

<p><b>Item D1</b> <b>05/00332/FUL</b></p>	<p><b>Essex County Council Specialist Archaeological Advice</b> Advises that trial trenching at the above site has identified large amounts of post – mediaeval and modern disturbance. With the exception of one small area, the majority of the site requires no further archaeological work.</p> <p>Advise that one small area, which has produced mediaeval pottery, requires a limited amount of extra work. This work has been agreed with the archaeological contractor and lies some distance from the proposed initial work.</p> <p>Advise that the work undertaken to date and the remaining work described above fulfills the archaeological condition. No objection therefore to development proceeding.</p> <p><b>Essex County Council Highways</b> Following recent meeting and receipt of revised drawing to show amended turning head as detailed on Ardent Consulting Engineers drawing T508 – 01 now confirm that whilst turning facility shown does not equate exactly with size 2 turning bay as specified in the design guide, the drawing does incorporate an extended side turn dimension together with bollard protection around a six metre radii and is therefore considered acceptable in this instance.</p> <p>It is understood that the developer intends the access road to remain private and it would not be considered suitable for adoption as publicly maintainable highway.</p> <p><b>Two</b> further letters have been received from the applicant which provide the following comments and information in response to the recommendation.</p> <p>Confirm that Somerfield have entered into a binding contract to take a lease on the supermarket and basement car park, subject to the Traffic Regulation Order which has now been passed, the completion of the agreement with Wentworth to provide pedestrian access to the Market Square which is now in place, the entry of the relevant parties into the Planning Legal Agreement and the Planning Permission being granted.</p> <p>Advise that it is not the applicant's intention to use the junction of the southern access and North Street (adjoining the Post Office) for construction access. Agreement with the site owners does not permit this.</p> <p>Suggest revised delivery times if required excluding 9.00 am – 7.00 pm when shops open.</p>
---	---

	<p>Officer Comment: This suggestion, it is considered, would give rise to amenity issues for new and existing residents and is not supported by officers.</p> <p><b>Revised Recommendation to modify head of condition 23 to read that the turning and manoeuvring area shall be detailed as per drawing No. 04 – 0595 – S – 002 T2, as received on 21<sup>st</sup> July 2005.</b></p>
<p><b>Item R2</b>  <b>05/00431/FUL</b></p>	<p>The Occupiers of 10 Bramerton Road have withdrawn their objections as they have been reassured about concerns over the potential noise from the use, and on the understanding that the drafted planning conditions would be imposed to control the music and not to be open after 9.00 pm.</p> <p>Two further objections received, but not raising any new issues. 14 Bramerton Road is especially concerned about overlooking and a resident of Rupert Jarvis Court is concerned regarding noise impact.</p> <p>For clarification, there have been letters of objection from 17 local households, 2 of which have now withdrawn them, and 1 household who visits the area.</p> <p>A petition has been received stating that the proposal would become a nuisance and intrusion into the privacy of residents of Rupert Jarvis Court, Spa Court and Bramerton Road – this has 14 signatures.</p> <p><b>The Head of Housing, Health &amp; Community Care</b> – Subject to the proposed condition 5 regarding inaudibility being enforceable, raises no objection.</p> <p>The consultation period in relation to this application, as identified on the ‘Public Access’ part of the Council’s website, expires on 30<sup>th</sup> July 2005; for the sake of clarity, the recommendation on the application has been amended to take account of this.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION</b>  <b>That the application be delegated to the Head of Planning Services to determine, including the conditions originally recommended, on expiry of the consultation period and assessment of any views received.</b></p>

<p><b>Item 5</b> <b>05/00358/FUL</b></p>	<p><b>Two</b> further letters have been received from the following addresses;</p> <p>Albert Road: 10, 4.</p> <p>And which make the following comments and objections in addition to those set out in the report ;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Revised application has not addressed concerns for the privacy and security of our property.</li><li>○ Roof Line has not been changed by the amendment and is still considerably higher than the original building.</li><li>○ Will still have a detrimental effect on our property, or the enjoyment of our property and rear garden.</li><li>○ Building shown would encroach onto adjoining property.</li><li>○ Overall dimensions show the building to be much larger than the original building.</li><li>○ Proposal further down plot making it more of a back build.</li><li>○ No. 4 is as much of a neighbour to the site as No.10.</li><li>○ Removal of planting and hedgerow now leaves numbers 6 and 8 open and vulnerable.</li><li>○ Should consent be given would like to ensure that a perimeter fence is installed prior to, during and after the development, as part of the permission as the applicant has been reluctant to repair or replace the fence previously. Also that dropped kerb be installed prior to the development taking place to prevent use of neighbours' access.</li><li>○ Whilst visual impact has been lessened by change to the roof design there is still an increase to the visual bulk of the disproportional roof compared to the existing building. The roof should have a normal or shallow pitch with the flank being a full hip and which would lessen the negative visual impact considerably.</li></ul> <p>It is noted that two further conditions were proposed on the previous application and it is therefore <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that an archaeological site access condition to allow a photographic record be taken and a precautionary archaeological impact assessment be included:</p>
--	---

	<p>Condition 10 – SC 67 Archaeological site access.</p> <p>Condition 11          “No development shall commence before an ecological impact assessment of the site has been undertaken and submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The assessment shall include appropriate mitigation measures for any protected species that may be found on the site. Furthermore, before any development shall commence, all reasonable steps necessary shall be taken to implement the identified mitigation measures for all protected species on the site. No translocation of these species, should it prove necessary, shall commence until written details of receptor sites, together with a management plan including monitoring, have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved by it in writing.”</p>
<p><b>Item 6</b>  <b>05/00427/COU</b></p>	<p><b>One</b> letter has been received from the applicant’s structural engineer and which makes the following comments on the recommendation;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers it unreasonable for the Inspector to have made a decision on the condition of the building without taking account of a specialist Engineer’s Report on the buildings.</li> <li>○ The conditions suggested in the Appeal seem reasonable to have adequately controlled the situation.</li> <li>○ Astounded that officers have drawn the conclusion about the structural condition of the building over the head of the engineer’s report and actually suggesting that the report is incompetent.</li> <li>○ Describes qualifications and experience for structural surveys related to historic buildings. Mr Brian Morton received an MBE in the 2005 New Year’s Honours List specifically as a conservation engineer for services to the Heritage.</li> <li>○ Reputation is that the applicant’s engineers do not damage historic buildings and use minimal interference procedures to safeguard them.</li> <li>○ Have extensive experience of converting barns without major reconstruction.</li> <li>○ State categorically that the building can be repaired without major replacement of structural elements and that a high proportion of the weatherboarding can be re –used and will replace only those roof tiles that are necessary.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ State categorically that if such buildings are not given new uses they are lost.</li></ul> <p>Officers have also received a copy of a letter circulated to Members from the applicant in addition to the above comments from the applicant's structural engineer.</p>
--	---