

PLANNING SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING
Thursday 31st July 2003
ADDENDUM

Deferred Item D1	<p>One additional letter has been received. The issues raised are broadly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• that a four bedroom property was previously approved, whereas a six bedroom property has been built;• that the roof was made larger with the premeditated intention of forming a six bedroom dwelling• that neighbours were not notified until a retrospective planning application was received, by which time the building was complete• the visual impact of the dwelling• that the street trees do not screen the house for a considerable part of the year when they are not in leaf• the second floor windows in the flank should not have been there in the first place• the flank elevation overshadows the adjoining property (No.14)• that the house may be extended in the future, and that a balcony enclosure could be provided on its roof - that the balustrade and French doors should be removed to prevent this happening. <p>The letter also asks why the Council did not stop the builder when it became apparent that the house was different from the one approved, and questions why the application has taken so long to be placed before Committee?</p> <p>A letter has been received from the applicant, setting out the reasons why the property as built differs from that granted permission. His points are broadly as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• the actual size of the property has not changed [Comment: This is not so. The alterations do increase the scale of the roof, albeit by a modest amount]• two rooms have been provided in the roof, by utilising a massive roofspace serving no useful purpose• the windows added to the flank elevations break up a huge and boring wall of brickwork• the French doors were provided to give the main bedroom more natural light• the balustrade was provided to put pot plants on and enhance the rear view
-----------------------------	---

	<p>The applicant concedes that these matters should have been dealt with when the building was being constructed, but notes that he did speak to the then case officer, and took certain comments on board - reducing the size of the balustrade originally fitted and using obscure glazing/fixing shut the second floor flank windows.</p>
Referred Item R2	<p>The Woodlands & Environmental Specialist advises that the tree is a Scots Pine, approximately 55ft, and has a high amenity value. It can be seen from a long distance in both directions along Eastwood Road.</p> <p>Although a viable and healthy specimen, it will suffer from the excessive amount of Ivy growing up to about 35ft. This bushy growth must be removed other wise the effects on the health of the tree could be serious.</p> <p>Any future development must take this tree into consideration. It is protected by TPO No. 26/2002.</p>
Schedule Item 3	<p>Rayleigh Civic Society has no comment to make following receipt of the site layout plan.</p>
Schedule Item 5	<p>The Head of Housing, Health and Community Care has commented on the proposal and whilst acknowledging that the environmental impact assessment that accompanied the application recognised the need for sound proofing to Smithers Cottages, it is considered that the plot/garden area of Smithers Cottages also requires some protection.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION</p> <p>Further to the points raised in the main body of the report it is recommended that the following be added to the response to Southend on Sea Borough Council:-</p> <p>‘That the Local Planning Authority look into the potential/feasibility of providing an adequate acoustic buffer/barrier between the new roadway and the plot/garden area of Smithers Cottages in order to provide the occupants of these properties with a suitable amount of protection.’</p>