

<p><b>Item 4</b>  12/00512/FUL  Greensward  Academy,  Greensward Lane,  Hockley</p>	<p><b>Contents:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Correction to Ward and Parish Details Set Out in the Report</b></li> <li><b>2. Anglian Water</b></li> <li><b>3. Rochford District Council Arboricultural Officer</b></li> <li><b>4. Further Neighbour Representation</b></li> <li><b>5. Revised Officer Recommendation</b></li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Correction to Ward and Parish Details Set Out in the Report</b></li> </ol> <p>The officer report identifies the Parish Council for this application to be Rayleigh Town Council and the District ward to be Sweyne Park.</p> <p>Hockley Parish Council is the correct Parish Council and Hockley North is the correct District Ward. Hockley Parish Council was consulted and has provided comments on the application, as set out in the report. The Ward Member for Hockley North was sent copies of key documents for the application.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>2. Anglian Water</b></li> </ol> <p>In response to the comments raised by the Environment Agency, officers have consulted Anglian Water with regard to available capacity for foul sewage in the existing sewerage network.</p> <p>Anglian Water has advised officers informally that it has no objection to raise to the proposal.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>3. Rochford District Council Arboricultural Officer</b></li> </ol> <p>Advises that the new construction is not anywhere near the good oak trees and cannot see a problem regarding levels with regard to the good quality of off site trees or smaller on site trees.</p> <p>The trees on the Greensward Lane roadside frontage comprise two Norway maple, which are reasonably nice and early mature, a reasonable hawthorn and poor rowan. These are located in a small group. Their loss is mitigated by the line of callery pear 14 – 16 cm girth proposed, which will extend the overall visual effect. Although not particularly large trees at maturity, they will be easily maintained and are a sensible option.</p>
---	---

	<p>Overall, given the size, the amount of replacement planting and the number of recently planted trees already on the site, happy with what is proposed, given that the landscaping scheme is adhered to.</p> <p><b>4. Further Neighbour Representation</b></p> <p>Three further letters have been received from the following addresses:-</p> <p>Hamilton Gardens: 36 Hampstead Gardens: 25 Greensward Lane: 51</p> <p>And which in the main raise the following comments and objections in addition to those set out in the report:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Loss of view of Ashingdon to landing window to No. 51 Greensward Lane.</li><li>○ Raised concerns with architect at the pre-application meeting held, but the architect's response was to say that where he lives in London houses are surrounded by large buildings. That is why we moved away from that urbanisation 20 years ago and we rely on the Council to defend our region.</li><li>○ Cannot find in the documentation the negative responses made against the proposal at the pre-application meeting, which is one sided.</li><li>○ Proposed front extension will dramatically de-value No. 51 Greensward Lane.</li><li>○ Concern that a bus would not be able to use the turn around shown. At the moment a bus serving the Ashingdon /Rochford area pulls into the school to minimise the traffic congestion and to allow students safe access. If this facility is removed then it would force the students onto the road and reintroduce problems we had a number of years ago where students had been involved in a number of accidents. If the configuration is to stay the bus stop should be located directly outside the school where the pavement is widest.</li><li>○ If the current configuration of in- out is removed this will result in obscene congestion as the current drawing will allow only a single vehicle to pass safely.</li></ul>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ There is no perimeter fence proposed outside the school buildings, which have previously been vandalised with graffiti. With an open front predict this problem will return. There is therefore a need for a decorative fence to the site frontage.</li><li>○ Seek provision for a designated smoking area on the school site as the problem has been passed to outside No. 51 Greensward Lane with staff using the garden to No. 51 as a dumping ground and construction workers may well do the same.</li><li>○ The proposed car park is only yards from the back door to 25 Hampstead gardens. The exhaust fumes and continued banging of car doors would be unacceptable and cause loss of enjoyment to garden and property. Already bad enough at weekends when the school is open for public use.</li><li>○ During periods of rain the school grounds tend to flood and being on higher level than No. 25 Hampstead Gardens cause problems. Previous application was in grasscrete that would have allowed the water to drain. The new application is for tarmac and for a larger area than originally planned.</li><li>○ As the school site is much higher, there will be a loss of privacy as people using the car park will be able to look straight into No. 25 Hampstead Gardens.</li><li>○ Problem with fast growing hedge planted a few years ago by the school along the high perimeter fencing adjacent to the proposed car park to stop students climbing over the fence, but which has grown unchecked over the footpath and into the garden of No. 25 Hampstead Gardens causing loss of sunlight.</li><li>○ The original plans state the area for the car park has no recreational use, but enclose photographs showing the area in use for sporting activity and that the statement is intentionally misleading.</li><li>○ Understand the school has to make use of a playing field in Plumberow Avenue, which is a ridiculous situation when can make use of the area on the site proposed for the car park.</li></ul>
--	--

	<p><b>5. Revised Officer Recommendation</b></p> <p>The applicants have revised the application to delete the vocational construction area. There is, however, an existing area on the southern side of the building in use for the provision of a skip and storage and which has attracted some concern at possible re-siting closer to residents with consequent noise and disturbance issues. Officers consider that it is therefore necessary that the existing skip facility be retained in its current position and that alternative siting be the subject of a condition to the grant of consent.</p> <p>The <b>REVISED RECOMMENDATION</b> is therefore <b>APPROVAL</b>, subject to the conditions set out in the report and the additional heads of condition concerning the retention and future provision of the vocational construction storage skip as follows:-</p> <p>12. Retain the existing open storage area at present used for vocational construction in the area hatched. No provision of alternative open storage including storage skips for vocational construction unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p>
<p><b>Item 5</b>  12/00520/FUL  125A-125D High Road, Rayleigh.</p>	<p><b>Officer Update</b></p> <p>Officers advise that this application will be reported to Members at the next Development Committee meeting on 22 November 2012.</p>
<p><b>Item 6</b>  12/00554/FUL  The Chichester,  London Road,  Rawreth</p>	<p><b>Rawreth Parish Council</b></p> <p>The proposed shelter seems quite large and the Council is concerned it could be used as an extension to the indoor bar area. The Council notes the close proximity to windows and doors and is concerned about smoke ingress and also noise pollution.</p>