

**PLANNING SERVICES COMMITTEE**  
**17<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2002**

**ADDENDUM**

<p>Agenda Item 9</p>	<p>Following the compilation of the report in this matter a further site inspection has taken place to allow the latest position to be taken into account.</p> <p>At a visit of 16 December protective fencing was in place (either individually or collectively) for all but three of the trees on the site. Those three trees are the smaller specimens and are the maximum distance possible from the works on the site. However, in some cases for the larger trees the fencing is not placed at the extent of the crown spread.</p> <p>A limited amount of material was stored at the site near/under the trees, but most notably towards the site frontage where the permitted proposals allow for hard standing in any event.</p> <p>The inspection revealed that the hardstanding actually implemented is, in some respects, greater in extent than that permitted. This matter will need to be the subject of separate consideration. However it remains possible for fencing to be implemented at the full extent of the crown spread of the trees, although this would incorporate small parts of the hardstanding now implemented.</p>
<p>Schedule Items 2 and 3</p>	<p><b>The Georgian Group</b> object, stating that merit of these buildings and the contribution they make to the Conservation Area has been established in previous letters. The Group notes from the conclusions of the Morton Partnership's structural survey that the financial cost of repairing the buildings is likely to be considerable and to outweigh the end value, but notes that no figures have been provided. The Group draws attention to the feasibility study to retain the buildings. The Group continues to believe that the presumption should be to retain the buildings, and that this proposal for the re-use of the building should be fully explored before demolition is considered.</p> <p><b>The Southend Society</b> objects to the proposal, urging the restoration of the building.</p> <p>A petition with 106 signatories has been received, objecting to the demolition of 50-52 West St and supporting the building's renovation. Of the 106 signatories, 63 live in Rochford.</p> <p>Four further letters have been received objecting to the proposal. These echo the broad concerns of the other objection letters received, as outlined in the Officer's report.</p>

	<p>One further letter has been received supporting the proposals on the grounds that they will enhance the whole area help to rejuvenate West Street.</p> <p>A letter has been received from the Applicant, addressing the concerns of objectors. The broad points made are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The structural survey concludes that the buildings cannot be economically refurbished, despite the increase in market values since the last survey</li> <li>• The replacement building has been designed to replicate the existing building down to the finest detail. Even if the repair of the building was possible, 60-70% would be new build.</li> <li>• The feasibility study indicates that the refurbishment of the existing building could only break even if the site could be purchased for £89,000, which it cannot</li> <li>• The architects have worked hard to produce a scheme which enhances the Conservation Area and the County Council's Historic Buildings &amp; Conservation Advisor concludes that this would be the case with the current proposals</li> <li>• The Highway Authority does not object to the proposals</li> <li>• The principle of backland development has been accepted by Rochford Council and the County Council's Historic Buildings &amp; Conservation Advisor</li> <li>• No restoration can take place unless there are sufficient funds. If, as in this case, the cost of restoration exceeds the value of the site/buildings, restoration will not take place</li> <li>• Comment has been made that 'the owners of the site are only interested in profit.' The owners, like any other business, will not embark on any project unless it considers that it will show a profit.</li> </ul>
Schedule Item 4	<p>With regard to the number of vehicles which may be attracted to the site, further information has been received from the applicant following the committee site visit. The information demonstrates, in the view of the applicant, how many vehicles would be at the site in the worst case (that is no car sharing or non car traffic). The maximum number of vehicles is shown to be 40 and traffic to and from the site would be staggered through the day of play.</p> <p>The applicant also demonstrates that he has investigated with Essex CC the possibility of a 'walking bus' scheme.</p> <p>The planning agent emphasises the willingness of the applicant to investigate with the landowner of the brickworks and the land adjacent Cherry Orchard Lane (if it is private) the use of buildings and provision of road passing bays.</p> <p>On further consideration, and at the request of a Member it is recommended that the following amendments are made to the</p>

	<p>suggested conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- additional condition removing the normal permitted development right to erect means of enclosure on the site (Part 2, Class A of the GPDO).</li> <li>- Condition 9, amendment to make it clear that the school holiday evening use times are to be Monday to Friday.</li> </ul>
Schedule Item 5	<p><b>Second Round</b></p> <p><b>English Nature</b> comments that the application site is close to a cemetery which provides a suitable site for protected reptiles. In its opinion the legislative requirements are addressed by the submitted report and its proposal for future surveys. Any clearing on the site should proceed with caution and the developer should consider the need for any separate licensing if/when works proceed.</p> <p>The <b>Head of Housing, Health and Community Care</b> suggests informatives be added to any permission relating to risk assessment and a condition in relation to the installation of any lift.</p> <p><b>Rayleigh Town Council</b> verbally indicates that it repeats its earlier comments.</p> <p>The applicant has written requesting that the matter be <b>deferred</b> from this meeting. He indicates that additional survey work in relation to reptile species is planned to take place at the earliest opportunity. He also indicates a willingness of the applicant to enter into a legal agreement to undertake works which would go toward meeting the requirements of the Highway Authority. Lastly, arrangements are to be made to undertake further tree survey work on the site.</p> <p>The applicant considers that a refusal or withdrawal now would not be helpful to the Authority as it would need to undertake repeat consultation and other work when the matter is resubmitted (at cost to the Authority).</p> <p>The requirement for a survey of the site for reptile species in the Spring, means that any deferment of this application is likely to be for a period of many months. Given this to be the case, it is considered that a decision should be taken on the merits of the current application.</p>