

<p>Schedule Item 1 05/00514/FUL</p>	<p>Consultation responses ROUND TWO</p> <p>Essex County Council Highways:- No objection, subject to matters relating to access and visibility splays. These can be addressed in appropriate conditions (conditions as per ECC email dated 29/11/05).</p> <p>Essex County Urban Designer:- The only amendment that has taken place is the removal of Plot 7. Plot 6 is still too close to the listed building. Considering this application is within the curtilage of a listed building I would expect a high standard of design which this proposal does not achieve. I would therefore recommend that this application is refused. (Officers' Comments: at the pre application stage the applicant sought the advice of the County Conservation Officer in order to determine the extent of the appropriate rear garden to the White House. This was agreed and reflected in the submitted drawings, given this added to the deletion of plot no 7 from the scheme and that plot 6 is sited obliquely from the rear of the White House this revised scheme is considered satisfactory).</p> <p>1 further letter from a local resident not raising any new issues to those already reported.</p>
<p>Schedule Item 2 05/00522/FUL</p>	<p>In relation to this application the Council have received further revisions to the proposed layout. These changes relate to the deletion of the rear boundary fence to the rear of the Block B, also the deletion of the pair of detached bungalows to be replaced by a pair of simple plan form cottages, as requested by the County Urban Designer, similar to the original building proposed here.</p> <p>The consultation responses, as reported below, are in relation to the second round. Re-Consultation on round three has been arranged and delegated authority is sought for the Head of Planning Services to decide the application following the expiry of this consultation process (consultation expires 2 January).</p> <p>It is considered that the proposed changes to this scheme are acceptable and help to maintain the character and appearance of the site, and would improve the setting of the White House. The changes to the scheme do not affect the density of the scheme as reported within the previously tabled report.</p> <p>Consultation Responses ROUND TWO</p> <p>Essex County Council Highways:- No objection, subject to matters relating to access and visibility splays. These can be addressed in appropriate conditions (conditions as per ECC email dated 29/11/05).</p>

	<p>Essex County Council Archaeological Officer:- The site lies within an area that has been fully evaluated. No archaeological deposits were identified. No archaeological recommendations are being made.</p> <p>Engineers:- No further comments.</p> <p>Essex County Council Urban Designer:- Concerned over a number of issues;</p> <p>The elevations to block A have improved though there should be no brick dressings (arched lintel) in rendered elevations, instead a raised render band or pentice board feature is more appropriate. The roof plan as indicated on the site plan also needs to be amended. (Officers' comments: could be controlled by conditions)</p> <p>The 1.8m high close boarded fence to the front of the White House is still indicated. This should be replaced by hedge planting to enhance the setting of the listed building. A post and rail fence can be erected on the Block B side of the hedge. (Officers' comments: on revised drawings ROUND THREE fence is shown to be removed and is also controlled by planning condition).</p> <p>The rear elevation Block B does have a problem with the duality of windows in the gables which could be resolved if the gables were omitted. The skin deep gable features should be avoided. (Officers' comments: these details could be controlled by planning conditions)</p> <p>The detached bungalows are totally inappropriate. They do not sit well within the complex of the courtyard and detract from the overall composition. They are suburban in character with over wide gable ends, deep plan forms and poorly designed elements. If a single storey building is required in the area of the site then it should be designed with the proportions of a small barn with a very simple plan form – ie one single duo pitched roof and have simple features and no projections. (Officers' comments: on revised drawings ROUND THREE the bungalows have been deleted from the proposal to be replaced by a simple plan form pair of cottages.)</p> <p>The hard and soft landscaping also needs to be designed - planting seems to be placed in just left over space. (Officers' comments: these elements are to be controlled by planning conditions).</p> <p>Considering this application is within the curtilage of a listed building I would expect a high standard of design which this proposal does not achieve. I would therefore recommend that this application is refused.</p> <p>Rayleigh Civic Society:- No comments to make.</p>
--	--

	<p>English Nature:- The site should be surveyed in respect of protected species with appropriate mitigation. (Officers' comments: the site has been surveyed and there are no protected species on the site and the water quality within the pond is poor).</p> <p>Head of Housing, Health and Community Care:- No objection subject to informatives:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SI16 Control of Nuisances • The applicant is strongly encouraged to attain at least a 'Good' rating under the Building Research Establishment Eco Homes Scheme (Environmental Rating for Homes) for development hereby permitted. Full details and guidance of the Eco Homes scheme are available from www.bre.co.uk/ecohomes <p>1 further letter from a local resident not raising any new issues to those already reported.</p> <p>RECOMMEDATION: APPROVE</p> <p>That the application be delegated to the Head of Planning Services following the expiry of the consultation process.</p> <p>Further to the tabled report the following heads of conditions should be attached to any approval, and the S106 agreement shall be amended to include the transfer of the bellmouth junction onto Eastwood Road to be offered for adoption as publicly maintainable highway.</p> <p>11. Notwithstanding the details shown on the plans hereby approved a revised rear elevation to Block B shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The revised details shall show the deletion of the rear gables and also the deletion of the 'skin deep' features. The revised details, as approved, shall be fully implemented at the site and be retained as such thereafter.</p> <p>12. Notwithstanding the details shown on the plans hereby approved revised elevation details of Block A shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The revised details shall show the deletion of the brick arches and the introduction of a raised render band pentice board feature within the rendered elevations. The revised details as approved shall be fully implemented at the site and remain as such thereafter.</p> <p>13. No development requisite for the construction of the residential units hereby approved until the bellmouth junction onto Eastwood Road to the internal tangent point of</p>
--	---

	<p>the radius kerbs has been constructed to binder/base course.</p> <p>14. Notwithstanding the details shown on the plans hereby approved and prior to the residential units coming into beneficial use the following shall be fully implemented at the site:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.4m x 90m visibility splays as measured from the carriageway edge shall be provided either side of the new access with no obstruction above 600mm within the splay • The junction of the new estate road with Eastwood Road to be provided with 7.5m radius kerbs • The access to parking spaces 1 and 2 to be widened to 3.6m at the back of footway and splayed to a suitable dropped kerb crossing. This will allow vehicles to turn out of the access without using the whole of the access road creating conflict close to the access junction with Eastwood Road • The distance between the cart lodge and planted area shall be increased to a minimum 8 metres to allow vehicles to enter and leave the parking area in forward gear. • A 1 metre wide strip to be provided at the end of the parking area to allow vehicles using spaces 11 and 12 to enter the spaces with greater ease • A demarcation strip to differentiate the highway and the private areas, details to be agreed with the Highways Authority, prior to the commencement of works • The access way to be constructed of permanent materials, details of which to be agreed by the Local Planning Authority. <p>Informatives:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SI16 Control of Nuisances • The applicant is strongly encouraged to attain at least a 'Good' rating under the Building Research Establishment Eco Homes Scheme (Environmental Rating for Homes) for development hereby permitted. Full details and guidance of the Eco Homes scheme are available from www.bre.co.uk/ecohomes
<p>Schedule Item 3 05//00933/FUL</p>	<p>Essex County Council Highways recommends refusal for the following reasons:</p> <p>The parking layout as shown is not acceptable. The proposed development as shown will cause occupants of five properties to converge onto Holt Farm Way via one access. The lack of turning facilities within the site will result in lengthy reversing movements which in turn may lead to possible conflict with other vehicles</p>

	<p>attempting to enter or leave the site between parked vehicles and along the narrow access to the new dwelling . Furthermore, access and egress to the new dwelling will be virtually impossible without overrunning the parking area for No. 30.</p> <p>Parking provision for No. 30 will be reduced to 1 useable space which, if not used correctly, could result in obstruction of the access to the new property and may lead to displaced parking on the bend of this busy estate road causing a danger and obstruction to other road users to the detriment of highway safety.</p> <p>Environment Agency</p> <p>No comments to make. Advise that surface water drainage should be controlled as near to source as possible using sustainable drainage methods.</p> <p>Woodlands Section Arboricultural Officer</p> <p>No comments to make.</p> <p>3 further letters have been received and which make the following comments and objections in addition to those set out in the report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of privacy • Once built it would be easier for future occupiers to propose dormers • Concern that proposal above a main sewer forcing future access to the sewer to be via Silverthorne Close which would be unfair and totally unacceptable • Access is currently shared by four properties and six vehicles. Provision of a further dwelling accessed on this bend would exacerbate road safety problems • Scale, size and form of the development is unduly obtrusive • Unacceptable noise disturbance to adjoining properties • Inspectors' concerns regarding access have not been addressed sufficiently • Precedent • Overdevelopment <p>Recommended that the Reason is expanded. In particular, the resultant lengthy reversing movements and displaced parking on the bend of the busy estate road are likely to cause danger and obstruction to other users of the highway.</p>
Schedule Item 4	Consultation responses:-

<p>05/00899/FUL</p>	<p>Environment Agency:- advises of general surface water drainage issues</p> <p>Head of Housing, Health and Community Care: No objection subject to the following informatives:-</p> <p>SI16 Control of nuisances</p> <p>The applicant is advised to contact the Head of Housing, Health and Community Care at the earliest opportunity in order to discuss the requirements necessary to meet current food hygiene legislation.</p> <p>2 further letters from neighbours have been received:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking will cause noise problems and pollution • Entrance is too small causing congestion in Love Lane • No provision is made for delivery vehicles for the shop • Loss of privacy • No need for further food establishments within Rayleigh
---------------------	---