrangements, bridleways and bus/coach dropping off facilities within the site. The requirements of this condition relate to the site as a whole.

- 6.59 In terms of the residential element to which this current proposal relates the key worker apartments show provision of one car parking space per apartment. The detailed layout achieves one off-street car parking space in the case of a number of smaller two bedroomed houses but otherwise the parking provision shown equates to two parking spaces per dwelling or more. Parking for cycles and motorcycles would be possible within the curtilages of individual dwellings. There is however no provision for cycle parking currently shown to the key worker apartment element of the scheme. This matter can however be addressed by a condition requiring submission of such details to any approval that might be given. The requirements of the condition relative to this submission of reserved matters for the residential element are otherwise considered fulfilled.
- 6.60 **Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage**
 Condition 16 of the outline consent requires the reserved matters to be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment. The previous application was accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment which undertook hydraulic modelling of the discharge and surface water run off of the former uses and proposed uses for residential, new sports centre and school being taken into account. Account was also taken of climatic change and recorded rainfall records. Given that the scheme is the same in drainage terms with a reduction of one unit and slightly smaller one bedroomed units to the Key Worker Apartments, the requirements are considered discharged by the previously submitted assessment.
- 6.61 The surface water drainage of the site is proposed to discharge by way of two additional outlets in addition to the existing outlet to the ditch adjoining the Laburnum Estate. Whilst the comments of the Environment Agency are awaited on this particular application members will recall that the assessment and previous application was revised to incorporate the Agency's requirements for a wet pond/swale feature shown to the northern edge of the site between the Key Worker housing Block 1 and the rear boundaries of Nos. 145–153 Rawreth Lane. The Environment Agency confirmed previously therefore that the requirements of condition 16 are met by the previously considered Flood Risk Assessment.
- 6.62 **Archaeology**
 Condition 17 of the outline consent requires the reserved matters to be accompanied by the results of a field evaluation to establish the nature and complexity of surviving archaeological deposits on the site. The site has since been fully evaluated in accordance with a report submitted with the previous application. This condition is now discharged.

6.63 **Design Considerations**

Generally the layout accords with the provisions of the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance contained within the Essex Design Guide (1997). The site has an overall area of 2.83 ha (7 acres) and the scheme has a density therefore of 45.2 dwellings per hectare (18 dwellings per acre) which compares with the government directive on achieving appropriate densities of between 20–50 net dwellings per hectare. The mixture of dwellings is shown between detached, semi-detached, linked and terraced units achieving enclosure of urban spaces with built frontages, which is a particular requirement of the design guide for developments in excess of 20 dwellings per hectare.

6.64 The footways extend to the Spine Road to give good connectivity throughout the layout and with Rawreth Lane

6.65 The composition of houses is between a mix of twelve different house types varying in overall height from 7.7m to the two bedroomed "Allerton" to 8.65m to the "Chisnall Link". The two and a half storey "Lister" and "Tollerton" are slightly higher at 9.6m and 9.5m respectively. Three storey dwellings exist in the vicinity of the site throughout the adjoining Countryside Homes and Bellwinch developments to the east of the site whereby flats were approved on appeal to a height of 10.4m.

6.66 Specifically the elevational treatment of the York and Chisnall linked house types have been modified to overcome previous criticisms at the arrangement of windows and the need to recess the linked feature as recommended by the County Council's Principal Urban Designer. All the house types now feature sloping soffits throughout the scheme.

6.67 The current application Key Worker apartments are of a modified design to that previously considered in that the layout of these apartments provide two bedroomed apartments on the ground and first floors with one bedroomed apartments set wholly within the roof space. This reduces the overall scale and appearance of the buildings and removes the need for a multitude of rainwater pipes previously of concern to the County Council Principal Urban Designer.

6.68 The height of the Key Worker building to Blocks 1 and 2 would be 10.5m comparable to the previous submission. The height of the apartment building to Block 3 would be increased from the previous 9.8m to 10.5m with the corner tower retained at a height of 12.5m. The appearance of these buildings has been improved by the removal of the previously proposed stucco in favour of face brickwork, again as recommended by the County Council's Principal Urban Designer.

- 6.69 The apartments comprising Block 1 would be located at a pinch point on the western boundary of the site 2.5m widening slightly to 3.5m adjacent to the ecological strip retained along the western boundary of the site. At the narrowest point the corner of the building would be 12.5m from the corner of the nearest dwelling No. 4 Sycamore Close. The resultant building and relationship would not appear cramped in planning terms. The western elevation to Block 1 does however feature secondary windows to living rooms and it is considered necessary to ensure that these windows are obscure glazed by condition to any approval given.
- 6.70 Block 2 would be located 7m from the site boundary but at right angles with windows directly viewing over the ends of gardens to Nos 147–153 Rawreth Lane. The closest part of the building would be 22.5m from No. 147 Rawreth Lane but at an oblique angle not directly opposing windows to the existing dwellings. This relationship would not result in unreasonable dominance or massing upon the setting of adjacent existing buildings.
- 6.71 Block 3 would front onto Rawreth Lane with a return frontage onto the Spine Road. This building would envelope the parking area serving this Block and Block 2. This building would be set just over 1m from the extent of the footway alongside the Spine Road and widening to over three metres as the line of the building extends southwards. The siting arrangement would make the necessary statement to the entrance onto Rawreth Lane and would achieve an appropriate setting desirable in townscape terms.
- 6.72 The four “Nova” type apartment units are located above garage provision and without garden amenity areas. This has been a previously accepted situation to this alternative house type beginning to feature amongst mixed residential development. The applicant has revised the garden areas with the result that only a small number, 15 in all, fail to meet the Council’s standards.
- 6.73 Whilst the distribution of the amenity areas serving the Key Worker apartments remains unequal with Block 1 having a significantly larger area about its surroundings than Blocks 2 and 3, the combined amenity area provision serving the Key Worker apartments as a whole exceeds the Council’s requirements by 31.9 square metres.
- 6.74 It is considered that given the variation in provision between dwelling types throughout the layout, the provision will match a variety of requirements for varying household size. The shortfall in the size of a small number of gardens is off-set by the location of informal Public Open Space at Sweyne Park a short convenient distance to the south of the site. In these circumstances it would be difficult for the Council to sustain an objection to the layout of the development based upon the measured shortfall in amenity area and garden space provision.

CONCLUSION

- 6.75 The proposal represents a revised submission meeting the requirements of the outline consent and seeking to overcome previous concerns at the massing, bulk and appearance of the Key Worker apartments and further concerns at the inadequacy of previous amenity areas to serve the dwellings proposed. The design of the dwellings and Key Worker apartments has been significantly improved and the layout reviewed and checked to reflect an accurate calculation of amenity provision for the dwellings proposed.
- 6.76 The proposal although very similar to that previously considered improves upon the previous scheme in design terms and meets with Council Supplementary guidelines for the density of the development proposed. The remaining shortfall in amenity area provision to a limited number of plots within the overall scheme is off set by the need to provide a variety of accommodation to suit varying household size and the availability of a large area of informal Public open space close to the site. In planning terms it is therefore considered that the proposal reasonably addresses previous concerns to the extent that permission should be granted on the merits of the current scheme.

RECOMMENDATION

- 6.77 It is proposed that this Committee **RESOLVES** to **Delegate to the Head of Planning Services to determine** the details subject to;
- The response being received from Essex County Council Head of Transportation and Operational Services with regard to the Highway aspects of the scheme and any further conditions recommended as a result
- And to;
- a supplemental **LEGAL AGREEMENT** to cover the matters of maintenance for the Ecological strips abutting the site boundary and amenity areas fronting onto Rawreth Lane
- and to the following heads of conditions;
- 1 Reserved matter time limit
 - 2 Obscure glazing to western flank elevation windows to Block 1 Key Worker Apartments
 - 3 Revised details for adequate bin Storage Provision to serve the Key Worker Apartments
 - 4 SC22A PD Restricted Windows(above first floor only)
 - 5 SC23 PD Restricted – Obscure Glazing specified windows to house types and Key Worker Apartments

- 6 SC17 PD Restrictions extensions to specified plots with substandard garden areas as detailed above
- 7 Non provision of doors or gates to car port details
- 8 Provision of carriageways and footway base course to provide adequate vehicle and pedestrian access prior to occupation of any dwelling.
- 9 SC67 Pedestrian Visibility Splays Plural
- 10 SC 74 Driveways Surface Finish
- 11 Recessed gates to vehicular access points within individual plots
Submission of details for residents and visitors cycle parking provision to Key Worker apartments.
- 12 Provision of Contractors Compound to provide a parking and storage areas clear of the Highway for the duration of the construction period.
- 13 Provision of wheel washing facility for construction vehicles and delivery vehicles
- 14 The submission of a scheme for the suppression of dust.
- 15 No burning of waste materials during construction.

REASON FOR DECISION

The proposal is considered not to cause significant demonstrable harm to any development plan interests, other material considerations, to the character and appearance of the area, to the street scene or residential amenity such as to justify refusing the application; nor to surrounding occupiers.

Relevant development plan policies and proposals:

H11 of the Rochford District Local Plan First Review



Shaun Scrutton
Head of Planning Services

For further information please contact Mike Stranks on (01702) 546366.

**TITLE: 05/00251/DP4
PROPOSED SENSORY GARDEN (CREATION OF AN
ENCLOSED GARDEN AND LANDSCAPE THAT WILL OFFER
A WIDE RANGE OF SENSORY EXPERIENCES ESPECIALLY
TO PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES)
LAND ADJACENT RAYLEIGH WINDMILL BELLINGHAM
LANE
RAYLEIGH**

APPLICANT: ROCHFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL

ZONING: COMMUNITY USE

PARISH: RAYLEIGH TOWN COUNCIL

WARD: WHEATLEY

PLANNING APPLICATION DETAILS

- 7.1 This is a Rochford District Council scheme and application.
- 7.2 Permission is sought for the creation of a 'sensory garden' on an area to the rear of Rayleigh Windmill.
- 7.3 The proposal involves a circular footpath, accessed from a footpath leading from the Windmill. The principle aim of this sensory garden is to create a self contained area that concentrates a wide range of sensory experiences to people with disabilities. The range of sensory experiences involve looking (shape movement), listening, feeling, smelling, tasting, gravity-balance; all of these experiences are designed to be inviting and comfortable, and intended to stimulate ideas within educational programmes to teach a wide range of skills.
- 7.4 A new railing and gate is proposed to be located between the windmill and the site, this railing will match the existing metal railings around the adjacent National Trust, and Rayleigh Castle site (2.1m vertical steel bars, rounded tops and black paint finish).

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 7.5 99/00682/FUL Educational and Environmental Centre Comprising Single Storey Building with Pitched Roof Application Permitted 23/11/00.

CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS

- 7.6 **Rayleigh Town Council** :- No objections
- 7.7 **English Nature**:- The development will not affect a SSSI, and if protected species are expected then an appropriate survey and mitigation shall be implemented.
- 7.8 **Buildings/Technical Support**:- No objections
- 7.9 **Rayleigh Civic Society**:- Fully support the proposal; trust that the fence is of sufficient height and robust enough to deter possible vandalism; suitable lighting will be required for similar reasons.
- 7.10 **Essex County Council Archaeological Officer**:- The proposal is unlikely to have impact on the known archaeological deposits in the area and much of the site has been excavated in 1969 – 70. Therefore on our present knowledge no archaeological recommendations are being made on this application. However, it would be worth bringing to the attention of the applicant that as a sensory garden it would be a possibility to include a Braille map of the history of the castle.
- 7.11 **County Highways Officer**:- No comment
- 7.12 **Essex Police Architectural Liaison Officer**:- No comments
- 7.13 **Woodlands & Environment Specialist**:- the impact upon the nearby habitat for protected species needs to be fully assessed. He has committed to ensuring that this development will be designed and implemented so that the protected species at the site will not be affected.
- 7.14 **The Environment Agency**:- No objection.
- 7.15 **Essex County Council Conservation Officer**:- I have no objections to this proposal on conservation grounds. The character of the listed building would not be harmed, and its setting would probably be improved by these works. I therefore recommend permission is granted.
- 7.16 **Corporate Policy Unit Community Safety Officer**:- At present a palisade fence that separates the proposed site and the Mill denies direct access to the boundary fence of 35 London Hill where, previously youths used to congregate and cause criminal damage.
- 7.17 I would endorse that the new fencing that will separate the sensory garden and the Mill should not be climbable and that the gate are locked at a night time.
- 7.18 I am satisfied that additional lighting will not be necessary.

- 7.19 From an environmental perspective, I did observe that users of the sensory garden would have an eye level view to the first floor of the property of 35 London Hill, which is at a lower level. I understand though that screening has been planned to avoid any invasion of privacy.
- 7.20 In conclusion I do not feel that the sensory garden will adversely affect levels of criminal damage and anti-social behaviour.
- 7.21 One letter of objection has been received from the occupiers of a nearby property who have objected in the main on the following issues:-
- History of anti-social behaviour from this site; this stopped when metal fencing was erected around the area
 - The anti-social activity may reoccur if the fencing is removed
 - Not sure this is the correct location for this proposal . Retaining wall has been erected at property, this proposal may cause structural damage to their property

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.22 The hard surfacing element of this scheme already exists as do the bench style seats. Therefore given that the majority of the work required to fully implement the sensory garden will be soft landscaping there should not be any material impact upon the protected species in proximity to the site.
- 7.23 It is considered that the use of the site as a sensory garden would not give rise to a material loss of amenity to the occupiers of the adjacent/nearby residential properties. In addition the railings and gate would help to mitigate anti-social behaviour; on this issue the submission has the support of the Council's Community Safety Officer and well as Essex Police. The proposed railing would be similar to the existing railing around the remainder of the windmill site.
- 7.24 The proposal will not have an adverse impact upon the setting of the Windmill in particular nor upon the surrounding Conservation Area in general.

CONCLUSION

- 7.25 The area the subject of this application has been part of the general public amenity area around the Windmill since the early 1970's and it is considered that the proposed development would not be out of character nor intrusive.

RECOMMENDATION

7.26 It is proposed that this Committee **RESOLVES** to **APPROVE** this application subject to the following conditions:

- 1 SC4 Time Limits

REASON FOR DECISION

The proposal is considered not to cause demonstrable harm to any development plan interests, other harm to other material planning considerations including the impact upon the adjacent listed building in particular and the surrounding area in general.

Relevant Development Plan Policies and Proposals:

UC1, H24 of the Rochford District Local Plan First Review



Shaun Scrutton
Head of Planning Services

For further information please contact Leigh Palmer on (01702) 546366.

CODE OF CONDUCT FOR PLANNING MATTERS

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Members and Officers must:-

- **at all times act within the law and in accordance with the code of conduct.**
- **support and make decisions in accordance with the Council's planning policies/Central Government guidance and material planning considerations.**
- **declare any personal or prejudicial interest.**
- **not become involved with a planning matter, where they have a prejudicial interest.**
- **not disclose to a third party, or use to personal advantage, any confidential information.**
- **not accept gifts and hospitality received from applicants, agents or objectors outside of the strict rules laid down in the respective Member and Officer Codes of Conduct.**

In Committee, Members must:-

- **base their decisions on material planning considerations.**
- **not speak or vote, if they have a prejudicial interest in a planning matter and withdraw from the meeting.**
- **through the Chairman give details of their Planning reasons for departing from the Officer recommendation on an application which will be recorded in the Minutes.**
- **give Officers the opportunity to report verbally on any application.**

Members must:-

- **not depart from their overriding duty to the interests of the District's community as a whole.**
- **not become associated, in the public's mind, with those who have a vested interest in planning matters.**
- **not agree to be lobbied, unless they give the same opportunity to all other parties.**
- **not depart from the Council's guidelines on procedures at site visits.**
- **not put pressure on Officers to achieve a particular recommendation.**
- **be circumspect in expressing support, or opposing a Planning proposal, until they have all the relevant planning information.**

Officers must:-

- **give objective, professional and non-political advice, on all planning matters.**
 - **put in writing to the committee any changes to printed recommendations appearing in the agenda.**