

Item R1 08/00567/FUL 43 Clifton Rd	<p>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">• Believe the plans are not all to scale• The proposed new house would be some 12 metres wide and would not fit the plot• The height of the proposed chimney and ridge appear to be over 11m and about the same height as No. 41 adjoining whereas the officer report indicates a ridge height of 8.7m. The adjoining house has a ridge height of 7.3m.• The roof base and the chimney stack breach the Council's 45 degree rule applicable in the vertical plane• These discrepancies go to the root of the invalidity of the application• The original bungalow is actually believed to be part of a detached bungalow• True picture of Clifton Road is not as stated in the report and misrepresentative of the street scene, creating an impression that the proposed house would be less out of keeping• Hawkwell Parish Council very strongly word their objection as offensive to the street scene. The proposed building would be much too prominent in the street by comparison to No. 41 and No. 47 and Nos. 33 – 39 to the east.• Contrary to Hawkwell Parish Council policy on replacing smaller dwellings with larger executive style home• No precedent for not respecting neighbouring building lines - No existing Clifton Road dwelling occupying nearly full plot width does so in a way that does not adequately respect neighbouring properties' building lines.• Respect for plot size - Without exception, all existing Clifton Road dwellings respect their plot sizes, and all of the truly large properties enjoying larger plots are not overbearing upon neighbouring dwellings. Proposed house would be first and most unwelcome exception, as over-dominant. Potential to set a bad precedent.• True character of No. 47 - Overstatement of No. 47 as "extensively extended" giving impression that proposed new house would be less imposing in context. Frontage of proposed new house standing proud and not pitched to our side, and would take our light and overshadow our property.• 45 degree rule / offence to amenity value of our home - Report failing to state that 45 degree rule in fact breached in respect of vertical (section) plane. Vertical angle between chimney / two-storey element at rear closest to our home in fact greater than 45 degrees. In any case, 45 degree rule not absolute, and Council's policy more flexible even within 45 degrees. Rule much-criticised in planning arena as far too crude a measure in isolation.
--	---

- Hawkwell Parish Council's statement that proposed house "offends the amenity value of the adjacent properties".
- Disproportionate weight given by report to Nos. 51 and 53 (much further away) by comparison with our immediately neighbouring property
- Weight given by report to Nos. 51 and 53 setting precedent in favour of proposed development (whereas our home would be much the more directly affected) unjustifiably disproportionate. Nos. 51 and 53 as extended not so overbearing on double-width No. 47 as proposed new house would be on our No. 41. To treat the proposed development the same does not compare like with like.
- No reference made in report to Nos. 33 - 39 (and insufficient weight to No. 47's extension being single-storey only). No reference in report to building lines of Nos. 33, 35, 37 and 39, all of which are nearer (to the east) and which respect ours (and vice versa). Insufficient weight to No. 47's extension being single-storey only. No Planning Officer viewing from our property. Proposed new house should be properly staggered as between No. 47's extension and Nos. 33 - 39, so as to respect our rear building lines (and thereby the amenity value of our property). Report's justification flawed.
- Report contains subjective judgments, takes insufficient account of our objections and representations and is not sufficiently objective. Report not objectively balanced as between proposed new house and its effect on us and our property.
- Scale of proposed new house not in fact reasonable in context. Two 'En-suites' as well as 'bathroom' and 'cloakroom' (for a four bedroomed house) as well as 'study' and 'utility Room' unreasonable if can all be accommodated only by building so far forward and back by comparison with our building lines. Proposed new house would be more than adequate without one of the 'en-suites' and the 'study' and/or 'utility room'.
- Present 'half a bungalow' not two-bedroomed, but single (and small) Report wrongly states existing dwelling "actually a 2 bed detached bungalow". Failure to note that only one single bedroom and small, resulting in impression that proposed new house a less significant increase in development and use and a less radical change in character and identity.
- Pear tree. No mention in report of non-compliance with SPD2 Housing Design (paragraph 4.1 a) ('Landscaping')) in respect of cutting down of pear tree being non-compliant with planning policy.
- Report omits reference to conditions proposed by the Highway Authority - No mention in report of two of the conditions proposed by Highway Authority's response to statutory consultation. If planning permission is not to be refused, these additional conditions should be imposed.
- Report fails to propose dis-applying general permitted development rights and requiring strict implementation as regards proposed single-storey element to rear. No mention in report of dis-applying generally permitted development rights in respect of proposed single-storey element to rear, and requiring implementation in strict accordance with details on

	<p>submitted drawing. If planning permission is not to be refused, such an additional condition (similar to the one relating to the rear window/balustrade recommended by the report) should be imposed to protect our property against possibilities such as future extension over single-storey element to rear.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking only sufficient if proposed garage used only as such - No mention in report of limiting garage only for garaging. If planning permission is not to be refused, such an additional condition should be imposed to ease traffic and parking problems in Clifton Road. • In passing, the reference in the rear window/balustrade recommended condition to "the extension" is an error. • Spelling of "use" as "sue" in recommended condition 13 is unfortunate.
<p>Item R2 08/00648/COU Land West of Rochford Hall</p>	<p>Neighbour Contribution – One additional objection - Adverse impact on residential area and inappropriate commercial use in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Correspondence from Agent - Definition of vehicles. We have set out the definition below to clarify the types of vehicles that would be worked on by Mr Overton. This should reassure Members that it is only specialist cars that are dealt with by Mr Overton and it would not become a general car premises.</p> <p>The vehicles at the site would be “veteran, Edwardian, vintage, post WWII and classic motor cars and quality cars no longer in production.”</p> <p>Environmental Services - Consultation Response The Head of Environmental Services reports that if Members are minded to approve the application, the following conditions should be attached to any consent granted:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prior to the commencement of the permitted use, the building envelope shall be insulated against the egress of internally generated noise, in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Such agreed works shall be fully implemented prior to the commencement of any use hereby permitted and shall be maintained in the approved form while the premises are in use for the permitted purpose. 2. Prior to the commencement of the permitted use, details of any external equipment or openings in the external walls or roofs of the building proposed at any time in connection with the permitted use, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the machinery is installed or the opening formed. The equipment shall be installed or the openings formed as approved and shall be maintained in the approved form while the premises are in use for the permitted purpose.

<p>Item 3 07/00881/DP3 Playing field adj. Rayleigh Leisure Centre</p>	<p>Essex Police</p> <p>Invite the use of the Architectural Liaison Service in order that any potential crime risk be identified and dealt with at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>3 further letters have been received in response to the public 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"> • Application is ill conceived and pays no respect to the interests of the local Residents in Priory Chase or Temple Way. • Already too many destinations creating traffic in what is a very small road and residential area • Already significant parking issues in Priory Chase and the top of Temple Way • Already suffer anti-social behaviour from youths and parents/car users at adjoining school, customers to leisure centre and deliveries to Asda. • Priory Chase and Temple Way are far too narrow to take parked vehicles. • Overspill parking set to be lost by the Coral application • Some leisure centre customers already park on Priory Chase, blocking the roundabout • Additional parking proposed is welcome but only if used • Spectators will prefer to watch from warmth and comfort of their cars instead of standing next to pitch. The design encourages people to park on Priory Chase rather than use the car park • Priory Chase and Temple Way are still private roads and have yet to be adopted therefore any parking restrictions are not enforceable • A bank needs to be constructed around the boundary with trees planted to improve the view for neighbours on Priory Chase and help deaden the noise and to discourage spectators from parking and watching • The reduction of this application from five pitches to four or less will help as pitch 5 is too close to the road and neighbouring homes • The use and access to these pitches needs to be controlled to prevent misuse and vandalism • Floodlighting would be opposed by local residents • Why are other uses such as athletics running track, netball or hockey pitches being considered • Unwelcome addition to the gross over-development of this small neighbourhood • Concern that abusive language on pitches will be heard in adjoining housing • Need for high fencing around the pitches to protect nearby homes and residents' cars and stop youths congregating and intimidating • Although leisure centre closes at 10.00 pm the car park lighting stays on till 11.30 pm, disturbing sleep. • Increased litter • Traffic calming measures required
---	---

- More aesthetic landscaping required
- Consideration for double yellow lines
- The implementation of a youth leisure facility is necessary but the application has not been fine tuned to take account of the deeper issues that affect such an application and were neither considered during the Asda development and Rawreth Nursery Development
- Increase in traffic is in conflict with policy statement that public transport and pedestrian access should be enhanced. The proposed parking area clearly conflicts with this.
- The proposal assumes that it is possible to enhance a wildlife area but natural succession processes without exception provide the best outcome
- The spraying of Glyphosate on the site must be investigated. If carried out to improve the chances of a successful development application then the proposal becomes void as do any ecological surveys which can only be representative if the site is allowed to return to its pre-sprayed condition
- The area of the proposed pitches encroaches on existing (best solution) climax habitat
- Pitch 5 should be removed as it encroaches on habitat
- Car parking should be replaced by bicycle parking and pedestrian footpaths
- Existing bus service to be made frequent and reliable to encourage leisure users
- One more year to pass before another more representative ecology survey is carried out on the site

In response to the comments made the applicant has since made the following further comments to clarify the scope of the application.

The pitches will be managed, as all other Council owned pitches, under the grounds maintenance contract with Connaught. Connaught will be responsible for all repairs and maintenance, including litter collection.

The football season runs from late August to Mid May; the pitches will be in use at this time, as is the case for all other Council owned pitches. The football clubs will be using the pitches predominantly in the afternoon on Saturday and Sunday. The football league determine the times of matches, as is the case for all other football pitches.

When not in use the Goal nets will be removed by the grounds maintenance contractor. The land will be available for use by residents, as is the case for many other pitches around the district.

	<p>Once the pitches are in use they will be monitored by the Council with regard to anti-social behaviour and the gathering of youths. The Council will liaise with Essex County Council and already have detached youth workers attending the skate park adjacent to the pitch area. The Council offers a programme of diversionary activities that will also continue.</p> <p>An additional 70 car parking spaces will be provided with 96 spaces also available in the leisure centre car park. The grounds maintenance contractor will be responsible for informing hirers of areas to direct team cars.</p> <p>The applicant would be happy to include a low level managed hedge in the project to provide screening to Priory Chase and dissuade park and watch spectators.</p>
--	---