

<p><b>Item 1</b> <b>08/00613/FUL</b> The Chequers Inn</p>	<p>The Members Site Visit on the 16<sup>th</sup> August 2008 raised a number of questions which are answered below:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It is confirmed that the entire building of the Chequers Inn including the outbuilding to the rear is not a Listed Building.</li><li>• A letter has been received from Building Design Associates (agents) dated 18<sup>th</sup> August 2008 which states that the car park to the rear of The Chequers is entirely private and the only persons permitted to use this out of trading hours are the owners, the managers (who live on site) and the staff with permission from management. The occupiers of Chequers Court are only entitled to use the designated right of way.</li></ul> <p><b>Backland Development</b></p> <p>Backland development is not in principle an unacceptable form of development, helping to fulfil requirements of PPG3 by making the best use of available land for development. Despite this, backland development must not compromise the amenities of existing residents and will be tested against Policy HP14 of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The two proposed bungalows within the application represent backland development. The bungalows are simple in form, reaching a maximum ridge height of 5.2m. Although it is considered that the bungalows are not to a design satisfactory within a conservation area location, they are not considered to be of an unacceptable scale or form to the detriment of the street scene or to residential amenity. The bungalows are separated sufficiently from neighbouring properties and are not considered to give rise to an unreasonable loss of amenity to the occupiers of surrounding neighbouring properties. The bungalows are considered to have a satisfactory relationship with existing buildings and as such satisfy part ii of Policy HP14.</p> <p>Policy HP14 also specifies an adequate means of access, the application site already has an existing access which would provide satisfactory to service the car parking spaces for all proposed residential units.</p> <p>As stated in the report all the specified amenity areas are below Council standards and as such represent an overdevelopment of the site. In principle, should the development be revised as to overcome concerns of the bungalow design to be</p>
---	--

	<p>sympathetic to the conservation area and introduce sufficient amenity areas, the proposal would be a reasonable form of backland development, in accordance with Policy HP14 of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Comments have been received from <b>three</b> additional neighbours and are set out below:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Sewerage outlet is very inadequate</li><li>• Not sufficient parking provided</li><li>• Loss of a valued amenity</li><li>• The proposed development is well presented and from a number of aspects is sympathetic to its surroundings in the conversion zone, however there is strong concerns about excessive building density with regard to the two bungalows</li><li>• Backland development should be avoided</li><li>• All neighbours would prefer Chequers to remain as a public house</li><li>• Proposal not in keeping with the requirements of Canewdon</li><li>• Such housing is likely to attract commuters and add to the traffic problems</li></ul>
<p><b>Item 2</b> 08/00565/FUL 289 Ferry Road</p>	<p>The agreement to secure provision for affordable housing equating to 3 Units as required is engrossed and signed by the developer and is anticipated to be signed by the Housing Association before the meeting.</p> <p>Members will be aware that the standard template for the provision of Affordable Housing used in this case and recommended by the Law Society does not include the retention of the units in perpetuity. This amongst other reasons is because tenants have existing rights to purchase the Housing Association share of the unit in which they reside. Whilst it is likely that the units would be retained by the Housing Association, in the event that a unit would be sold by the Housing Association the monies raised can only be used in the provision of affordable housing elsewhere and so effectively subsidizing the provision of affordable housing on another site. In these circumstances officers are comfortable that the provision of the units required is effectively retained in perpetuity.</p> <p>For clarification, given the strong likelihood that the final signing of the legal agreement by the applicant and Housing Association provider will conclude within the remaining time</p>

	<p>period for determination of the application, the <b>RECOMMENDATION</b> is <b>APPROVAL</b> as set out in the report. Only in the event that the legal agreement is not concluded in the timeframe will the alternative fall back position of <b>REFUSAL</b> be relied upon.</p>
<p><b>Item 3</b> <b>08/00541/FUL</b></p> <p>Land Adj Asda, Priory Chase, Rawreth.</p>	<p>Since the preparation of the report two further letters of objection have been received and four letters from the applicants agents in response to the officer recommendation.</p> <p>These letters have not been summarised or reported here as the application has since been <b>withdrawn</b> by the applicant and does not now fall for consideration.</p>
<p><b>Item 4</b> <b>08/00486/FUL</b> 89 High St, Rayleigh</p>	<p>The applicant has confirmed that the proposed re-development does not result in the loss of any retail units.</p> <p>In response the objections received following consultation the applicant's agent raises the following points:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number of signatures on the petition does not appear to be a significant number</li> <li>• Concern by the suggestion that the end of the clubs tenancy and the need to relocate should be linked to the possible demise of the business</li> <li>• There has been a decline in snooker halls nationally for a number of reasons and the tenant has previously confirmed a significant decline in business</li> <li>• Redevelopment is adequate reason for the non-renewal of a lease</li> <li>• The current tenancy is due to end in September 2009</li> <li>• Alternative premises could be sought locally</li> <li>• The site is in a town centre with 100% coverage and thus no scope for on-site parking</li> <li>• There are good alternative modes of transport available and the development is in line with national directives promoting town centre mixed use sustainable redevelopment</li> <li>• Local policy is for zero parking and there is a large local authority car park with good capacity available next door to the site</li> </ul> <p><b>Transportation Services:</b> No problems are foreseen in relation to the development. It is advised that even at peak there is always parking available and that parking of cars overnight is allowed so residents with car park season tickets are accommodated.</p>

	<p><b>ECC Schools, Children and Families Directorate:</b> Confirm that a developer contribution of £14,326 is sought with regard to the provision of one early years and childcare place.</p> <p>Officer comment: There is no statutory requirement for the provision of early years or childcare places by the County Council and in these circumstances a developer's contribution is not being sought.</p> <p><b>Neighbour Representation:</b> A neighbour letter that accompanied the petition submitted in objection to the application makes the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Change from leisure to residential not in keeping with the retails units of the town centre</li><li>2. Proposal is another loss of a leisure unit in Rayleigh</li><li>3. Already many flats in Rayleigh, the proposal is overdevelopment and does not fall within guidelines with regard to car parking</li><li>4. Occupiers of the flats will have an outlook onto the back of shops, noise from the High St and Webster's Way and also have to pay six days a week for parking</li><li>5. Closure of the club will be a severe blow to many local people</li></ol>
--	--