

<p>Item 6</p> <p>17/00996/FUL</p> <p>New Airport Terminal Building, London Southend Airport.</p>	<p><b>1. Objection Received from Public Notification</b></p> <p>An objection has been received in relation to the application on the following grounds; Insufficient drainage as the airport was dumping water into a brook. Parking, over-development and traffic development. This is just another form of expansion to increase passenger numbers when the airport promised no expansion once they got the runway extension.</p> <p><b>2. Additional Consultation Response from ECC Lead Local Flood Authority</b></p> <p>We would still continue to maintain our holding objection. Although we are still not content with the details submitted which are contrary to our best advice, we understand the position of the Council may be to grant and condition the application. In this instance I would recommend the following conditions:-</p> <p><u>Condition 1</u></p> <p>No works shall take place until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro geological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>The scheme should include but not be limited to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Limiting discharge rates to 1 in 1 year green field rate unless this is demonstrated not to be feasible, in which case a minimum of 50% betterment of the existing brown field rate, for all storm events up to and including the 1 in 100 year rate plus 40% allowance for climate change.</li><li>• Provide sufficient storage to ensure no off site flooding</li></ul>
--	--

	<p>as a result of the development during all storm events up to and including the 1 in 100 year plus 40% climate change event.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Details of capacity within the existing drainage network if this is to be utilised.</li><li>• Final modelling and calculations for all areas of the drainage system, including run off rate and storage provision.</li><li>• The appropriate level of treatment for all run off leaving the site, in line with the CIRIA SuDS Manual C753.</li><li>• Permission from the relevant water authority to connect to the existing surface water sewer.</li><li>• Detailed engineering drawings of each component of the drainage scheme.</li><li>• A final drainage plan which details exceedance and conveyance routes, FFL and ground levels, and location and sizing of any drainage features.</li><li>• A written report summarising the final strategy and highlighting any minor changes to the approved strategy.</li></ul> <p>The scheme shall subsequently be implemented prior to occupation.</p> <p>Reason</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water from the site.</li><li>• To ensure the effective operation of SuDS features over the lifetime of the development.</li><li>• To provide mitigation of any environmental harm which may be caused to the local water environment</li></ul>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Failure to provide the above required information before commencement of works may result in a system being installed that is not sufficient to deal with surface water occurring during rain fall events and may lead to increased flood risk and pollution hazard from the site.</li></ul> <p><u>Condition 2</u></p> <p>No works shall take place until a Maintenance Plan detailing the maintenance arrangements including who is responsible for different elements of the surface water drainage system and the maintenance activities/ frequencies, has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Should any part be maintainable by a maintenance company, details of long term funding arrangements should be provided.</p> <p>Reason</p> <p>To ensure appropriate maintenance arrangements are put in place to enable the surface water drainage system to function as intended to ensure mitigation against flood risk.</p> <p>Failure to provide the above required information before commencement of works may result in the installation of a system that is not properly maintained and may increase flood risk or pollution hazard from the site.</p> <p><u>Condition 3</u></p> <p>The applicant or any successor in title must maintain yearly logs of maintenance which should be carried out in accordance with any approved Maintenance Plan. These must be available for inspection upon a request by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason</p> <p>To ensure the SuDS are maintained for the lifetime of the</p>
--	---

	<p>development, as outlined in any approved Maintenance Plan, so that they continue to function as intended to ensure mitigation against flood risk.</p> <p>If you would be minded to condition the application, while our holding objection is maintained, the LPA would be liable for any flooding on site. This is due to the application being granted against our recommendations.</p> <p><b>3. Officer Comment in Response to ECC Lead Local Flood Authority Comments</b></p> <p>In officers' view there is capacity within the airport site to provide the necessary water storage in a surface water drainage scheme to ensure that the run off rate required by ECC Lead Local Flood Authority can be met. As a consequence, officers are satisfied that an acceptable detailed surface water drainage strategy can be achieved and as a result it would be appropriate to condition the requirement for such. The condition(s) is worded such that no development could commence before the detailed surface water drainage strategy was agreed by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>The recommendation is as originally published with the substitution of condition 11 with the three additional conditions, as stated above.</p>
<p><b>Item 7</b>  <b>17/00588/REM</b>  <b>Land North Of London Road And South Of Rawreth Lane And West Of Rawreth Industrial Estate</b>  <b>Rawreth Lane</b>  <b>Rayleigh</b></p>	<p><b>1. Additional Ecological Information Supplied</b></p> <p>Since completion of the officer report further ecological information has been supplied by the agent from their ecological consultant in the form of field notes from 2016, a badger and water vole activity plan from 2016 and an accompanying letter. This is in response to the comments received from the Council's ecological consultant.</p> <p>This confirms that survey work has been undertaken in 2016 and advises that the position remains as reported in the approved 2015 outline application, with the absence of protected species within the reserved matters area of the site.</p>

	<p>Officer Comments</p> <p>Mitigation surrounding great crested newts continues to be controlled through condition 23 of the outline application which requires a European protected species mitigation strategy to be prepared in consultation with the Local Planning Authority and Natural England prior to commencement of development in each phase for the protection of great crested newts.</p> <p>It remains officers' view, confirmed further through the supporting letter and additional survey information provided by the applicant's ecological consultant, that no further conditions are required regarding ecology at the site.</p> <p><b>2. Further Comments from Agents</b></p> <p>The agents have raised concern with the condition suggested by officers as part of this application.</p> <p>The agents consider that the condition does not meet the 'necessity' test and that it is repetition of conditions already attached to the outline application. They do not consider that further conditions are needed.</p> <p>Officer Comments</p> <p>Conditions need to meet 6 tests before being imposed. They need to be necessary, relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects. The condition imposed seeks to ensure that the proposal as currently submitted does not conflict with the plans and details approved and in consideration as part of the outline application. Therefore it is considered to meet the 6 tests. However, it is considered that it could be more reasonably worded and a revision to the condition can be found in the conclusion below. The reason has also now been included.</p> <p><b>3. ECC Education Comments</b></p> <p>Whilst referred to within the officer report these were omitted from the consultation section of the report. The comments received were as follows:-</p> <p>With regard to the footpath now proposed it's outside the school boundary (which will be fenced to 1.8m high) and</p>
--	--

	<p>the other side of a bund. As we usually have roads and pathways abutting a school boundary, we have no issue with a footpath, as designed by the applicant. However, on inspecting the plans, I note a gas PRI is located near to the school boundary. What is this and does this inhibit the development of the proposed school site...I assume there is a gas pipeline feeding it.</p> <p>Officer Comments</p> <p>No further comments with regard to the location of the footpath.</p> <p>With regard to the gas PRI, the agents have supplied further information confirming that the PRI itself does not impact the proposed school site as it falls outside of the school boundary and within the developer land and that no gas apparatus is proposed to enter the school boundary as the new network will all run along the proposed footpath/main spine road below ground. They go on to advise that there will be sufficient capacity allowed for within the PRI to provide a gas supply to the school in the future; this will require a connection to the school boundary in the future. Therefore, the positioning of the gas PRI is not considered objectionable in relation to the positioning of the school.</p> <p><b>4. Conclusion</b></p> <p>Recommendation to remain as approval, subject to the following revised condition:-</p> <p>(1) The strategic landscaping plan hereby agreed shall only be implemented in accordance with the following:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Proposed native hedgerow corridors shall be provided across the site in accordance with details submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority as part of the discharge of planning condition 21.</li><li>b. The existing hedgerow to the north eastern corner to the boundary with Rawreth Lane shown as H001 on drawing no. 3878-D-1 within the Arboricultural Impact Assessment produced by Haydens as part of the approved outline application 15/00362/OUT shall be retained.</li></ul>
--	---

	<p>c. The two trees identified as T003 and T004 on drawing no. 3878-D-1 within the Arboricultural Impact Assessment produced by Haydens as part of the approved outline application 15/00362/OUT shall be removed.</p> <p>d. The drainage scheme must accord with drawing no. 47065807-DES-01 P7 by URS submitted as part of application reference 17/00943/DOC or an equivalent drawing as agreed through condition 34 of the approved outline application 15/00362/OUT.</p> <p>REASON: To ensure consistency and accuracy between the plans and details agreed as part of the outline application 15/00362/OUT and the approved application.</p>
<p><b>Item 8</b>  <b>Land between</b>  <b>Star Lane and</b>  <b>Alexandra Road,</b>  <b>South of High</b>  <b>Street Great</b>  <b>Waking.</b></p>	<p><b>1) Further Neighbour Letters</b></p> <p>Two further letters have been received from the following addresses:-</p> <p>High Street: 251, 277.</p> <p>And which in the main make the following comments and objections:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Still wholeheartedly object to this development.</li> <li>○ I'm particularly concerned that I am unable to view the plans. The website design lumps all the documents in with the plans (I guess) which makes them extremely difficult to locate. This is very unfair.</li> <li>○ I am particularly concerned if the plans locate houses that directly overlook or impose on my property (251 High Street). If they must be built I would request that gardens or municipal open space are placed closest to existing properties.</li> <li>○ Access must not be via High Street, which is very over contested and unsafe for pedestrians.</li> <li>○ Over population already exists in the village - therefore flats and small high density housing are not viable.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Significant investment in the village upkeep and facilities must be secured.</li> <li>○ Bus services and travel links have to be reviewed.</li> <li>○ Land to the north of plots 123 - 125 indicates there will be some tree planting on the edge of the development. It is not clear if there is to be a ditch or embankment. My property and my neighbours enjoy a south facing garden. Any planting will have a detrimental effect on our outlook and will cast shade on our gardens and in particular my substantial green house as I am a keen horticulturalist. Any trees over 2m in height will put the greenhouse in shade rendering it useless.</li> <li>○ I would like to request some screening in place for the duration of construction to protect against wind blown dust and debris causing harm and obscuring the greenhouse glazing as I would not have access during construction to clean it.</li> <li>○ It is not clear if the emergency access path to the High Street is to be a permanent right of way. This will have a significant effect on my property and security. Please can some consideration be given to our privacy by way of low rise bollard lighting and a higher fence.</li> <li>○ A large willow tree is situated on the verge of the High Street with the emergency access. Measures will need to be put in place to ensure that there is no ground heave by removing the tree and that any subsequent damage that may occur to my property is made good by the developer.</li> <li>○ I would also request that no construction traffic uses this access other than to construct and landscape the emergency access.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Item 9</b></p> <p><b>17/00928/COU</b></p> <p><b>Convert Kings Head public house to 11 no. multiple occupancy bed</b></p>	<p><b>1) Rochford Parish Council Response</b></p> <p>Members strongly object to this application on the following grounds:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Over-development of the site.</li> <li>○ The building is listed, both externally and internally.</li> <li>○ Lack of bin storage.</li> </ul>

<p><b>sitting units and 3 no self contained shop units</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Internal partition walls are not in keeping with the listed building.</li><li>○ Concerns about the structure of the building, particularly the top storey.</li><li>○ A safety report on the impact of this change of use in the area.</li><li>○ Members understand other applications to change the use of commercial properties to residential have been refused in the Market Square.</li><li>○ Members were also concerned about car parking.</li></ul> <p>Officer Comments</p> <p>Irrespective of the concerns made, officers consider that the proposal meets national and local planning policy.</p> <p><b>2) ECC Highways Response</b></p> <p>As stated in the Parking Standards Design and Good Practice September 2009, a lower provision of vehicle parking may be appropriate in areas where there is good access to alternative forms of transport and the proposal site is considered to be in a sustainable location in the immediate vicinity of Rochford town centre with good access to public transport and other facilities, therefore.</p> <p>From a highway and transportation perspective the impact of the proposal is acceptable to the Highway Authority subject to the following conditions:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Cycle parking shall be provided in accordance with the EPOA Parking Standards. The approved facility shall be secure, convenient, covered and provided prior to occupation and retained at all times.</li><li>2. Prior to commencement of the development, the areas within the curtilage of the site for the purpose of loading</li></ol>
--	---

	<p>/unloading/reception and storage of building materials and manoeuvring of all vehicles, including construction traffic, shall be provided clear of the highway.</p> <p>3. Prior to first occupation of the proposed dwellings the developer shall be responsible for the provision and implementation of a Residential Travel Information Pack for sustainable transport, approved by Essex County Council, to include six one day travel vouchers for use with the relevant local public transport operator. One pack per dwelling.</p> <p>Officer Comments</p> <p>It is considered that sufficient cycle parking is provided within nearby Back Lane car park. Condition 2 is not considered reasonable here as there is nowhere within the curtilage of the site whereby such storage/reception could take place. As the property is within multiple occupation it is not considered that condition 3 would be appropriate here.</p> <p><b>3) Neighbour Responses</b></p> <p>Responses have been received from the following addresses: 27 - 31 South Street (The Gunnery), 26 North Street, 9 West Street and The Old Forge, Back Lane, which can be summarised as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ It is a listed building grade II and in a Conservation Area, and is contrary to the Rochford Town Centre Area Action Plan.</li><li>○ We already have enough anti-social behaviour in the Square and this application for proposed development of the Kings Head can only make the situation worse. We already have two other homes of multiple occupation in the town and any more will be putting a stain on the character of a town of historic interest.</li></ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ It has safety issues – fire escape immediately onto the road with buses pulling in all the time. There seems to be no mention of access in the design and no mention of parking.</li><li>○ Rochford District Council seems intent on destroying the lovely historic town of Rochford instead of improving it for the residents.</li><li>○ Council strategy for the Market Square is to maintain and promote commercial activity.</li><li>○ Listed iconic and historical building.</li><li>○ Density of development inappropriate in this position.</li><li>○ No parking provision available.</li><li>○ Economic balance of shops and residential inappropriate.</li><li>○ Potential fire hazard for the Market Square.</li><li>○ No recreational facility for tenants.</li><li>○ Drainage not capable of accommodating mass use (already a drains problem in the alley way).</li><li>○ Probable escalation of anti-social activity in the Market Square; a threat to existing businesses.</li><li>○ In a nutshell – totally inappropriate use of a much loved building.</li><li>○ I am the Practice Manager for the adjacent property, Oak Dental Rochford, and feel this would not be a suitable location for social bedsits.</li><li>○ This property has been a public house for over 200 years and as you are aware is a Grade 2 listed building. To deviate its heritage would be tragic for</li></ul>
--	--

	<p>Rochford.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Located in the Market Square - this building is surrounded by local businesses like us. To convert this historic building would be a huge mistake. Rochford already has a big problem with drugs and alcohol abuse and I feel this would only make this worse. We have no local policing since the station was closed a few years back. What provisions have been made for parking for these residences?</li><li>○ Being a dental practice directly next door, we have concerns with anti-social noise during our working hours.</li><li>○ I do not understand why this application is even being considered. It is not in keeping with the area and can only bring it down. We do not need more flats; we do not have enough parking as it is. We do not have the Police to manage these places. We do not want bedsits in Rochford.</li></ul> <p>Officer Comments</p> <p>Irrespective of the concerns made, officers consider that the proposal meets national and local planning policy.</p> <p><b>4) Supporting Letter</b></p> <p>A supporting letter has been provided from 18 South Street which states as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ My property is situated next door to 22 South Street, which has been developed into new residential accommodation.</li><li>○ Before the development started I had constant issues with a local gang of young people who would regularly throw stones, break into the empty buildings causing noise and damage to my property as well. On one occasion the garages at the rear of the empty property</li></ul>
--	---

	<p>were set on fire, which caused great distress as they are within 3 metres of my property.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ The owners of the property contacted me before the start of the building works and provided me with their contact details. When any issues occurred they always answered and responded straight away. They rectified issues and also carried out repairs to my own property from damage caused by vandalism.</li><li>○ They took the costly decision to install overnight and weekend security whilst conversion was taking place to alleviate any issues.</li><li>○ There was no disruption to me whilst the building works were ongoing and I was always kept informed if there were any potential points that would cause me an issue; there were none.</li><li>○ Since the property has been occupied I haven't experienced any of the problems that I had before.</li><li>○ The property has been maintained and managed to a very high standard.</li><li>○ The owners have restored the building very much in keeping with the historical heritage of Rochford. I have lived in Rochford since 1961 and I am very passionate about my local area.</li></ul> <p>Officer Comments</p> <p>Officers consider that the supporting information assists in providing clarity regarding the concerns raised within the previous Committee meeting.</p> <p><b>5) Conclusion</b></p> <p>The recommendation remains as approval, subject to conditions.</p>
--	---

<p><b>Item 10</b></p> <p><b>17/00974/LBC</b></p> <p><b>Convert Kings Head public house to 11 no multiple occupancy bed sitting units and 3 no self contained shop units and internal and external alterations</b></p>	<p><b>1) Rochford Parish Council Response</b></p> <p>As per item 9 above.</p> <p><b>2) Neighbour Responses</b></p> <p>Responses have been received from the following addresses: 9 Brayers Mews, 28 North Street and 80 Oxford Road, which can be summarised as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This development is totally unsuitable for the building and this surrounding area. It is situated in the Market Square where current and new businesses and services should be supported and encouraged. Over the last few years Rochford has lost vital services, ie, Police station, college, supermarket and smaller independent businesses. I feel that the location and history of the premises means that it should not be permitted a change of use to residential.</li> <li>○ I feel that as a listed building the whole town should be able to enjoy it. Rochford is an historic town and more should be done to promote the buildings we have. The occupancy could add to already congested parking areas, something I feel strongly about as a resident who has a car and no parking space.</li> <li>○ This application was refused and altered by reducing the number of occupants. The building is of historic value to Rochford and I feel to turn it into bedsits will lower this value. Also there is no parking for any vehicles and it will bring increased congestion. My personal view is the area is already being over-developed with housing and this will bring an added strain on resources.</li> <li>○ In addition, the addresses written on the report as '68 South Street' should be recorded as '6B South Street'.</li> </ul>
---	---

	<p><b>3) Supporting Letter</b></p> <p>As per item 9 above.</p> <p><b>4) Conclusion</b></p> <p>The recommendation remains as approval, subject to conditions.</p>
--	--