

<p>Item 1 12/00109/FUL Pearsons Farm, London Road, Rayleigh</p>	<p>Contents</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Comments from Rayleigh Town Council2. Comments from Rochford District Council Consultant3. Additional Site History4. Officer Comment and Revised Recommendation <p>1. Comments from Rayleigh Town Council</p> <p>Object to this application due to insufficient amenity space and the danger of cars exiting onto the A129.</p> <p>2. Comments from Rochford District Council Consultant Ecologist</p> <p>Advise that the application is not accompanied by any ecological information despite there being clear impacts to trees and the presence of a large pond within Pearsons Farm. Aware of a record of a Great Crested Newt from a site approximately 350m to the west.</p> <p>In the absence of any supporting ecological information recommend refusal.</p> <p>3. Additional Site History</p> <p>Further to paragraph 1.9 (page 5) of the officer report the following application is considered relevant by officers:-</p> <p>Application No. ROC/62/83 Outline application to erect one detached house and garage. Permission refused on 13 April 1983 for the following reasons (summarised)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Importance to keep open frontage to setting of estate.2. Would encourage further sub-division of the curtilage to No. 176 detrimental to open setting of the estate and multiple access points contrary to highway safety.3. Original curtilage to No. 176 already substantially reduced unduly impacting on the setting of the Listed Building.4. Would result in a dis-unified and incongruous scene resulting in new dwelling and Listed Building set in isolation.5. The proposal would not provide a vehicular access to the garage within the application site.
---	--

	<p>4. Officer Comment and Revised Recommendation</p> <p>The Council's consultant ecologist raises objection to the absence of any ecological survey to determine the presence or otherwise of protected species and the impact upon them of the development. In view of the expert advice more recently received, the Council has reason to suspect the presence of protected species on the site that should be taken into account. The absence of an ecological investigation to accompany the application is grounds for an additional reason for refusal.</p> <p>The REVISED RECOMMENDATION is REFUSAL for the reasons set out in the report and, in addition, the following reason:-</p> <p>5. The proposal is to a site with the presence of trees and within 350m of record of a Great Crested Newt. In these circumstances the Local Planning Authority considers it likely that protected species could be present on the site. The application does not include in the application particulars of any assessment of the presence of protected species and the impact upon them, if found, of the development proposed. The Local Planning Authority is therefore unable to consider this matter in the interests of those protected species that may or otherwise be found present.</p>
<p>Item 2 12/00103/FUL London Southend Airport, Rochford</p>	<p>Contents</p> <p>1. ECC Highways Consultation Response and Officer Comment 2. RDC Environmental Protection Unit Response 3. Natural England Consultation Response 4. Additional Neighbour Contributors 5. Clarification Relating to Current Aircraft Movement Limits</p> <p>1. ECC Highways Consultation Response and Officer Comment</p> <p>No objection, subject to the following conditions:-</p> <p>1. Prior to commencement of the development, the areas within the curtilage of the site for the purpose of loading/unloading /reception and storage of building materials and manoeuvring of all vehicles, including construction traffic, shall be identified clear of the highway, submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>2. Prior to commencement of the proposed development details of a wheel cleaning facility within the site and adjacent to the egress onto the highway shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The wheel cleaning</p>

	<p>facility shall be provided at the commencement of the development and maintained during the period of construction</p> <p>Officer comment: the above condition would be imposed.</p> <p>2. RDC Environmental Protection Unit Response</p> <p>The Head of Environmental Services has no adverse comments in respect of this application.</p> <p>3. Natural England Consultation Response</p> <p>Natural England does not consider that this application poses any likely or significant risk to those features of the natural environment for which Natural England would otherwise provide a more detailed consultation response and so does not wish to make specific comment on the details of this consultation.</p> <p>The lack of case specific comment from Natural England should not be interpreted as a statement that there are no impacts on the natural environment. Other bodies and individuals may make comments that will help the Local Planning Authority to fully take account of the environmental value of this site in the decision making process.</p> <p>4. Additional Neighbour Contributor</p> <p>5 additional objections making the following additional points:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Concern regarding the proposed pollution control system, which would involve airport operatives manually closing the relevant diversion chambers prior to de-icing of aircraft whose competence is questioned in light of scenes of operatives carrying out their duties witnessed in a recent Stobart TV programme. On this basis, the proposed controls cannot be relied on. ○ Residential development would be required to account for at least 10% energy sourced from renewable energy; the development should aspire to include energy efficiency designs to support this objective. ○ Flood risk concerns. ○ Additional passenger numbers would require use of different planes, giving rise to concern regarding noise and emission impacts. ○ Impact on protected species and ecology. ○ Lack of parking facilities. ○ Visual amenity impact on Green Belt. ○ Concern that number of jobs stated to be created would not materialise as many jobs are being taken by transfers from people currently employed at Stansted.
--	---

	<p>5. Clarification Relating to Current Aircraft Movement Limits</p> <p>The Committee report at paras. 2.87, 2.102 and 2.108 could be interpreted as meaning that the current cargo movement limit at the airport is additional to air transport movement limit. To clarify, the Cargo Air Transport Movement Limit is 5,330 and that the 5,330 is included within the overall Air Transport Movement limit of 53,300.</p>
<p>Item R3 12/00017/COU Land East of Land Adjacent Broomhills, Stambridge Road, Stambridge</p>	<p>Contents</p> <p>1. MLM Flood Risk Assessment and Officer Comments 2. Conclusion</p> <p>1. MLM Flood Risk Assessment and Officer Comment</p> <p>The applicant instructed MLM to complete a flood risk assessment, which was submitted to the Council on 17 April. The assessment concludes as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed change of use is appropriate in terms of the NPPF. ○ The nature and extent of any predicted flooding is such that there would be plenty of time for evacuation of players and spectators as the onset of an extreme tidal event would be both slow and visually obvious. The proposals can therefore be regarded as safe. ○ The proposals do not cause any increased run-off or any displaced flood water and therefore no increased flood risk to others. ○ There is no reason to object to the proposals on grounds of flood risk. <p>The assessment has been completed on the basis of no hard surfacing being proposed. Whilst none is proposed as part of this current application, suggestions of parking at this site, if requiring a hard surfaced area, would need to consider impact on flood risk and could be controlled by planning condition.</p> <p>It is considered that the proposed flood risk assessment addresses the reason for refusal.</p> <p>2. Conclusion</p> <p>The officer recommendation is revised following receipt of the flood risk assessment and is now a RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL for the following reason:-</p> <p>REASON FOR DECISION</p> <p>The proposal is considered not to cause undue demonstrable harm</p>

	<p>to any development plan interests, other material considerations, to the character and appearance of the area or residential amenity such as to justify refusing the application.</p> <p>It is advised that the following planning conditions should be attached to an approval:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. SC4B – Time Limits Full2. The cricket pitch hereby approved shall not be used for any sporting, recreational or leisure purposes between 1 November and 31 March inclusive in any year.3. No development shall commence, before plans and particulars showing precise details of where the parking of vehicles would take place and the surfacing of such a parking area are submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, such provision shall be implemented and maintained in the approved form and used for no other purpose that would impede the parking of vehicles.4. No buildings or structures (including those that may be considered mobile) shall be constructed or sited on the land without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority via the submission of an application for planning permission.5. No development shall commence, before plans and particulars showing precise details of the precise sizing and location of the cricket pitch hereby approved are submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The size of the cricket pitch shall be in accordance with the requirements provided by The English Cricket Board (ECB) and the Marylebone Cricket Club (MCC) stated within Supplementary Planning Document 3. The cricket pitch shall be implemented as agreed and maintained in the agreed form.6. No development shall commence, before plans and particulars showing precise details of a satisfactory means of surface water drainage (including attenuation measures if appropriate) for this site, have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any scheme of drainage details, as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, shall be implemented commensurate with the development hereby permitted and made available for use upon completion of the cricket pitch. <p>Informatives</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. It is recommended that the Cricket Club signs up to the Environment Agency Flood Warning System and makes visitors aware (e.g. through notices in the nearby facilities building) that they might be required to evacuate upon receipt of a flood warning or if flooding appears likely to encroach upon the cricket field.
--	---

	<p>2. The applicant is advised that access to public footpath no. 26 should at no time be obstructed, nor should parking occur on the footpath. There should be no encroachment of the footpath from the cricket pitch. The public's rights and ease of passage over the footpath shall be maintained free and unobstructed at all times.</p>
--	---