

<p>Item 6 16/00668/OUT Land between Star Lane and Alexandra Road, South of High Street, Great Wakering</p>	<p>Ecology: Paragraphs 4.25 & 7.53</p> <p>The HRA Screening report for the application site has been substantially updated since the previous version that was issued in order to address the points raised in the consultation response in (reference: 192634). The key changes since the previous version are:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The applicant has reviewed and updated its open space provision, and the site now provides a circular dog walking route of 1.6 km to 2 km. This route takes in a number of habitat types, and we have made a recommendation regarding the provision of interpretation boards and dog waste bins to ensure that it is attractive to dog walkers.2. The applicant has expanded the radius for which the potential for recreational effects is considered. As requested, this now covers an 8 km driving distance from the site, as well as a 1.3 km walking distance. Ecological experts have visited the application site and walked the majority of accessible pathways within this radius, and it is their professional opinion that the disturbance risk posed to qualifying bird species is extremely low and it is not likely to be significant.3. Cumulative effects with other adjacent developments have been considered. The overall conclusion of expert ecologists is that no likely significant effects on the Foulness SPA and Ramsar site will occur; however, a number of precautionary recommendations have been proffered to ensure that the potential for impacts, albeit minor, is minimised, and these recommendations can be secured by condition. <p>Recommended additional condition:-</p> <p>(51) Prior to the occupation of the 51st unit hereby approved, the dog walking routes as illustrated within the Habitats Regulations Assessment Report (Jan 2017 RT-MME-121553-Rev B), shall be laid out and be operational. All new dwellings built as part of the development shall be provided with an information pack detailing the locations of convenient walking and dog walking facilities in the local area. The dog walking route referred to above shall also be equipped with dog waste bins and interpretation boards, which are to be installed within the circular walking route.</p>
---	--

<p>Item 7 16/00733/FUL “Three Acres” Anchor Lane Canewdon</p>	<p>Contents</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Amendment and Update to Heads of Terms for the S106 Agreement With Regard to Highways and Open Space2. Amended Wording to Conditions 16 and 213. Canewdon Parish Council Comments <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Amendment and Update to Heads of Terms for the S106 With Regard to Highways and Open Space<ol style="list-style-type: none">1.1 The wording: ‘Provision of footway to Anchor Lane as shown on plans’ should be changed to ‘Provision of a 2m footway to Anchor Lane as shown on plans’1.2 The wording ‘Provision of access and access rights through site to adjoining site of Birch Lodge’ should be changed to ‘Provision of access and access rights through site to adjoining site of Birch Lodge to ensure that the site is free of ransom strips.’1.3 The following sections should be added to the S106 heads of terms:- <u>Open Space Maintenance</u> Maintenance arrangements for the open space will be undertaken by Sanctuary as the freeholder of the site during and after construction, and in perpetuity. <u>Provision of Bins</u> Requirement to pay £168.00 for each set of three bins per household, totalling £5880 for the 35 units proposed. <ol style="list-style-type: none">2. Amended Wording to Conditions 16, 21 Condition 16 should read as follows:- No construction works above the floor slab level shall take place until a scheme detailing the provision of open access ducting for fibre optic cable to serve a range of telecommunication services shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development of the site hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved strategy unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
---	---

	<p>Condition 21 should read as follows:-</p> <p>Prior to first occupation the road junction at its centre line shall be provided with a clear to ground visibility splay with dimensions of 2.4 metres by 75.9 metres to the east and 2.4 metres by 75.9 metres to the west, as measured from and along the nearside edge of the carriageway. Such vehicular visibility splays shall be provided before the road junction is first used by vehicular traffic and retained free of any obstruction at all times. A 2m footway shall be provided along the northern side of Anchor Lane from the junction of the proposed development in an eastward direction to link to the existing footway in front of 131 Anchor Lane. The footway on Anchor Lane shall be provided with full kerbs and appropriate drainage to carriageway. Details as shown in principle on Motion Drawing 150339- 07 shall be agreed with the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.</p> <p>3. Canewdon Parish Council Comments</p> <p>3.1 The report refers to a sum of money being paid by the developer, via a S106 agreement, to go to healthcare services. Who will receive this money and who will decide how and where it is spent?</p> <p>3.2 The report refers to doctor surgeries at Greensward Surgery in Hockley and Ashingdon Medical Centre, whilst we know that people in Canewdon actually use Central Surgery in Rochford and even Leecon Way, which are not even mentioned. We have no direct transport links to Hockley, so putting extra money in those surgeries is unlikely to benefit Canewdon.</p> <p>REVISED RECOMMENDATION to APPROVE, subject to the heads of terms and conditions set out in the recommendation, subject to additional heads of terms to the legal agreement to provide for open space maintenance and refuse bins and revised conditions 16 and 21, as set out above.</p>
<p>Item 8(1) 16/00618/COU</p> <p>42 - 46 Eastwood Road, Rayleigh</p>	<p>Further Neighbour Representations</p> <p>Since the preparation of the officer report three letters have been received from the following addresses:-</p> <p>Hardwick Close: “Langthorne” Roach Avenue: 32</p> <p>and one other unaddressed letter</p>

	<p>And which in the main make the following comments and objections:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Streets no go area for elderly residents since arrival of Lynx, Bar Blanco and Marco’s Bar is a nuisance; • Anti-social behaviour • Parking problems in area • Another late night establishment unsuitable in area.
<p>Item 8(2) 16/01159/FUL</p> <p>Frances Cottee Lodge Clarence Road Rayleigh</p>	<p>Further Neighbour Representations</p> <p>Since the preparation of the officer report three letters have been received from the following addresses:-</p> <p>Copford Avenue: 41 Eastwood Road: 250 Whitehouse Court: 7</p> <p>And which in the main make the following comments and objections:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only 21 parking spaces on an estate of 29 flats. • Whereas the previous residents were all elderly and might not have a car, the new residents will be younger. • Yellow lines on surrounding roads. • No contribution to schools or infrastructure. If this were a new development of 29 units it would require significant funds for schools, etc. • Effect on local schools. • Noise pollution and anti-social behaviour.
<p>Item 8(3) 16/01084/FUL Land opposite 2 Goldsmith Drive, Rayleigh</p>	<p>1. Further Neighbour Representations</p> <p>Since the preparation of the officer report 7 letters have been received from the following addresses:-</p> <p>Goldsmith Drive: 1, 2, The Nook Hullbridge Road: Woodville Maine Crescent: 14 (2 letters) McCalmont Drive: McCalmont Manor</p> <p>And which in the main make the following comments and objections:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient grazing. • Over-development .

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Hard standing 29.6m x 15m. Excessive amount of hardstanding on Green Belt for a simple turning manoeuvre.• If this application is approved it will set a precedent for all unsuitable small plots in the Rochford area to applying for planning and start covering the Green Belt in hardstanding and stables. RDC may then be condoning bad practice regarding horse welfare issues.• Although the application borders a bridleway the idea that the bridleway can be used for extra grazing is impractical. This is because the bridleway is a much used single track road used by cars and lorries with very little available foliage. To have horses trying to graze by this roadside is dangerous for horses and other road users.• Two planning applications 11/00427/FUL and 15/00448/FUL, both adjacent to the above application and very similar in land area, were both refused; planning officers concluded sites were too small to sustain any long term grazing, mentioning RDC Policy DM14. There seems to be a lack of continuity since the current application has been approved by planning officers, particularly as this application also does not meet DM14, only having half the area of land to meet the necessary criteria.• Planning application 16/00679/FUL was refused due to not enough grazing and too much hardstanding is not much different to application 16/01084/FUL, which was marked for approval.• The section in the officer's report regarding past planning history shows all refusals on this plot and one approval for a log cabin. The inclusion of an approved application for a log cabin on this site is incorrect. Did mention of an approval for a log cabin on Mr O'Connor's field affect any officer's decision to approve the current application, unaware that this fact was incorrect?• Also, there are not many residential properties in the area of the application but nearly all have sent in objection letters. However, not all submitted objection letters were included on the RDC planning website and were also not included in the officer's report although I was informed by Miss Thorogood that RDC had them.• Has there been a change in RDC policy in order for planning officers to approve unsustainable development on the Green Belt?• The red line plan fails to show the full extent of built development in close proximity to the application site.
--	--

- Inspectors at appeal have considered that the appropriate size of the associated buildings and hard surfaced areas should be determined by the size of the site and the predominant character of its surroundings. The proposal would not fit the term 'small' and would constitute inappropriate development.
- Increase in traffic, fears that even fairly modest facilities could become the focus of riding events and shows.
- Stable buildings near to residential property will inevitably attract objection on the basis of smell and possibly health hazards such as vermin and flies, causing adverse conditions for neighbours.
~
- The common practice of burning manure is known to cause considerable distress to neighbours.
- Horse based uses raise the same sustainability and highways objections as experienced by other uses in rural areas.
- Not sustainable – additional vehicle journeys would be generated by the proposal.
- No mention of disposal of waste products.
- Wildlife has not been taken into consideration.
- Is there an adequate water supply?
- Will only storage of vehicles and machinery needed for upkeep of the land and horses be stored on the site?
- Horses kept on this land in the past have broken through the wooden post and bar fence and partially destroyed the young hedge.
- Would the applicant be willing to compensate if this happens?

2. Correction

To remove the following from the officer's report:-

Application No. 08/00829/FUL. Log cabin
Approved 23/12/2008

The inclusion of the log cabin (paragraph 6 of the officer's report) in the planning history is incorrect. This reference appears in the site history on Uniform, which is why it was included in the planning history; however, it relates to a neighbouring site and is therefore incorrect.

	It is proposed that this planning application reference should be removed from the site history.
Item 8(4) 16/01029/COU 24 Sirdar Road Rayleigh	Further Neighbour Representations Since the preparation of the officer's report 2 letters have been received from the following addresses:- Woodlands Avenue: 30 and 32 And which in the main make the following comments and objections:- <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Noise from gym, particularly bass music.• Cars will park on Woodlands Avenue causing problems to residents.• Hours of operation excessive.