

<p>Item 2 08/00795/OUT 9/11 Bull Lane</p>	<p>County Urban Designer: The proposal is to replace 2 bungalows with 14 apartments on a site located close to the town centre of Rayleigh. This proposed increase in density is, I consider, appropriate for this sustainable location. The proposal appears to respect the scale and massing of the adjacent development and the layout satisfactorily addresses the frontages of both Bull Lane and Highfield Crescent. I have, therefore, no objection to this outline application.</p> <p>In respect of the design of the elevations I would just draw to your attention that there are few issues which would need to be addressed if the elevations were submitted under reserved matters. These are – the problem with duality of windows in gable elevations, the lack of chimneys, the detailing of the boundary treatment and brick dressings in render which is a feature that should avoided.</p> <p>Revised Design and Access Statement: The applicant has submitted a new statement that corrects a number of mistakes present within the original submission. It is confirmed that the number of units proposed are 14 (no.11 two-bedroom and no. 3 one-bedroom) and that the height of the building ranges between 1.5 and 2 storeys. In addition reference to the use of the flats for sheltered/retirement usage has been deleted.</p> <p>Neighbour Contribution – Two further letters have been received in response to the neighbour notification and which make the following comments and objections in addition to those set out in the report:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Existing mature trees in Highfield Crescent will in time block light to new apartments and will inevitably lead to attempts to cut back or remove them, which will have a disastrous consequence on the appearance of the street landscape.
<p>Item R3 08/00836/FUL 145 Ferry Road, Hullbridge</p>	<p>One letter has been received from the applicant's agent and which makes the following comments in response to the officer recommendation:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The application was submitted online but the Council have printed the layout drawing incorrectly and smaller and as a result the report describes the amenity area, car parking spaces and turning area as being too small, whereas it is in fact in excess of the Council's requirements. ○ Have since provided an accurate print and concerned that an incorrect report does not go to Councillors as this could reflect in a refusal of the application. Concerned also that the accurate print is in colour whilst the inaccurate print is in black and white.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The applicant has already suffered a financial loss because the original planning approval was lost by the Council and did not show up in the solicitor's search. As a result, officers were not aware of the consent to change from a shop to residential five years ago. <p>Would appreciate the report being redrafted as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>Officer comment:</p> <p>Officers confirm receipt of an accurate print of the site layout plan which confirms the parking spaces and turning area to be to the correct size. The amenity space measures 177 square metres and exceeding the 175 square metres required by Council guidance for this development.</p> <p>The application concerning the change of use of the existing building to residential granted on 4 November 2003 did feature as a material consideration in the application recently granted permission for the conversion of the building into five flats under application reference 08/00732/FUL and also in the officer report to this current application.</p>
--	---