

PLANNING SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING
Thursday 25th September 2003
ADDENDUM

Schedule Item 2	<p>Hullbridge Parish Council have responded to the reconsultation in respect of revised plans, as follows: Objections were raised on the grounds this proposal is in Green Belt; whilst the County Surveyor and Head of Health, Housing & Community Care repeat their original views.</p> <p>A replacement conclusion as follows is recommended: "Whilst the majority of the application site has an established lawful use, the area that does not have an established lawful use constitutes inappropriate development within the Metropolitan Green Belt and should be resisted on this basis."</p>
Schedule Item 4	<p>A letter has been received from the agents acting on behalf of Bellwinch Homes. This sets out that the foul and surface water drains are the same as those approved under the Countryside scheme, and that Bellwinch has the right to connect into the drainage system provided by Countryside. It is considered that this satisfies the Environment Agency's requirements (see paragraph 4.12 of the officer's report)</p> <p>The agents have also provided draft plans illustrating changes to the finishes/detailing of the blocks of flats, to improve the overall character and appearance of the buildings. A verbal update on this issue will be given at the Committee, with reference to the plans.</p> <p>Two further letters have been received from local residents. The letters echo the broad objections already received, as set out at paragraph 4.17 of the report.</p> <p>It is noted that the planning condition recommended by the County Archaeologist has been omitted from the officer's report. The following condition (No. 26) is therefore added: 26. No development or preliminary groundworks of any kind shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the local planning authority. The programme shall set out that work will be undertaken by a professional archaeological team, and will consist of a series of trial trenches to assess the importance, nature and depth of archaeological deposits, followed by any larger scale excavation to record the deposits prior to their destruction.</p>
Schedule Item 5	<p>The Head of Housing, Health & Community Care reports that:- "there is potential for national air quality objectives to be exceeded as a result of this development. The noise criteria imposed on the original application are not based on current background levels or current guidance. Therefore an air quality assessment and noise impact assessment should be submitted prior to a decision being made."</p>

<p>Schedule Item 6</p>	<p>Essex County Council (Highways) has provided the following updated view:</p> <p>"This authority has received from Messrs Boreham a transport assessment regarding the proposed change of use of former mushroom farm buildings to seed-bed business starter units. This authority has had no experience of vehicular activity that might be generated by such developments and, as you will know, this authority recommended refusal based on concerns of highway safety. This objection was made regarding access to the site by large commercial vehicles based on first hand observation and the submission of photographs by residents.</p> <p>There are concerns by residents regarding the activities on the site, some allegedly without the benefit of planning consent, that already generate a number of HGV movements and that the proposals will merely exacerbate an already difficult traffic situation.</p> <p>The report by Messrs Boreham suggests that, based on data they have accumulated at two other similar developments, movements, though not altogether discounted, will be negligible.</p> <p>I have no reason not to accept the findings by Messrs Boreham. However, in order that some reassurance can be given to the frontagers, I would nevertheless ask that if your authority is minded to grant consent, that some form of suitably worded condition be attached limiting vehicular movements to and from the site."</p> <p>A letter has been received from Rochford District Chamber of Trade & Commerce supporting the application. The letter states: "We support this application as it would increase substantially the availability of small commercial units within the District, thus hopefully reducing out-commuting. We would also consider it not unreasonable to limit the hours for collections and deliveries, for the benefit of local residents, yet to allow tenants access at other times, subject to noise controls."</p> <p>A further letter has been received from a local resident, referring to a width restriction placed upon Windsor Gardens. The letter infers that signage drawing attention to the width restriction has been moved to make the road look wider. The letter also states that the road is wider than the width restriction (3.5m), and considers that the road has been widened in the past 20 years. Further information on the history of the road is included in an email attached to the letter.</p> <p>Having regard to the list of conditions recommended in the officer's report, it is recommended that a further condition be imposed as follows:</p> <p>7. No sales to the public shall take place from any part of the building, or elsewhere on the site in respect of any goods or items associated with any of the Class B1 (light industrial) uses carried out in the building.</p>
-------------------------------	--