

<p>Item 4  11/00689/FUL  Former E-On  site 190  London Road  ,Rayleigh.</p>	<p><b>Contents:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Further neighbour representations received in response to the notification on the revised plans.</b></li> <li><b>2. Natural England.</b></li> <li><b>3. Note from the applicants advising how Secure By Design has been taken into account in the proposed development.</b></li> <li><b>4. Reply to above from Essex Police Architectural Liaison.</b></li> <li><b>5. Officer comment on Secure by design issue.</b></li> <li><b>6. Letter from the applicant.</b></li> <li><b>7. Revised recommendation.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>1. Further Neighbour Representations Received in Response to the Notification on the Revised Plans</b></p> <p>Two letters have been received from the following addresses:-</p> <p>81, Eversley Road, Benfleet.  22, Hackamore, Benfleet.</p> <p>And which in the main raise the following additional comments and objections:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The revisions made to the planning application above still do not make provision for the continuation of the small section of the site at the north east corner to remain for D1 use.</li> <li>○ Despite attempts to enter into consultation with Bellway Homes about this particular section of the site they acquired in November 2011, they have not agreed to meet with or consult with any of the community group members that currently occupy the site.</li> <li>○ I am respectfully bringing to the Council's attention that if it was considered appropriate to have an area of land for D1 community use when the previous houses were built, how much more is it still appropriate to maintain that D1 use when it is proposed to build over 100 new houses in the area.</li> <li>○ I am one of about 100 people who currently benefit by attending the Mt Carmel Messianic Congregation who at present manage the existing D1 area in question, but as we have been served notice we will be leaving the site on 31 May 2012. As a local</li> </ul>
---	--

community group we are in the difficult process of trying to find a suitable alternative meeting place. Due to a lack of D1 designated sites in the Rayleigh area suitable to our use, we are now having to look at relocating further afield, which will mean local attendees having to travel out of their local residential area. I believe the Council should continue to ensure that there are adequate sites available for D1 use when new developments for residential housing are proposed. Therefore I am asking that the Council maintain at least a small area of the 190 London Road site for D1 use so that when the additional houses are built and families move in there will be the opportunity for community groups to meet.

- The various parliamentary members all agree that the establishment of local grass root community groups bring huge benefits to residential areas.

## **2. Natural England**

Advise that the advice provided in the previous response applies equally to this amendment. Have no additional comments to make in relation to protected species.

## **3. Note from the Applicant Advising how Secure By Design has been Taken into Account in the Proposed Development**

Note – the information provided by the applicant deals with secured by design issues in some detail, and is reproduced in full below.

The proposed scheme for the re-development of the former E-On offices on the north side of London Road, Rayleigh, has been designed to meet the principles of the Secured by Design (SBD) initiative. The current standards for the design of new residential development are set out in the Association of Chief Police Officers' publication New Homes 2010, which is applicable to all SBD applications made after 01 January 2010. The document sets out 38 areas that need to be considered, divided into two main sections: the site layout and physical security.

The 18-page SBD New Homes application form is presented in the form of the checklist and has been used to set the structure of this note. The issues that the scheme needs to address with regard to the site layout in order to complete a successful Secured by Design application are as follows:-

- 1.5 The planning application to which this checklist refers demonstrates adherence to the seven attributes of a sustainable community.

	<p>The seven attributes of a sustainable community, as set out in Safer Places – The Planning System and Crime Prevention (April 2004) are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Access and movement – the proposed scheme creates well defined routes and a clear differentiation between the public realm and private space. The hierarchy of spaces is clear and entrances are positioned in order to permit convenient movement without compromising security.</li><li>• Structure – the whole site will be in residential use and is enclosed by other residential development, therefore there will be no conflict between different uses.</li><li>• Surveillance – all parts of the public realm are overlooked by the proposed homes, and where a blank frontage cannot be avoided (such as where a rear garden abuts the public realm), surveillance is provided by the building on the opposite side of the street. Where semi-private areas are proposed, such as the parking courtyard serving plots 15 to 19, the same principle of overlooking from the houses that are served by the space is applied.</li><li>• Ownership – the scheme has been designed in order to avoid the creation of “left over” pieces of land, with a clear sense of ownership to the curtilage of each plot. The majority of the site will be sold as the curtilage of the new homes, either to private owners of each house or to a Registered Provider for the affordable housing, whilst the roads will be adopted by Essex County Council and the central area of public open space will be adopted by Rochford District Council. As such, territorial responsibility will be created for private areas, alongside community responsibility for the shared area of open space.</li><li>• Physical protection – security features will not detract from the street scene, with brick walls used to enclose private areas that abut the public realm and pinch points and additional side windows used to enclose the entrance to semi-private areas.</li><li>• Activity – the level of human activity will be appropriate for a residential area served by a cul-de-sac. Care has been taken to ensure that the central area of open space and the water course are well overlooked by the adjoining properties.</li><li>• Management and maintenance – the ongoing upkeep of the proposed homes is mainly reduced to a plot-by-plot level, with only a few areas of communal access and car parking proposed. In these areas, the conveyance of the land</li></ul>
--	---

	<p>ownerships will make clear who is responsible for the management and maintenance of the space.</p>
1.9	<p>The Design and Access statement submitted with the planning application to which this checklist refers demonstrates an awareness of the crime and disorder issues in the area of the planning application and informs the planning officer of the measures to be taken to mitigate any identified problems. The Design and Access Statement submitted in support of the application for planning permission considers the need to “design-out” opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour. Care has been taken to design a scheme that does not require mitigation measures to address shortfalls in the quality of the proposals.</p>
3.1	<p>The development is not compromised by excessive permeability caused by the inclusion of too many routes. Although there has been pressure from one of the consultees for additional routes through the site to be created, these have been resisted and the scheme has two points of access, on the southern boundary and in the north eastern corner. There is no route through the site for vehicles.</p>
4.1	<p>Vehicle, pedestrian and cycle routes are visually open, direct and well used and are not segregated. There is a clear hierarchy to the road layout, but there is no segregation between different road users. There is good visibility through the public realm and the pedestrian link between the two cul-de-sac roads is placed in a logical and legible position.</p>
5	<p>Footpath landscaping minimises the opportunity for crime and disorder. The proposed footpath link is straight, avoiding any corners or hidden areas that could lead to problems.</p>
6	<p>Footpath seating, design and location avoids the creation of inappropriate loitering places and opportunities for crime and disorder. No seating is proposed and no opportunities for loitering are provided.</p>
7, 19.1, 19.6	<p>Appropriate lighting has been provided for footpaths. Lighting to both footpaths and roads will be provided to Essex County Council’s standards for adoption.</p>
8	<p>Consideration has been given to the delay of a footpath in a phased development. The footpath link will be provided when it is safe for pedestrians to walk through the site – both in terms of crime/disorder and health and safety during construction works.</p>

	<p>9.1 Communal areas have been designed and located in such a way as to allow natural surveillance, prevent unauthorised vehicle access, reduce the opportunity for crime and disorder and not immediately abut residential buildings.</p> <p>The central area of open space is enclosed on all four sides by roads and drives, creating a buffer between the public and private space. Houses face onto the public open space from all sides, creating the setting of the space as well as providing the required natural surveillance. A timber arris rail marks the edge of the landscaped area, preventing unauthorised access by cars and ensuring that users do not stray into the road.</p> <p>9.2.2 Adequate mechanisms are in place to maintain communal areas. It is intended that the public open space will be adopted by Richford District Council.</p> <p>9.6 Private outdoor space has been secured to restrict access to the occupants of the building for which this space has been provided. All houses are provided with their own private amenity space to the rear of the building. The small block of apartments (plots 38 to 42) is provided with a communal amenity area to the rear of the building, with access via side gates to which only the residents of the buildings will be provided with a key.</p> <p>10.1 Boundaries between private and public space are clearly indicated. All front gardens are proposed to be filled with soft landscaping in order to create a semi-private space that separates the street from the house. Where rear gardens abut the public realm, they are enclosed by a 1.8 metre high brick wall to provide security and to maintain the amenity of the space behind.</p> <p>10.5 Access paths to the sides of dwellings have been securely gated on or as near to the front building line. All side access paths (and where there is access direct to a garden from a rear parking courtyard) are protected by a gate in a position that does not create a space that is unobserved or creates an opportunity for crime or anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>10.6 Side and rear boundary fencing is adequate for the crime risk. All side and rear fencing is proposed to be 1.8 metres tall.</p> <p>10.8 Sub-divisional fencing between gardens is adequate for the crime risk. All side and rear fencing is proposed to be 1.8 metres tall.</p> <p>11.1 Dwellings are positioned to face each other. In the main, the proposed houses face each other across the street. In some</p>
--	--

	<p>areas, in order to add interest to the street scene or to make best use of the land available for development, some properties are positioned side-on to the street but a house on the opposite side of the road provides the necessary surveillance of the public realm.</p>
12	<p>Gable end walls have been avoided or designed to mitigate crime and disorder problems that they might generate. Where houses are positioned side-on to the public realm, blank elevations are avoided through the addition of extra windows to the side elevation.</p>
13	<p>Rear access footpaths have been avoided or gated at the entrance to the footpaths at the building line. Rear access paths are only required to a small number of mid-terraced properties and are gated in order to prevent unauthorised access.</p>
14.1	<p>Dwelling identification will be clearly displayed. All house types include space by the front door for names and numbers to be displayed.</p>
15	<p>Aids to climbing have been avoided. Flat roofed extensions and balconies are avoided in order to minimise opportunities for intruders to gain access to a property by climbing. Sheds (where provided) are positioned at the far end of the rear garden and the bin and cycle stores are positioned away from the buildings that they serve.</p>
16	<p>Car parking arrangements have been designed to minimise crime opportunity. Car parking is provided within the curtilage of the property wherever possible. Communal parking is provided in small groups, close to the homes that are served and visible from habitable rooms in the property.</p>
16.4	<p>Internal courtyard car parking has been avoided or is protected by a gate. A rear parking court is proposed in the north western corner of the site, making good use of the land between the utility easements and the site boundary. The courtyard is at the far end of the street and is overlooked by the six houses that it serves, therefore it is felt that opportunities for crime are sufficiently reduced in order to allow the courtyard to be proposed.</p>
16.7	<p>Communal parking areas are to be lit to BS 5489. Street lights will be positioned so that they also light the communal parking areas, guaranteeing that they will be lit in perpetuity.</p>
18	<p>Planting (soft landscaping) arrangements do not impede natural surveillance and do not create hiding places. The</p>

	<p>proposed soft landscaping scheme is comprised of plants that will not grow too tall – most landscaping is to the front of properties and is intended to remain below the level of ground floor windows. Any landscaping that is proposed on the edge of a street will not comprise a species that will provide cover for a person that wishes to hide from view. The tree species proposed will have high canopies, avoiding opportunities for the tree to be climbed in order to gain access to a property.</p> <p>19 All street lighting for adopted highways, footpaths, private estate roads and car parks complies with BS 5489. It is intended that all street lighting will become part of the adopted highway. No private lighting is required.</p> <p>19.3 19.4 Overall uniformity of street lighting and its colour rendering qualities achieve at least the minimum levels required. The street lighting will be installed to the specification of Essex County Council. More details will emerge as the Section 38 Agreement for the adoption of the streets is prepared.</p> <p>19.5 A 'Lux Plan' is or will be supplied to the CPDA. The street lighting will be installed to the specification of Essex County Council. More details will emerge as the Section 38 Agreement for the adoption of the streets is prepared.</p> <p>19.6 Light pollution has been minimised. The street lighting will be installed to the specification of Essex County Council. More details will emerge as the Section 38 Agreement for the adoption of the streets is prepared. Matters relating to physical security, such as specification of external doors, design of intruder alarms, position and specification of utility supplies and specification of party walls, are issues that are normally considered after planning permission has been granted, as part of the preparation of the working drawings. As such, no information with regard to the detailed specification of the proposed scheme is currently available for submission as part of the application for planning permission.</p> <p><b>4. Reply to above from Essex Police Architectural Liaison</b></p> <p>The response from the applicant covers the issues of design etc., but does not state SBD certification will be achieved. Would therefore seek a condition that Secured by Design Certification is achieved on all new buildings prior to handover. This can be achieved in phases or 10 or more units at a time if required.</p>
--	--

**5. Officer Comment on Secure by Design Issue**

The applicant has set out the details of how they have approached the scheme taking account of the requirements for Secure By Design. The Police Liaison agrees.

This application is a detailed full application and unlike an outline consent where the details fall for further consideration, the application, as presented, is that which, if approved, can be built. It is not possible to impose a condition requiring an overall review of the design that would otherwise require the consideration of a fresh application. Only minor details can be considered by conditions such as those requested by the County Council's urban designer. The applicants are, of course, open to pursue Secure By Design certification separately in as much as they can in relation to the layout and design forming this application.

Officers therefore conclude that the applicant has gone to sufficient length in the consideration of the prevention of crime and that the condition requested by Police liaison would be unworkable.

**6. Letter from the Applicant**

Write to confirm the current affordable housing position with respect to paragraphs 4.3 – 4.15 of the officer report.

Bellway Homes submitted a viability assessment in November 2011, which supported a mix of 26 affordable dwellings on the site (25% of the total units). The District Valuer was not instructed until March 2012. It is for the DV to assess and agree the viability assessment against a range of issues, including build costs, site anomalies and contingencies.

Feedback was received in early May and the DV requested clarification of a number of areas, including residual land value and developer profit. Due to the timing of the response, the applicant will not be in a position to provide the information and allow sufficient time for further assessment in advance of the May Development Committee. As a result Bellway has proposed that the affordable housing is provided on the basis of Core Strategy Policy H4 and is subject of further viability testing. It is of note that the Council commissioned the three dragons viability assessment in July 2010, which sets out at paragraph 6.35 that: "...the LDF Target of 35% is likely to be generally too ambitious for the District in current circumstances."

We are currently in consultation with the DV and have provided the further information required. For clarity at Committee, Bellway confirm that the affordable housing provision will not be less than 25%, with a possible uplift to 35%, dependant on the outcome of



	<p>discussions and assessment of the viability appraisal.</p> <p><b>7. Revised Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>REVISED RECOMMENDATION</b> is <b>APPROVAL</b>, subject to the applicants entering into a legal agreement under section 106 of the Act to the heads of terms and conditions set out in the report and the additional heads of terms to the legal agreement:</p> <p>D) Provision and maintenance of public open space  E) Maintenance of sustainable drainage provision</p>
<p>Item 5  12/00161/FUL  10 Macintyres  Walk,  Rochford</p>	<p>No further comments or documentation received.</p>
<p>Item 7(1)  12/00158/COU  Car Park,  Station  Approach,  Station Road,  Rayleigh</p>	<p><b>Contents</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Letter from MP Mark Francois</b></li> <li><b>2. Revised location plan and aerial photograph submitted</b></li> <li><b>3. Email from Contracts Manager of National Car Parks Ltd.</b></li> <li><b>4. Conclusion</b></li> </ol> <p><b>1. Letter from MP Mark Francois</b></p> <p>A letter has been received from MP Mark Francois forwarding concerns of one of his constituents that resides at 125 Love Lane, Rayleigh. The comments raised by this constituent can be summarised as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Increased traffic generation in an area that already has major congestion at peak times. Queues already form in surrounding areas with vehicles more likely to illegally turn into Love Lane. Road rage incidents are likely to increase.</li> <li>○ Make it more awkward for taxis when they are trying to park in their rank and impact queuing could have on neighbouring bus parking area.</li> <li>○ Impact of the drainage infrastructure and its ability to cope with the volume of water being used.</li> <li>○ Environmental impact this would have using up our valuable water supplies, especially as we are facing a drought/hosepipe ban this year.</li> <li>○ Additional exhaust fumes and impact this will have on the environment.</li> </ul>

- More noise and disturbance for residents who live in this area, unacceptable especially at weekends.
- Devalue residential properties.
- Design is ugly and will spoil the general look and feel of the area. It is not an industrial estate, which is where this development would be more suited.
- Cause a loss of car parking spaces in a car park that already gets full at times causing more people to try and park in surrounding roads.
- Rayleigh already has adequate car wash facilities; another car wash is not needed.
- Cause more accidents in the area. Impact on pedestrians and cyclists.

Such issues were considered as part of the officer recommendation.

## **2. Revised Location Plan and Aerial Photograph Submitted**

A new location plan has been submitted, which was requested by RDC as inaccuracy in the precise site location was identified on the initial plan submitted.

An aerial photograph has been provided, which outlines the premier parking bays, disabled bays and taxi rank.

The submission of the new plan and aerial photograph assist in clarifying certain matters identified in association with this application.

## **3. Email from Contracts Manager of National Car Parks Ltd.**

An email from the Contracts Manager of National Car Parks Ltd. has been received, which states as follows:-

‘I can confirm that the two runs of bays where the car wash hope to sit are currently reserved premier bays that we have not been able to sell. The car park is under occupied and so we are looking at ways for setting something up here and then in turn better filling the main car park.’

This provides further clarity around the existing use of the bays proposed to be re-allocated for use by the car wash facility.

	<p><b>4. Conclusion</b></p> <p>The officer recommendation remains a <b>RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL.</b></p>
--	---