

**PLANNING SERVICES COMMITTEE  
THURSDAY, 23rd JANUARY 2003**

**ADDENDUM**

<p><b>Schedule Item 1</b></p>	<p>Rochford Parish Council support the application but would ask the Council to take into consideration that part of the site that lies within the Conservation Area and ensure that the development is in accordance with this.</p> <p>The Essex Police Crime Reduction Officer makes a number of recommendations to reduce vandalism, vehicle crimes, theft of staff belongings and theft of hospital equipment. These recommendations are presently being considered.</p> <p>Anglian Water - no objection, subject to standard conditions</p> <p>Rochford &amp; District Chamber of Trade &amp; Commerce - objects to the proposals as they stand, on the basis that the site should be considered together with the Wimpey and Essex CC sites as part of a comprehensive development brief. The application should be deferred for 6 months to allow time for the 'joined-up' planning issues to be considered. Consideration should be given to the provision of a one way access/exit to the proposed supermarket site through the hospital site, exiting via Union Lane. This should be considered along with the proposed scheme to access Back Lane car park from Locke Hill. An independent traffic survey should be commissioned to explore the long-term effects of using Union Lane to exit the supermarket site. Doubts are expressed regarding the amount of car parking proposed. It is questioned whether a Right of Way has been produced through the site, which it is now intended to extinguish through the erection of security fencing. The Council is asked to satisfy itself that the site is 'quiet' enough for mental health uses, given its location close to roads and the railway, and whether such a use would upset the 'fragile social balance' within the Town Centre.</p> <p>One letter of support has been received.</p> <p>One letter has been received, objecting to the proposal broadly on grounds relating to the intended use of the hospital.</p>
<p><b>Schedule Item 2</b></p>	<p>One additional letter has been received from a neighbouring occupier (who had previously responded) objecting on the basis that the proposals would result in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Loss of privacy, daylight and sunlight;</li> <li>- Constitute extension of urban sprawl very close to the Green Belt boundary;</li> </ul>

	<p>- Development out of character with the nature and appearance of the area</p> <p>The applicant has corresponded with Officers with regard to the suggested reasons for refusal. With regard to the first reason (accessway), in a letter dated 22 January, the applicants agent has indicated that a reduced specification roadway is likely to be accommodated within the proposals.</p> <p>With regard to the second reason, the applicant indicates that further evidence can be presented to demonstrate that this can be adequately resolved.</p> <p>On this basis that applicant requests that authority be delegated to Officers to determine these proposals favourably, subject to the resolution of these issues. The applicant also indicates that they have no intention of allowing the outline application (for which this is a reserved matters) to run out of time.</p> <p><b>Officer comment:</b> It appears to Officers that further amendment can be made to the scheme which may indeed overcome the suggested reasons for refusal. This is not yet fully demonstrated. In addition, even if these proposals were to be refused at this meeting, the outline application would not time expire, as a separate reserved matters application is still under consideration at appeal (ref 02/00453/REM).</p> <p>Despite that, it would appear that no particular purpose would be served by moving ahead to refusal if the applicant is willing to further amend the scheme. It is suggested that request of delegated authority be followed but instead:</p> <p><b>Revised Recommendation:</b> Members are requested to DEFER consideration of this report to allow the proposed amendments to be fully considered by Officers.</p>
Schedule Item 3	<p>The following are responses that have been received following consultations on the appeal:</p> <p>English Nature is satisfied that no SSSIs are affected. It indicates however that the presence of protected animal species is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. If any are suspected to be present, the appropriate ecological surveys should be undertaken.</p> <p>Four neighbouring occupiers have responded raising, in the main, the following issues:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- development appears to encroach on the Green Belt and not in accordance with the development plan;</li> <li>- loss of openness and not in keeping with the character of the area, dominant in terms of frontage;</li> <li>- loss of privacy, sunlight/ daylight;</li> <li>- will exacerbate existing poor traffic conditions and all residents will have vehicles due to poor local public transport/ distance to station</li> </ul>
<b>Schedule Item 4</b>	<p>Four neighbouring occupiers have responded to consultation raising, in the main, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- no objection to the replacement of the existing dwelling with one new;</li> <li>- encroachment onto Green Belt land;</li> <li>- extension of urban sprawl;</li> <li>- loss of privacy, daylight/ sunlight;</li> <li>- existing road infrastructure not sufficient to deal with new development;</li> <li>- surface and foul water drainage problems;</li> <li>- out of keeping with the character of development in the area/ over-development/ dominant;</li> </ul>
<b>Schedule Item 5</b>	<p><b>Hawkwell Parish Council</b> has no objections</p> <p>The Essex Police Crime Reduction Officer has no objections in principle but has raised a number of issues with regard to the internal design and management of the site which could assist to solve existing criminal activity problems.</p> <p>Of relevance to the planning permission, the Police Officer suggests the use of more/ better targeted external lighting and some building design matters.</p>
<b>Schedule Item 6</b>	<p>The Head of Housing, Health and Community Care repeats the points made in relation to the earlier scheme. These are that conditions be applied with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- fume extraction and ventilation equipment;</li> <li>- openings in the building and the installation of equipment;</li> <li>- lift</li> </ul>
<b>Schedule Item 8</b>	<p>A further letter of objection has been received, reiterating concerns relating to loss of privacy and surface water flooding.</p>

<b>Referred Item R9</b>	<p>A further letter has been received in support of the proposal in essence on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Rayleigh Town Council have a lottery grant of £5,000 which must be taken up by the 28<sup>th</sup> February;</li> <li>(b) The hardstanding has been the subject of local discussions and the Police, shopkeepers and public are awaiting its provision to enable youngsters to enjoy their sport and fun without interfering with other sections of the community;</li> <li>(c) cannot understand how Rochford Planning Officers can recommend acceptance of the first application, but now recommend refusal.</li> </ul> <p><b>Officer Comment:</b> Subsequent to the first recommendation of approval, that application was of course refused by Committee and then dismissed on Appeal. The Inspector analytically considering its impact in particular in relation to the Surgery, the rose garden and local residents. These aspects form further material considerations which have to be assessed in considering the current application and the assessment has led to the recommendation of refusal before Members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(d) draws attention to the legal detail that the application is purely for a hardstanding and there is no requirement for the applicant to declare for what use the area is intended and that the youngsters involved are 100% co-operative in trying to get their project off the ground.</li> </ul>
-----------------------------	---