

<p>Schedule Item 1 05/00563/COU</p>	<p>Relevant Planning History:-</p> <p>03/00863/FUL Extension to Existing Warehouse - Approved 25/11/03.</p> <p>05/00341 Erection of Dust Extraction unit located to the rear of the plot - Withdrawn 10/06/05.</p> <p>In relation to this withdrawn application, the Council received the following information:-</p> <p>Two petitions of objection signed by 16 local residents (some names are duplicates) and 2 letters of objection relating in the main to the following points:- retrospective, do environmental reports accompany the application as the extractor will deal with toxic pollutants; the properties in Thorpe Gardens lie in the direction of the prevailing winds and, as such, would prove a health hazard.</p> <p>Officer's Comments</p> <p>In relation to application 05/00563/COU currently before Members, there are no further responses received other than those referred to in the tabled report.</p>
<p>Schedule Item 3 05/00324/FUL</p>	<p>There has been considerable discussion with the applicant, who yesterday explained there was further information that needs to be provided in support of the case and therefore confirmed orally that the application would be withdrawn. On this basis, given the public interest in the application, officers advised the public that the application was withdrawn and would not be considered tonight by the Committee.</p> <p>However, a letter received today from the applicant explains that the application is not withdrawn, but asks that it is not considered tonight by the Committee, to allow time for additional information to be assembled.</p> <p>In the circumstances, given the commitment to local residents, together with the applicant's concern to ensure we have all the appropriate supporting material, the Head of Planning Services considers that the only course of action is for the matter not to be considered tonight by the Committee.</p>

The applicant has commented in correspondence following the drafting of the tabled report that further work needs to be undertaken on the following issues:-

- Annex E of PPG 13 is set out as an amendment to PPG 2 “Green Belts”. Whilst the Rochford officer’s report refers to PPG 13 at paragraph 5.30, it only refers to it in respect of parking standards and not about the relevance of park and ride facilities in the Green Belt. The guidance states that park and ride facilities are not inappropriate in the Green Belt if they meet certain criteria.
- This Impact Analysis on behalf of the East of England Development Agency (EEDA) is currently being undertaken by York Aviation and is due to be completed in the first week of December 2005.
- The assignment has been commissioned in partnership with the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, Department for Transport and Government Office for the East of England, and the East of England Development Agency. The study is commissioned to identify and quantify the full range of economic and social benefits that would result from expansion of current levels of passenger throughput and business activities at the airport.

Essex County Highways Officer:- Raises no objection to the proposal, but they have qualified their position with a requirement for additional information and for both on and off site works. These works relate broadly to:-

- Junction works and vision splays
- Provision of footpath along Southend Road
- Pedestrian refuge
- Further survey work and possible improvements to Sutton Road roundabout
- Improvements to existing pedestrian crossing
- Bus stops to be improved
- Contribution to the reconstruction of Warners Bridge.

Stambridge Parish Council

The Southend Road and Warners Bridge area is already well used and at times very congested. With the above plans we are concerned about the congestion it will cause and hope that this application is only approved as long as the Southend Road/Warners Bridge is significantly enhanced and congestion measures are implemented and that neighbouring residents’ quality of life isn’t jeopardised or commercial business affected.

	<p>The applicant has forwarded further comments:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The airport has shown that there is no material harm by reason of inappropriateness, impact on the purposes of Green Belt designation openness or visual amenity. • Without this proposal the overall interchange development would not be economically viable and therefore without this 'enabling development' the terminal/station would not be built. Therefore, any minor harm is overcome by these very special circumstances. • There are no suitable alternative sites for this proposal. • The benefits of improved public transport capacity, better utilisation of existing assets and efficient integration of transport modes contribute significantly to the proposals as a sustainable form of development, encouraged by Central Government Policy. • The proposals are in accordance with local, regional and national policy. • This comprehensive interchange will bring about the creation of 360 direct jobs, increasing to 2000 if (subject to planning permission) passenger forecasts grow in line with the Aviation White Paper (2003). A number of indirect jobs would be created both on and off the airfield. • The technical issues relating to highways, ecology and archaeological matters have been addressed through on site studies and the submission of further technical reports. The remaining matters are dealt with through the use of appropriate planning conditions, as previously set out by the airport. • The main concern of local residents, namely on street commuter parking, has been addressed by the airport offering a planning condition to ensure the funding of a suitable controlled parking zone. • The ticket pricing for this car park will match and mirror any rises at Rochford Station. <p>85 standardised letters of objection commenting in the main on the following issues:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate use of Green belt Land • Traffic issues • Further car parking issues on the Anne Boleyn estate • Quality of life affected by noise, pollution, congestion, increase in the use of roads as 'rat runs' • Need for traffic lights at the junction • There is sufficient parking space within the Airport • Rush hour congestion • Loss of green space • Increase in accidents
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Damage to local roads - who will pay? • Residents should be placed before profit • What traffic calming will there be in the surrounding streets? • What will happen to Rochford Station? • Devaluation of property values • Residents' parking at no cost to residents and for life • Should be accessed via tunnel under the railway • Runoff will cause flooding • Inadequate access for emergency vehicles • Pathways needed for safety from Warners Bridge to Rochford on the west side. • Very dangerous situation with the increase in traffic <p>Rochford Parish Council Have queried the number of signatures on the petitions received. As within the tabled report, and for clarity, the signatures on the petitions received in relation to the submission is 306 in total.</p>
<p>Item 4 05/00536/REM</p>	<p>The Environment Agency Withdraw their objection to the proposal, as the scheme would be compliant with PPG25, subject to a condition on any approval that requires that the development be implemented in accordance with the designed drainage details, as shown on drawing number 001201-200-A.</p> <p>Essex County Council Travel Plan Co-ordinator No objections, subject to modifications to the Green Travel Plan. These have been incorporated into an updated Green Travel Plan.</p> <p>Boundary Treatments:- Members may recall that under application reference 03/00496/REM consent was given for the proposed boundary treatment around the perimeter of the site. For clarity, this submission proposes to revise the soft landscaping to the buffer strip/bund. This revised soft landscaping, as commented upon in the tabled report, is acceptable.</p> <p>In addition to the soft landscaping, this application gave consent for palisade fencing to the northern, western and southern boundaries of the site and 1m high steel bollards along the Cherry Orchard Way boundary; it is the applicant's intention to implement this boundary treatment.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION That the following condition be imposed in place of condition 1 previously recommended.</p>

	<p>The surface water disposal from the site shall be in accordance with the details shown on drawing number 001201 – 200 –A. No other form of surface water disposal shall be used unless previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>REASON In the interest of suitable water drainage of the site, to safeguard localised flooding/surcharging and to accord with the parameters of PPG25.</p>
Item 5 05/00674/FUL	Members will note that in relation to the tabled conditions, No. 13 is a continuation of Condition No. 12. All the numbers of the following conditions should be revised accordingly (16 conditions in total).
Item 6 05/00679/FUL	<p>There is an error in the text to paragraph 6.3 of the report (page 75 of the Schedule) where the development is described as having six two bedroomed units. The correct number of two bedroomed units proposed is 8 two bedroomed units. This does not affect the total number of 29 units, as proposed.</p> <p>Essex and Suffolk Water Advise no comments or observations to make regarding this application</p> <p>Arboricultural Officer Advise that the trees to be planted in the amenity space should be native species and suggests Common Alder and two Silver Birch.</p> <p>Essex County Council Highways and Transportation Group Raise no objection to the application, subject to the following conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The limit of the side turn shall be physically identified on the ground and any bollards, either fixed or collapsible, shall be sited a minimum of 500mm clear of the vehicular way. 2) Space shall be provided within the proposal site to accommodate the parking, loading, unloading and turning of all vehicles visiting the site, clear of the highway and properly laid out and such space shall be maintained thereafter free of any impediment to its designated use, further, in order to allow all vehicles to enter and leave the highway in forward gear.

	<p>3) The carriageway of the proposed access road shall be laid out and constructed up to and including road base level, prior to commencement of the development intended to take access therefrom. Furthermore, the carriageway and footways shall be constructed up to and including base course surfacing to ensure that prior to occupation each unit has a properly consolidated surfaced carriageway and footway between the unit and an existing highway which shall thereafter be maintained in good repair until the final surface is laid. Until such time as the final surface is completed, footway base course shall be provided and maintained in a manner to avoid any upstands to gullies, covers, kerbs or other obstructions within or bordering the footway. The carriageway, footways and footpaths commensurate with the frontage of each unit shall be fully completed with final surface within twelve months from occupation of the unit.</p> <p>4) Prior to commencement of the development, an inspection of the haul route supported by photographic evidence shall be carried out by the applicant in conjunction with the Highway Authority. A further inspection shall be carried out upon completion of the development and any damage caused as a result of the development being constructed shall be rectified to the satisfaction of ann at no cost to the Highway Authority.</p> <p>Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Highway Authority do not consider the proposed access road as being suitable for adoption. ○ As the proposal, including the access road, is to remain private the on site drainage system shall have to discharge into a system other than that used to drain the existing highway. ○ Prior to occupation, each dwelling unit shall be served by a system of operational street lighting between the dwelling unit and an existing highway which shall thereafter be maintained in good repair. ○ Given the restricted width into which large vehicles are expected to manoeuvre, the flanks of the buildings located on either side of the side turn may have to be designed and constructed to withstand vehicle impacts. ○ Sufficient turning and off loading facilities for delivery vehicles, together with an adequate parking area for those employed in developing the proposal site, shall be provided within the limits of the proposal site. ○ All highway related details shall be agreed with the Highway Authority.
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The number of parking spaces, including disabled, cycle and motorcycle, shall be in accordance with those standards set down within Essex Planning Officers Association, Vehicle Parking Standards, August 2001. Further, all cycle and motorcycle parking shall be convenient, covered and secure. ○ Any proposed traffic calming shall be laid out and constructed having consulted the emergency services and bus operators. <p>Officer Comment:</p> <p>It is FURTHER RECOMMENDED that the additional conditions and informatives recommended by Essex County Council detailed above be included in any Approval that might be given.</p> <p>One letter has been received from the applicants having viewed the officer recommendation and which expresses the following concerns regarding the legal agreement.</p> <p>Have no objection in principle to the agreement, but consider the wording of the clauses to penalise the applicants. There is no concern to require the buildings to commence construction at the same time.</p> <p>The problem now envisaged is that the applicants' building is the smallest within the development and will be completed by March / April 2007 at the same time as which Barratts are expected to hand over the supermarket building to Somerfield for fitting out. At this point Somerfield will require a further 5/6 months' work before opening for trading.</p> <p>The current legal agreement would not allow McCarthy and Stone to occupy their building until 6 months after it is complete, awaiting the opening of the supermarket for trading. McCarthy and Stone do not wish their building to be vacant for this period of time.</p> <p>Consequently the applicants are requesting an amendment to the clause 3.21 to state ...</p> <p>" No occupation of Block B until the supermarket space is available for fitting out".</p> <p>Officer Comment:</p> <p>The request of the applicant to vary the clause is considered reasonable and would prevent the building remaining empty and at risk. The intentions to secure provision of the supermarket would be achieved by the applicants' request.</p>
--	---

	<p>REVISED RECOMMENDATION as set out in the report and including the additional conditions and informatives of Essex County Council Highways and Transportation and to incorporate the current application into the existing legal agreement, but amending clause 3.21 of the agreement to state;</p> <p>No occupation of Block B until the supermarket space in Block A is available for fitting out”.</p>
<p>Item 7 05//00735/GD</p>	<p>Environment Agency Object to the proposal on the basis that no Flood Risk Assessment has been provided in support of the application.</p> <p>Officer Comment:</p> <p>The portakabin building exists at the Shoebury end of the site and is to be relocated to Landwick Gate. Both the existing site and proposed site are in the floodplain. Officers consider that there is no material difference in flood risk terms to the impact of this building on the capacity of the floodplain or risks to the building itself.</p>