SCHEDULE ITEMS

ITEM 2 07/00083/OUT

PLANNING APPLICATION

The application is supported by a tree survey which does recommend some tree surgery/tree removal. This submission mirrors an application to carry out works to TPO trees administered by the Council's Woodlands Section which was approved. These works have been implemented at the site.

The applicant's agent has supplied a further supporting statement which comments in the main on the following points:-

- The proposal does not affect the setting of the Mount; it is hidden by the existing mature tree screen; this is the case all the way along Hillview Road. There is no view of the Mount itself from Hillview Road.
- Proposal does not affect the ecology of or the recreational/ elevational use of the Mount.
- The mature high amenity value trees are to be retained within the proposal; so long and short-range views will be maintained.
- Archaeological matters can be dealt with by condition.
- No effect upon protected species.
- Trees to be removed are with the full knowledge and consent of the Council's Woodlands Section.
- Timber frame construction would not be intrusive in terms of effect upon mature trees that are on site; the terraces will be constructed outside of the root protection zone.
- Protective guards to the drains and drain runs and crown thinning could be controlled by condition.
- In design terms this scheme resolves better the relationship between the site and neighbouring properties.
- Tree protection could be controlled by condition and the contractors' area would be outside the root protection zone of the high amenity trees.

REPRESENTATIONS

Essex Wildlife Trust: No objections to the proposals.

Essex County Council Highways Officer: No objection, subject to conditions controlling: pedestrian visibility splays, drainage details (site run off), parking and turning details and that the applicant be required to construct a bound surface for 10m at either end of Hillview Road.

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - 29 March 2007

OFFICERS' COMMENTS

It is considered that the proposed highway works to Hillview Road could not be justified, given the scale of the development hereby proposed, namely 2 additional dwellings in an established street of some 24 dwellings.

2 letters have been received from local residents. One letter is fully supportive of the proposal and the other comments that the architectural drawings are impressive, well designed and thought has been given to the existing environment and dwellings in view of this application. The only concern is the condition of Hillview Road itself; this should not be affected by the proposal and the Council should look to safeguard it through the construction phase.

ITEM 3 07/00023/FUL

1 further letter from a local resident has been received which makes the following comments and objections in addition to those set out in the report:-

- Questions scale of the plans, as dimensions of access road do not tie up.
- Questions practicality of location of the bin store.
- Turning head insufficient for refuse vehicle.
- Location of bin store next to brook will encourage vermin.
- Plan does not maintain the density and pattern of existing development.
- Already significant number of similar sized dwellings at Coppice Gate, the Mullberries, Crown Hill, etc.
- Detrimental to the open aspects of the Country Park.
- Loss of trees and shrubs.
- Position of Block C will detract from general amenity enjoyed.
- Ask that the wall around the car park be no higher than the existing boundary fence.
- Concern for party wall issues, given excavation within 3m.
- Concern for risk of flooding, given filling of culvert.
- Site outline in conflict with deeds to neighbouring dwelling.
- Consider appearance of Blocks A and B inferior to previous application.
- Requests additional planting along boundary with No. 64.
- Request fence to No. 64 be replaced if removed as a result of works to remove trees.
- Requests obscure glazing to landing window of Block A.
- requests building work be restricted in hours 9 am 5 pm weekdays and 9 am – 1 pm Saturdays.
- Requests developer ensures minimal disturbance by contractors' vehicles and removes dirt and repairs damage to highway.

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - 29 March 2007

ITEM 4 07/00121/FUL

PLANNING APPLICATION DETAILS

Since the publication of the report officers have noted an error in the original report which incorrectly quotes measurements for the dimensions for the buildings. For the avoidance of doubt the correct dimensions are:

Depth of the flats (north to south)

Width of the flats (east to west)

Ridge height of the flats

Ridge height of the detached dwelling

20.3 metres

19.5 metres

8.5 metres

This error in the original report related only to the elevational plans, such that all the scaled spatial distance dimensions quoted in the report remain correct. Street scene perspective drawings submitted with the application demonstrate the relationship in the street to existing buildings. Furthermore, the officer's assessment of the proposal and its impact on its neighbours remain as set out in the report.

Management of the Pond

Members at the site visit raised concerns relating to the management of the pond once development is complete. The applicants advise that as part of the purchase of the site there is a private covenant requiring the long-term retention of the pond. In addition, the applicants confirm, whilst previously there has been no management plan for the pond, they will establish a management company whose responsibility it will become. The intention of the application is to retain a freehold interest in the site, so it will remain the applicants' ultimate responsibility.

It is considered reasonable to ensure that the pond is maintained as part of this application and retained in the future so a condition can be added to the consent.

Bin Stores

The applicants confirm that the bin store is large enough to accommodate the required bins for the development.

REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbours

A further 18 letters received from neighbours, totalling with those in the report 39 letters of objection. Additional issues raised are summarised below:-

- The building is a historic property, worthy of protection.
- The tree report submitted is submitted by a company who are not qualified to comment on the trees.
- It is likely that the trees will be adversely affected by the flat

development.

- There is evidence of bats and newts in the area contrary to the surveys undertaken.
- What about the covenants?
- The occupants of the Close would be watched all the time.
- Concern about the boundary treatment blocking in the existing pond.
- The sewerage system could not cope.

Rayleigh Town Council: No objection.

Urban Designer

The application is generally acceptable. There is a minor issue with regard to the detached house in that a corner has been subtracted from the pitched roof that leaves it appearing unfinished. Infilling this corner would resolve this issue. There are additional conditions required relating to the materials to be used in the development. Specifically, the balconies shall be smooth float finish and the eaves shall be drop soffit.

Officers' Comments: This is considered to be a minor issue and is not considered to cause significant demonstrable harm to the street scene. Officers can control materials used in the development by Condition 2 in the report.

Natural England

No objection.

Historic Buildings Adviser

The officer visited the site and advises that the building is not a historic building. It is likely the dwelling was built in the 1930s. It has been altered from the original chalet. The chalet opposite this site is the same shape and dimensions as the original property on the application site. The materials used in its construction of the development are traditional looking vernacular. There are some attractive stained glass windows that may be of local interest. It is unlikely that a notable architect designed this property, it is not worthy of listing and it is now so markedly altered that one would expect it to be excluded from the Local List.

Officers' Comments: The property was not included within the previous Local List.

RECOMMENDATION

The additional condition should become Condition 20.

Condition No. 20

The existing pond on the site shall be retained and maintained in

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - 29 March 2007

Addendum

	the existing form and shall not at any time be filled in or reduced in size without first obtaining written consent from the Local Planning Authority.
Item R5 07/00030/FUL	Essex County Highways
	The Highway Authority have confirmed that irrespective of the outcome of the planning application for the installation of the ramp, for it to proceed the applicant would be required to enter into a Minor Works Agreement with the Highway Authority.
	Such an agreement would require, amongst other things, design, specification and method of working, together with a Bond and site supervision fees.
	Under this arrangement the Local Highway Authority would have direct powers to ensure the retention of an adequate width of highway adjoining the limits of the proposed development.