Schedule Item 1	 Drainage As mentioned at 1.50 in the report, the Environment Agency has now confirmed it raises no objection to the proposal. Archaeology & Infrastructure The report at 1.36 - 1.38 and conclusions refers to the fact that the applicants had commissioned the Archaeological fieldwork evaluation in conjunction with the County Archaeologist. This work has been completed. Letter received from Consultant.
	This work has been completed. Letter received from Consultant Archaeologists, as well as the County Archaeologist, who confirms that there is no evidence on the site of any significant archaeological features. This being the case, the County Archaeologist confirms there is no requirement for either further archaeological work or any archaeological conditions on any planning permission granted.
	Members will recall the applicants' previous application (03/00468/FUL) refused at Committee on 25th September 2003 into which an Appeal is proceeding by way of Public Inquiry. In the light of the Archaeological findings outlined above, the Authority is not now in a position to continue to advance on Appeal the reason for refusal No. 3
	 Development of the site is premature ahead of archaeological investigations.
	The Appellants' pre-Inquiry statement, in accordance with Circular 8/93, invites the Local Planning Authority to withdraw the archaeological reasons for refusal No. 4 and also reason No. 3 relating to inadequate phasing of additional Education and Healthcare infrastructure. The report at 1.39 to 1.41 explains the infrastructure improvements should be considered in the context of the entire "Reads Nursery" site. It lists these improvements and the further enhancements, subject to the recommendation on this latest application.
Schedule Item 3	 At the start of the report the heading applicant should read King George the V Trustees/Rayleigh Town Council. The town councillors are the trustees and as such are making this application in their capacity as trustees.

PLANNING SERVICES COMMITTEE - 22 January 2004

 Essex Police have commented on the application and made a number of observations and suggestions, details of which have been sent to the applicants. They also suggest that the building should obtain formal certification under the "Secured by Design" scheme.
3. The applicant's agent indicated that it is intended to make the toilets on the ground floor fully available for public use. In addition, to address issues of security, the intention is to provide CCTV and it is hoped that a centre manager will be employed and that increased on site management will help with issues of crime and vandalism.
4. Paragraph 3.28 should read – "Overall, whilst the proposed building does not deliver a landmark design, it is not considered that it would be significantly harmful to the area so as to justify a refusal on this basis."
5. The revised plans, to take account of the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act, make some slight changes to the fenestration pattern and widen some doors. The footpath has also been slightly realigned to pass straight in front of the building.
Following the receipt of the amended plans, the Bowls Club would wish to add the following to their previous objections to the proposal:
 Maintain that there should be no viewing area overlooking the green as this would encourage vandalism; The number of windows facing the green has increased and the windows are not of a design conducive for viewing matches and no thought appears to have been given to users; For safety reasons a door of a patio type should be included on this side; The ramp has been altered to a stepped path that would not be suitable for wheelchair access; The only entrance door is above ground level and again not user friendly for disabled people; Generally unhappy with the area allocated to them as a large portion of it is taken up by a passage and walk through; As a whole, find the whole enterprise unsatisfactory.