

**PLANNING SERVICES COMMITTEE
THURSDAY, 20TH FEBRUARY 2003
ADDENDUM**

<p>Deferred Item D1</p>	<p>One further letter has been received from a resident of Landsdowne Drive relating to local flooding problems caused, in the writer's view, when the Swallow Close development was constructed several years ago</p> <p>The Head of Housing Health & Community Care has revised his earlier consultation response, requesting that conditions, rather than informatives, be employed to deal with any potential contamination of the site (due to the former use of the land to the West) and to agree an appropriate form of glazing, given the potential for noise from the nearby railway. Two additional conditions are therefore recommended, viz:</p> <p>12. SC87 Contaminated Land</p> <p>"Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, details of the glazing to be used shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such a form of glazing as is approved shall thereafter be installed in the building and be maintained in the approved form throughout the lifetime of the development."</p>
<p>Referred Item R2</p>	<p>A further letter has been received from the applicant, together two additional plans: an indicative internal layout plan and a site layout showing parking provision.</p> <p>The applicant considers that the cafe is mainly to be for the use of customers at the petrol station and shop. It is not intended that the café would to operate outside the normal business hours of the petrol station. Parking provision is proposed at the Northern end of the site and the applicant considers that this would in no way prejudice the continued use of the site for petrol sales.</p> <p>Officer comment:</p> <p>A condition restricting the hours of operation of the Café is already recommended. A further condition is recommended relating to the submitted parking layout plan, viz:</p> <p>"Prior to the commencement of the use of the cafeteria hereby approved, details of a line of bollards to be provided in the position marked in GREEN on the site layout plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The bollards shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to the commencement of the use of the cafeteria, and shall thereafter be permanently maintained (and replaced as necessary) throughout the lifetime of the development."</p>

<p>Schedule Item 3</p>	<p>Eight additional responses have been received from members of the public, in response to the additional consultation. Five of these comprise a repeat of the letter copied by a number of residents and sent earlier originally. Additional points have been made by them, and the remaining three respondents however, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - dwellings do not comprise affordable dwellings; - marginal change to positioning does not overcome objections; - The Croft represents an example of the poor development that would result from these proposals; - Concern at the situation should the flood prevention measures fail; - Disturbance, noise pollution etc as a result of the siting of the new access close to an existing dwelling; - Unlike the Croft in that these proposals have a greater impact on the adjacent frontage housing; <p>The additional consultation period on the recently revised plans is still to conclude. As a result it is recommended that, if members are minded to grant planning permission in this instance, a decision is not made at this meeting, but that authority is delegated to the Head of Planning Services to release the decision, subject to all the conditions as set out in the report, at the conclusion of the consultation period.</p>
<p>Schedule Item 4</p>	<p>Essex County Council Archaeological Officer confirms that the area of the site has been damaged by former quarrying and that no archaeological recommendations are made as a result</p> <p>Essex County Council Highway Authority confirms the situation set out in the report that it has no objections subject to the applicant being required to enter into a Legal Agreement to provide financial assistance to junction improvements at the Purdeys Way/ Sutton Road junction.</p> <p>In addition, it suggests that conditions be applied in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - width of accesses; - pedestrian visibility splays; - marking out of parking spaces; - materials of construction of parking areas; <p>The applicant has submitted further comments in relation to the sequential site assessment. These relate to the land identified for supermarket use in Rochford. It is considered that the site is not realistically available for the use proposed and would not be suitable for it in any event. Further comments are set out in justification for the need for the unit, given other furniture retail units at the Airport Retail Park. The applicants conclusion</p>

	<p>remains that the unit is justified.</p> <p>The applicants transport consultant additionally comments that it would be appropriate for the developer of this to contribute towards road improvements if these are being programmed by the Highway Authority. The consultant comments that, although public transport facilities to the site are not good, it is not anticipated that many of the customers would travel to the site by that method in any event. It would be reasonable he suggests however, that a 'green transport plan' be secured for employees.</p> <p>Further comments are set out in justification of the parking provision to be made available at the site.</p> <p>Officers comment: these matters are addressed in the report and it is not considered that different conclusions are reached taking this additional information into account.</p>
Schedule Item 7	<p>Two letters have been received from residents abutting the site. One of these questions whether a crash barrier could be provided to prevent cars damaging the boundary fence, and also questions how the fence will be maintained. The hours of construction are also queried. The other letter queries the location of the bin store.</p>
Schedule Item 8	<p>A letter has been received from the Chairperson of the Social Club, explaining the Club's wish to extend the clubhouse. The Club has expanded to 12 teams with 200 football players (approx.); 500+ members, including the families of the players. Only a fraction of that number of people are ever in the club house at any one time but the Club hope that an extension will allow more people to attend the monthly functions that take place.</p> <p>There are inadequate facilities on site for disabled users and the Club feels that the extension will allow this to be addressed. Furthermore the facilities available for female teams are also limited and the Club would like to improve these.</p> <p>Last year the club had two tournaments to raise money for the Southend Building Blocks charity and would like to be able to hold such a tournament every year to raise money for charity. Furthermore in the future the club hopes to open their doors to the community of Rochford.</p> <p>Since the management of the Club has changed, they consider that the relationship with the local residents has improved. This has resulted, in particular, from Club members mainly using</p>

	<p>the designated car park.</p> <p>A further letter of objection has been received. In the main, this echoes concerns raised in the earlier letters received. The writer notes that children climb on the roof of the existing pavilion and cause nuisance, and considers that any extension will compound this problem. Parking in Doggetts Close is also raised; the writer considers that this could obstruct emergency vehicles.</p>
--	---