

PLANNING SERVICES COMMITTEE
25th JULY 2002
ADDENDUM

Agenda Item 8	For information: A planning appeal has now been lodged against the refusal of planning permission for the extension of this garden.
Schedule Item 4	<p>The County Millwright comments as follows in relation to the revised plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Drawings of proposed windows and doors should be approved prior to work commencing. These should be similar to those of the mill as last working. Windowsills should be similarly treated. (Note – this is covered by suggested condition 3) - Minimal decoration should be applied to the internal glazing screens and detailed comments are given as to where this could be avoided - in relation to ceilings and floors these should be original or wide boarded replacements. They should show from below. - Any existing 'old mill details' should be documented and preserved if possible. <p>(Note – all of the above details are acceptable to the Principal Officer (Architecture) and can be accommodated into the scheme)</p>
Schedule Items 5 and 6	<p>A letter has been received from The Georgian Society, which notes that the buildings to be demolished are on the Council's Local List and fall within the conservation area. The letter describes the building, noting the facade and bracketed cornice, which it considers makes this a building of some distinction. It goes on to describe No.54 and concludes that the group of buildings contribute to the character of West Street and its composition.</p> <p>The letter notes that the Society's casework secretary visited Rochford to view the building at the time of the appeal and considered that West Street might be thought of as the most distinctive of the four main streets in Rochford, if not the grandest. The letter draws attention to PPG15, in particular the general presumption in favour of retaining buildings that positively contribute to the character of conservation areas, and the statement that the same broad criteria should be applied to the demolition of buildings in conservation areas as are applied to the demolition of listed buildings.</p> <p>The letter concludes that the loss of historic buildings and their replacement with modern interpretations dilutes the character of a town. Even if they are stylistically similar, modern buildings are</p>

	<p>very different in character because building methods and materials have changed. The letter urges that consent to demolish the buildings be refused.</p> <p>By way of clarification, a letter was also received from The Victorian Society. In the Officer's reports this letter is included in the representations discussed at paragraph 5.17 (in the case of Item 5) and paragraph 6.8 (in the case of Item 6). The letter draws attention to The Georgian Society's letter submitted pursuant to the appeal, and endorses the views expressed therein. It further states that The Society is opposed to the demolition and replication of buildings in conservation areas since it devalues both the conservation area and the importance of the buildings and groups it contains. The Society therefore urges that consent to demolish the buildings be refused.</p> <p>A further letter of objection was received in the office from a resident which notes that the reasons for resisting the demolition of the buildings are as valid as they were in 1988/89. The Council should compulsory purchase the buildings and ensure their sympathetic repair. In addition, the letter expresses concern about the new houses to the rear, access for fire engines and visibility splays.</p> <p>A petition with 8 signatories from two families was handed into the office on 24th July. The petition objects to the demolition of the buildings and to the principle of backland development. The scheme is considered to be over development and one that will cause highway difficulties.</p> <p>Finally, a letter of support for the proposed scheme was handed into the office on 24th July 2002 from two residents in West Street. The letter supports the principle of redevelopment, particularly given the state of dereliction of the buildings, but suggests that the front of the new building might best be constructed in old stock bricks.</p>
Schedule Item 7	<p>Essex County Council Planning Officer comments that No Objection is raised to the proposals subject to the following suggested conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hours of use; Maximum vehicle numbers; Establishment of noise limits and monitoring; Bunding for fuel, lubricant or oil storage; <p>Drainage details</p> <p>(Note – the first three of these suggestions are considered unnecessary due to the siting of this proposals on an industrial estate, or they would be impossible to enforce. The last two are dealt with by the Environment Agency and the last is already</p>

	<p>included in the conditions suggested).</p> <p>(Note – the first three of these suggestions are considered unnecessary due to the siting of this proposals on an industrial estate, or they would be impossible to enforce. The last two are dealt with by the Environment Agency and the last is already included in the conditions suggested).</p> <p>Southend Airport Objects to this proposal on the basis that approx one third of the site is located within the revised public safety zone. For this reason it is suggested that this application be DEFERRED from this meeting to allow further consideration of this matter. No objection is made in relation to the impact on radar coverage.</p> <p>Additional information provided by the applicants indicates that vehicles, once processed, would be placed in a racking system approx 6-7m in height (max 3 vehicles).</p> <p>REVISED RECOMMENDATION: That this application be deferred.</p>
Schedule Item 8	<p>Eleven further representations have been received in response to the neighbour notification procedure carried out in respect of the revised plans. The grounds of objection reflect those reported in paragraph 8.25 of the Officer's report.</p> <p>Rayleigh Civic Society have concerns about the position of the Doctor's Surgery and, whilst supporting the provision of affordable housing, have concerns about the inclusion of three storey units in a semi-rural setting. The Society also suggested alterations to the parking layout on the West side of the site, though this has now been revised. Finally, the Society urges the use of light coloured bricks in the development.</p> <p>Since drafting the Officer's report, revised plans have been received illustrating amendments to the internal layout of the affordable two bed flats. These have been submitted, given concerns that to provide suitable noise attenuation to the flats, bedroom windows would need to be fixed shut. The revised plans illustrate the removal of windows to habitable rooms to elevations of the buildings facing the estate.</p> <p>A further memorandum has been received from the HHH&CC, particularly with regard to the revised internal layouts. The memo notes that the solution adopted is agreeable, although it may not provide occupiers with the best possible living environment. The memo notes that windows to flank elevations should open away from the industrial estate.</p>

	<p>The memo also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • notes the absence of an attenuation barrier to the site boundary with the site of the doctor's surgery, and asks that such be provided as part of this application; • with regard to the land that is to be used for the Doctor's Surgery a further noise survey being carried out prior to the commencement of the development. • Comment: the provision of the fence to serve the doctor's surgery has been raised with the applicants, however it is noted that the provision of the surgery does not itself form part of this application. • clarifies that concerns relating to noise would be most appropriately covered by the following sequence of events: • with regard to the housing development: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the appropriate method of noise attenuation (the acoustic fence) being agreed with the LPA; 2. the noise attenuation mechanism being implemented in its entirety, further survey work being carried out following installation of the noise attenuation mechanism and, should the mechanism prove insufficient, further works of attenuation being carried out. 3. All the above works being carried out prior to the commencement of the construction of the dwellings, with the exception of the affordable flats (which have been designed to provide noise attenuation and do not, therefore, need to rely mainly upon the provision of the attenuation barrier). <p>With regard to the issues noted at 1-3 above, these can be satisfactorily covered by amendments to the conditions/S106 recommended in the Officer's report.</p>
--	--