



Rochford District Council

**SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE CONSIDERED BY
PLANNING SERVICES COMMITTEE 30 June 2005**

All planning applications are considered against the background of current Town and Country Planning legislation, rules, orders and circulars, and any development, structure and locals plans issued or made thereunder. In addition, account is taken of any guidance notes, advice and relevant policies issued by statutory authorities.

Each planning application included in this Schedule is filed with representations received and consultation replies as a single case file.

The above documents can be made available for inspection as Committee background papers at the office of Planning Services, Acacia House, East Street, Rochford.

If you require a copy of this document in larger print, please contact the Planning Administration Section on 01702 – 318191.



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

PLANNING SERVICES COMMITTEE – 30 June 2005

Ward Members for Committee Items

HOCKLEY WEST

Cllr Mrs L Hungate

ROCHFORD

Cllr K J Gordon

Cllr Mrs S A Harper

Cllr Mrs M S Vince

WHEATLEY

Cllr J M Pullen

Cllr Mrs M J Webster



PLANNING SERVICES COMMITTEE 30 June 2005

DEFERRED ITEMS

- | | | | |
|----|---|------------------|---------|
| D1 | 05/00237/ADV
Externally Illuminated Sign and Non Illuminated
Directional Sign and Coat Of Arms Located at Open
Archway to Front of Building.
3 - 15 South Street Rochford | Mrs Judith Adams | PAGE 5 |
| D2 | 05/00238/LBC
Externally Illuminated Sign and Non-Illuminated
Directional Sign and Coat Of Arms Located at Open
Archway to Front of Building.
3 - 15 South Street Rochford | Mrs Judith Adams | PAGE 11 |

REFERRED ITEM

- | | | | |
|----|---|--------------|---------|
| R3 | 05/00165/FUL
Construct Pitched Roofed Building to Provide 12
Stables, Feed, Tack, Shavings, Office and Mess
Rooms, Pitched Roofed Hay Barn, Construct Access
and Parking Area From Church Road and Layout Site
to Provide Full Livery Yard.
Land At Junction Of Murrels Lane Church Road
Hockley | Mike Stranks | PAGE 16 |
|----|---|--------------|---------|



PLANNING SERVICES COMMITTEE 30 June 2005

SCHEDULE ITEMS

- | | | | |
|------|--|-------------------|---------|
| 4 | 05/00332/FUL
Revised Application For: Block A:
Two and Three Storey Building Containing
Supermarket, Library, 3 No. Shops, 42 Flats (24 Two
Bedroomed and 18 One Bedroomed) and Involving
Re-Siting, Provision of Two Electrical Sub-Stations,
Provision of Sliding Gate, Revised Car Parking
Layout.
Block B: Two and Three Storey Building
Containing 34 Sheltered Flats (17 Two Bedroomed
and 17 One Bedroomed) and 3 No. Shops and
Involving Revised Elevations and Revised Car
Parking Layout.
Block C: Two, Three and Four Storey Building
Containing 73 No. Flats (44 Two Bedroomed and 29
One Bedroomed) and Involving Revised Elevations,
Revised Car Parking Layout, Increase in Height by
0.6m to Building Previously Approved; and Variation
to Condition 23 of Consent 03/00947/FUL to Allow
Revised Design of Turning Head and Variation to
Condition 27 of Consent 03/00947/FUL to Allow
Revised Layout of Car Parking Area for the
Supermarket and Revised Arrangements for
Dedication of Residents' Car Parking.
Land North Of Market Square/West Street And West
Of North Street Rochford | Mr Mike Stranks | PAGE 21 |
|
 | | | |
| 5 | 05/00370/FUL
Adaption and Extensions of Existing Sports Pavilion.
King George V Playing Field
King George Playing Field Eastwood Road
Rayleigh | Mrs Monica Palmer | PAGE 37 |



PLANNING SERVICES COMMITTEE - 30 June 2005 Item D1 Deferred Item

TITLE : 05/00237/ADV
EXTERNALLY ILLUMINATED SIGN AND NON ILLUMINATED
DIRECTIONAL SIGN AND COAT OF ARMS LOCATED AT
OPEN ARCHWAY TO FRONT OF BUILDING
3-15 SOUTH STREET ROCHFORD

APPLICANT : ROCHFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL

ZONING : HISTORIC CORE/OFFICE

PARISH: ROCHFORD PARISH COUNCIL

WARD: ROCHFORD

DEFERRED REPORT

- 1.1 Consideration of this application was deferred at the meeting of 26 May 2005 to enable the applicant to revise the submitted details.
- 1.2 The applicant has revised the application to provide capital letters at the beginning of each word in both proposed signs to accord with Members' request.
- 1.3 The original report and recommendation to the last Committee is set out below.

REPORT OF 26 MAY 2005

PLANNING APPLICATION DETAILS

- 1.4 Advertisement consent is sought for the installation of an externally illuminated "Rochford District Council" sign, a non-illuminated directional sign to the reception and coat of arms located at the open archway to the front of the main Council offices, South Street, Rochford.
- 1.5 The signs will be attached to a listed building located within the historic core and conservation area of Rochford town centre but which is annotated specifically as offices within these designations.



- 1.6 The proposed corporate sign will have separate white lettering 3.75m in length and lettering size between 0.15 m and 0.25m in height and located above the archway. The sign will be externally illuminated via a black finish trough light fitting mounted on brackets above the letterings.
- 1.7 The non-illuminated directional sign will be a black and white enamelled sign 0.2m in height and 0.275m in length located on the brick return inside the archway. The lettering will be a maximum of 30mm in height. The coat of arms will be located above the archway towards the left and will be painted in true heraldic colours to match the corporate coat of arms.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 1.8 **04/00679/ADV** – one non-illuminated 0.6m diameter hanging sign and four 0.3m x 0.2m directional signs to be attached to front of building.
- 1.9 This application was withdrawn following adverse comments from the Historic Buildings Advisor (E.C.C.). The current application has been produced on the basis of preliminary design consultation sought prior to submission prior to the current application.
- 1.10 The current application follows advice sought from historic buildings advisers from Essex County Council. On receipt of this advice the design and appropriateness became the focus of this current application.

CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS

- 1.11 **Rochford Parish Council:** concern as to whether this is in keeping with the policy on illuminated signage within the conservation area. Also concerns with the style of writing on the sign.
- 1.12 **County Surveyor (Highways):** advisory comments regarding glare and dazzle to drivers on the main road. Recommend a condition - the lighting for the externally illuminated sign should be suitably positioned and shielded to avoid unnecessary glare/dazzle to drivers.
- 1.13 **Historic Buildings Adviser (E.C.C):** no objection to the use of a limited amount of appropriate signage on this listed building, although considers this proposal unacceptable.



- 1.14 Use of individual letters acceptable but style proposed inappropriate. Typeface has no 'architectural' quality and is too informal for the wall of a listed building of 'classical' character. Lower case letters would look weak and ineffective. Capital letters, with serifs preferable.
- 1.15 Lighting would look over-dominant here and questions the necessity when the building is only open during office hours and street lighting levels are good. Should be omitted and appropriate lettering located higher up wall than proposed clear of the arch.
- 1.16 Use of coat of arms not unacceptable but no details provided. Should be slightly larger than shown and placed about level with the transoms of the windows.
- 1.17 Directional sign unnecessarily large – information could be shown on a sign half the size. Design might be acceptable if the border letters and arrow were raised.
- 1.18 With amendments an acceptable scheme could be produced but cannot recommend consent for application as it stands.

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Highway Safety

- 1.19 When determining applications for advert consent, highway safety and residential amenity are the two governing factors. In relation to highway safety the proposed illumination is considered acceptable as long as the light is suitably positioned and shielded to prevent glare. The proposed light as shown on the approved plans is a down lighter style light, focusing on the lettering and is unlikely to cause dazzle to drivers since the light will be shielded from the road by the aluminium casing.
- 1.20 With regards to this application policy SAT 8 is relevant as it relates to illumination in conservation areas. The policy states that:

Within conservation areas the use of internally illuminated fascias and projecting box signs will not normally be permitted. Where illuminated signs are exceptionally permitted illumination shall take the form of spot lighting of hanging signs or other discreet forms of lighting. Traditional wooden, painted fascias and hanging signs will be preferred to coloured plastic fascias and boxes.



Amenity

- 1.21 Due to the location of the proposal the design and illumination needs to be fitting for the conservation area and the listed buildings and further needs to give weight to the need to inform the public of the presence in this area, which is appropriate as this area is allocated as office on the Local Plan. Therefore the Historic Building Adviser's comments need to be considered with this in mind. In addition, it needs to be noted that the proposal does not face a residential area, it faces Rochford secondary shopping frontage area.
- 1.22 There are no objections in principle to the use of a sign in this position or to the use of individual lettering. The location is suitable. The actual position of the sign could be positioned a course of bricks higher up, although policy refers to shop adverts located directly above the entrance. The requirement is to advertise the premises for information primarily in such a way that ideally enhances the visual character of the area. Therefore, it is considered that the lettering is best placed close to the top of the carriageway rather than closer to the window openings above.
- 1.23 The lettering of the sign has been criticised as appearing too informal for the conservation areas' and listed buildings' 'classical' design. The lettering, however, is simple and clean. Whilst the lettering is modern this does not make it necessarily inappropriate for corporate signage in a conservation area; the proposal is not considered to be detrimental to the character of the building.
- 1.24 Within the conservation area and attached to a listed building the light fittings should not be a feature in themselves but should be discreet in form. This proposed strip of lighting is considered to be discreet by continuing the brick line with a colour that blends with the character of the building. Although against the Historic Building Adviser's comments, it is considered necessary to demark the entrance to the building through lighting the sign at certain times through the year in office hours. Therefore in the shorter days in winter and nights this would allow visitors and residents to Rochford and the District to easily identify the Council offices.
- 1.25 The design has been subject to minor alterations with regard to the size and position of the crest and the size of the directional sign, which has been reduced, in response to consultation with the Historic Buildings Advisor.
- 1.26 The non-illuminated directional sign in the originally submitted plans was 0.3m in height and 0.4m in length, which was considered unnecessarily large. This has been reduced to 0.2m in height and 0.275m in length and the font has changed from a sans serif font to a serif font, which conforms to the advice.



- 1.27 The coat of arms in the originally submitted plans was nearly half the size and situated only 0.55m above the proposed illumination. This was considered inappropriate and aptly revised to enlarge the coat of arms and to relocate between the two windows above the proposed illumination, which now conforms to the Historic Buildings Advisers' advice.

CONCLUSION

- 1.28 The original proposal, although delivered following the expert advice from Essex County Council, faced several objections from the Historic Buildings Adviser. The scheme has been revised to reflect Members' concerns about the lettering. The revised scheme has not overcome the objections regarding the illumination. However, in this particular case where a balance between the need for information and the need to ensure that the signage would not adversely affect the visual amenities of the area, the illumination is acceptable and considered to have no detrimental effects to highway safety.

RECOMMENDATION

- 1.29 It is proposed that this Committee **RESOLVES** to **APPROVE** this application subject to the following conditions:
- 1 SAC1Advert Time Limits (5 Years)
 - 2 SAC3 – Advert – Standard Condition
 - 3 SAC5 – Illumination Restricted

REASON FOR DECISION

The proposal is considered not to cause significant demonstrable harm to any development plan interests, other material considerations, to the character and appearance of the conservation area or residential amenity such as to justify refusing the application; nor to surrounding occupiers in South Street.



**PLANNING SERVICES COMMITTEE - 30 June 2005 Item D1
Deferred Item**

Relevant development plan policies and proposals:

SAT7, SAT8, SAT9, SAT11 of the Rochford District Local Plan First Review



Shaun Scrutton
Head of Planning Services

For further information please contact Mike Stranks on (01702) 546366.



PLANNING SERVICES COMMITTEE - 30 June 2005 Item D2 Deferred Item

TITLE : 05/00238/LBC
EXTERNALLY ILLUMINATED SIGN AND NON ILLUMINATED
DIRECTIONAL SIGN AND COAT OF ARMS LOCATED AT
OPEN ARCHWAY TO FRONT OF BUILDING
3 - 15 SOUTH STREET ROCHFORD

APPLICANT : ROCHFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL

ZONING : HISTORIC CORE/OFFICE

PARISH: ROCHFORD PARISH COUNCIL

WARD: ROCHFORD

DEFERRED REPORT

- 2.1 Consideration of this application was deferred at the meeting of 26 May 2005 to enable the applicant to revise the submitted details.
- 2.2 The applicant has revised the application to provide capital letters at the beginning of each word in both proposed signs in accord with Members' request.
- 2.3 The original report and recommendation to the last Committee is set out below.

PLANNING APPLICATION DETAILS

- 2.4 This application seeks listed building consent to erect an externally illuminated sign and Council coat of arms above the carriageway and to the front face of the Council offices in South Street leading to the new temporary reception building. The application also seeks permission to erect a directional sign within the building return to the carriageway.
- 2.5 The signs will be attached to a listed building located within the historic core and conservation area of Rochford town centre but is annotated specifically as offices within these designations. It is one of a group of buildings that form the façade on the east side of South Street which have both individual and group value.



- 2.6 As Rochford District Council are the applicants, this application by virtue of section 74(2)a, falls to the Secretary of State to determine.
- 2.7 The proposed Corporate sign will have separate white lettering 3.75m in length and lettering size between 0.15m and 0.25m in height and located above the archway. The sign will be externally illuminated via a black finish trough light fitting mounted on brackets above the letterings.
- 2.8 The non-illuminated directional sign will be a black and white enamelled sign 0.2m in height and 0.275m in length located on the brick return inside the archway. The lettering will be a maximum of 30mm in height. The coat of arms will be located above the archway towards the left, it will be painted in true heraldic colours to match the corporate coat of arms.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 2.9 **04/00680/LBC** – one non-illuminated 0.6m diameter hanging sign and four 0.3m x 0.2m directional signs to be attached to front of building.
- 2.10 This previous application was withdrawn following adverse comments from the Historic Buildings Advisor (E.C.C.). The current application has been produced on the basis of preliminary design consultation sought prior to submission.
- 2.11 This application follows advice sought from historic buildings advisers from Essex County Council. On receipt of this advice the design and appropriateness became the focus of this current application.

CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS

- 2.12 **Rochford Parish Council** – concerns whether this is in keeping with the policy on illuminated signage within the conservation area and concerns with the style of writing on the sign.
- 2.13 **County Surveyor (Highways)** – advisory comments regarding glare and dazzle to drivers on the main road.
- 2.14 **County Planner (Historic Conservation)** – No general objection to the limited use of appropriate signage on this listed building. The use of individual letters is acceptable but the proposed style is too informal and lower case letters are ineffective and weak on a building of 'classic' character. Appropriate lettering should be located higher up the wall than is proposed, clear of the archway.



- 2.15 The proposed lighting is over-dominant and should be omitted, its necessity is questionable as the building will only be open during office hours and the existing levels of street lighting are good.
- 2.16 The use of the coat of arms is not unacceptable but should be slightly larger than shown and placed about level with the transoms of the windows.
The directional sign is unnecessarily large; the design might be acceptable if the border, letters and arrow were raised.
- 2.17 Consent is not recommend for the application as it stands, although amendments could produce an acceptable scheme.

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Impact on Listed Building and its Setting

- 2.18 There are no objections in principle to the use of a sign in this position or to the use of individual lettering. Notwithstanding the comment from the Historic Buildings Advisor, it is considered that the lettering is best placed close to the top of carriageway rather than moving closer to the window openings above. The requirement is to advertise the premises for information primarily, in such a way that ideally enhances the visual character of the area.
- 2.19 The lettering of the sign has been criticised as appearing too informal for a listed building of 'classical' design. The lettering, however, is simple and clean and whilst modern this does not make it necessarily inappropriate for corporate signage in a conservation area and it is not considered to be detrimental to the character of the building. The material for the lettering of the main sign is 5mm thick white acrylic with nylon locators to the rear fixing which will allow the lettering to have a separation from the fabric of the listed building.
- 2.20 Within the conservation area and attached to a listed building the light fittings should not be a feature in themselves but should be discreet in form. This proposed strip of lighting is considered to be discreet by continuing the brick line with a colour that blends with the character of the building.
- 2.21 The design has been subject to minor alterations with regard to the size and position of the crest and the size of the directional sign, which has been reduced, in response to consultation with the Historic Buildings Advisor (E.C.C.).



- 2.22 The coat of arms in the originally submitted plans was nearly half the size and situated only 0.55m above the proposed illumination. This was considered inappropriate and aptly revised to enlarge the coat of arms and to relocate in the middle between the two windows above the proposed illumination, which now conforms to the Historic Buildings Advisers' advice.
- 2.23 The non-illuminated directional sign in the superseded plans was 0.3m in height and 0.4m in length, which was considered unnecessarily large. This has been reduced to 0.2m in height and 0.275m in length and the font has changed from a sans serif font to a serif font, which conforms to the advice.

CONCLUSION

- 2.24 The original proposal, whilst delivered from the expert advice from Essex County Council, faced several objections from the Historic Buildings Adviser. The scheme has been revised to reflect Members' concerns about the lettering. The revised scheme has not overcome objections regarding the illumination. However, in this particular case where a balance between informing the public of the presence of the premises and the need to ensure that the signage would not adversely affect the visual amenities of the area, the illumination is acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION

- 2.25 That, in referring the application to the Secretary of State for his consent, the Local Planning Authority recommendation is approval with the following conditions:

- 1 SC4 Time Limits – Five Years

REASON FOR DECISION

The proposal is considered not to cause significant demonstrable harm to any development plan interests, other material considerations, to the character and appearance of the conservation area or residential amenity such as to justify refusing the application; nor to surrounding occupiers in South Street.



**PLANNING SERVICES COMMITTEE - 30 June 2005 Item D2
Deferred Item**

Relevant development plan policies and proposals:

UC7 of the Rochford District Local Plan First Review



Shaun Scrutton
Head of Planning Services

For further information please contact Mike Stranks on (01702) 546366.



PLANNING SERVICES COMMITTEE - 30 June 2005 Item R3 Referred Item

TITLE : 05/00165/FUL
CONSTRUCT PITCHED ROOFED BUILDING TO PROVIDE 12
STABLES, FEED, TACK, SHAVINGS, OFFICE AND MESS
ROOMS, PITCHED ROOFED HAY BARN, CONSTRUCT
ACCESS AND PARKING AREA FROM CHURCH ROAD AND
LAYOUT SITE TO PROVIDE FULL LIVERY YARD.
LAND AT JUNCTION OF MURRELS LANE CHURCH ROAD
HOCKLEY

APPLICANT : T CRIPPS

ZONING : METROPOLITAN GREEN BELT

PARISH: HOCKLEY PARISH COUNCIL

WARD: HOCKLEY WEST

In accordance with the agreed procedure this item is reported to this meeting for consideration.

This application was included in Weekly List no 781 requiring notification of referrals to the Head of Planning Services by 1.00 pm on Tuesday 14 June 2005, with any applications being referred to this Meeting of the Committee. The item was referred by Cllr Mrs L Hungate.

The item that was referred is appended as it appeared in the Weekly List, together with a plan.

- 3.1 **Hockley Parish Council** - Have no adverse comments with regard to diversification of farming and the appearance of the buildings.
- 3.2 Concerned at the siting of the proposed entrance and refer to previous recommendation of objection from County Highways concerning entrance from Church Road. Consider that the alternative from Murrells Lane would be no better.
- 3.3 Concerned that the consultant's document accompanying the application states that Church Road has no importance in the County's road hierarchy. Consider that Church Road is very important as the quickest and only practical route between Hullbridge and Hockley. Have strong objection to the proposal on this basis.



PLANNING SERVICES COMMITTEE - 30 June 2005 Item R3

Referred Item

NOTES

- 3.4 This application is to a site on the western side of Church Road and to the north of Murrells Lane. The site comprises improved grassland and is bounded by a tall hedgerow to the frontage onto Church Road and ranch style fencing to the remaining boundaries. A slope exists across the site uphill from south to north but falling away towards Blountswood Road to the west.
- 3.5 To the west of the application site, but part of the same field, was previously proposed a mushroom growing unit, refused permission on 14 December 2000 under application ref: 00/00068/FUL and which accessed midway along Murrells Lane by an improvement to the existing access. The application was refused permission because of the size and industrial appearance of the building and the impact upon the character and openness of attractive countryside. An appeal against the Council's decision was dismissed.
- 3.6 The proposal is to construct a pitched roofed building to provide 12 stables in a quadrangle but open on the south side. The building would accommodate a feed store, tack room, shavings store, and office and mess room. The building would have an overall height of 5.2m, and would comprise blockwork construction on a brick plinth with rendered external finish. The roof would be finished in red pantiles.
- 3.7 A detached pitched roof hay barn with overall height of 4.6m is also proposed. The barn would be finished in fairfaced blockwork to the lower walls and tanalised boarding with gaps to the upper walling. The roof would be finished in brown fibre corrugated cement sheeting.
- 3.8 The proposal also includes the construction of a 5.5m wide access road from Church Road, splayed with 10.5m radius to an overall width of 17m at the carriageway edge. Parking area for seven cars is included
- 3.9 The proposal would provide stabling and layout of site to provide a full livery yard. The application shows the remainder of the site divided into paddocks.
- 3.10 Policy C2 to the replacement Structure Plan and policy GB1 to the Council's adopted Local Plan require that development that might exceptionally be approved in the Green Belt be for small scale facilities for outdoor participatory sport that shall in turn preserve the openness of the Green Belt. More recent advice contained in Planning Policy Statement 7 (August 2004) states that small scale horse enterprises involving up to 10 horses should facilitate the re-use of farm buildings to provide useful farm diversification.



- 3.11 Policy LT10 to the adopted Local Plan amongst other things requires that stabling be provided on land equivalent to 0.5ha per horse where there are nearby bridle paths. The area of the site is some 6.27ha (15.5acres) allowing for the stabling of 12 horses given the existence of bridle paths in the vicinity of the site. Although the proposal is for 12 stables the site meets the scale of provision that can be permitted by way of criteria detailed at Policy LT10. The erection of the stable building would not therefore be inappropriate development in terms of the small scale nature of the proposal for the participation in outdoor sport and recreation.
- 3.12 The existing site is very open and slopes within the landscape giving prominence in the wider surroundings. A modern agricultural building exists to the south west of the site and there is a wider scattering of dwellings and a scrap yard in Murrells Lane. With the exception of the adjoining agricultural building the remaining sites are, however, screened by long established trees and hedging and are less prominent than the open grassland on which the proposal would be sited. In dismissing the previous Appeal the inspector concluded that the previous building was so large that it could not be satisfactorily screened. The proposed stables are, however, modest in size and could be screened by planting and landscaping.
- 3.13 The barn and stable buildings are of a high standard in design, fit for purpose and, subject to satisfactory landscaping conditions, would not conflict with Policy RC8
- 3.14 **Essex County Council Highways Department** - Raise no objection to the proposal, subject to the applicant entering into a suitable Planning Obligation, details of which to be agreed with the Highway Authority to:
- secure a contribution from the developer of £3,000 towards the improvement of the local bridleway network
- and to the following heads of conditions;
- closure of the existing access to the junction of Murrells Lane and Church Road
 - Provision of 2.4m x 90m visibility splay
 - Access to be paved in permanent material
 - Provision of parking for all vehicles regularly visiting the site
 - The development to provide full livery only
- 3.15 **English Nature** - Advise that the proposal is not likely to affect SSSI. Advise that if protected species are suspected to be present on the site the applicant should provide an ecological survey to determine the effects of the proposal and acceptability of any mitigation required.



- 3.16 **Environment Agency** - Encloses guidance for the applicant on the storage of animal and vegetable wastes to include the storage of manure not within 10m of any watercourse or 50m of any wells, springs or boreholes. No stockpiling should take place on land containing land drains. Only clean uncontaminated water should discharge into any soakaway, watercourse or surface water sewer.
- 3.17 1 letter has been received from residents in the vicinity of the site and which make the following objections;
- Applicant's company refused permission to erect mushroom growing units of some 40,000sq.ft. and subsequently dismissed on Appeal.
 - Importance in keeping the area open.
 - Important visual amenity of the Green Belt.
 - Current application much smaller in scale.
 - In 2000 the applicant owned a barn of some 5,000sq.ft. on part of this application site with additional unit for storage of straw added. The area between has been used for storage of containers, lorries and equipment altering the visual impact of the area and changing its character.
 - The current application with buildings arranged over some 10,000sq.ft. when added to the arrangement above further considerably alters the character, openness, visual amenity of the area.
 - Concern at the proposed new entrance. The existing junction at Murrells Lane was cited by the inspector as a further reason for refusing the Appeal.
 - Gradual changes are eroding the grounds of objection to previous Appeal.
 - Applicant's traffic consultant makes much of the replacement poor entrance but this is rarely used as there is no activity taking place on the land and access is possible from the units mentioned above.
 - Church Road is a rat run for vehicles between Lower Road through to High Road. Own observations have noted 6 vehicles per minute during peak periods and 4 vehicles per minute during Sunday mid-to-late morning at most commonly 40mph.
 - Support objections previously held by Essex County Highways.
 - Entrance from Murrells Lane would be appropriate rather than new entrance onto Church Road, given worst case of three vehicles per hour using the proposal.
 - Any increase in horse riding on Church Road could cause increased danger, given existing levels of riding locally.
 - If minded to approve, suggest proposal be relocated close to Murrells Lane to distance the proposal from the eight dwellings adjoining the church to prevent spoiling of views of the church and landscape.



3.18

RECOMMENDATION

It is proposed that this Committee **RESOLVES** to **APPROVE** this application' subject to the Applicants and owners entering into an AGREEMENT under Section 106 of the Act that the applicant provide a contribution of £3,000 towards the improvement of the Local Bridleway Network and to the following conditions;

- 1 SC4 Time Limits Full - Standard
- 2 SC14 Materials to be Used (Externally)
- 3 SC35 Floodlights - Orientation
- 4 SC59 Landscape Design - Details (Full)
- 5 The buildings hereby approved shall not be occupied beneficially before visibility splays 2.4m x 90m have been provided at both sides of the approved vehicular access. Once provided, the said visibility splays shall thereafter be retained and maintained in their approved form, free of obstruction above the finished surface of the approved vehicular access.
- 6 The accessway shall be paved in permanent material between the highway boundary and the proposed position of the gates.
- 7 Prior to the beneficial occupation of the buildings hereby approved the existing field access at the junction of Murrells Lane and Church Road shall be suitably and permanently closed.
- 8 The development hereby permitted shall be used only for purposes as a full Livery Yard
- 9 SC27 PD Restricted – Horse Riding.

REASON FOR DECISION

The proposal is considered not to cause significant demonstrable harm to any development plan interests, other material considerations, to the character and appearance of the area, to the street scene or residential amenity such as to justify refusing the application; nor to surrounding occupiers in neighbouring streets.

Relevant Development Plan Policies and Proposals:

GB1, RC8, LT10, of the Rochford District Council Local Plan First Review



Shaun Scrutton
Head of Planning Services

For further information please contact Mike Stranks on (01702) 546366.



**TITLE : 05/00332/FUL
REVISED APPLICATION FOR;
BLOCK A : TWO AND THREE STOREY BUILDING
CONTAINING SUPERMARKET, LIBRARY 3 No. SHOPS, 42
FLATS (24 TWO BEDROOMED AND 18 ONE BEDROOMED)
AND INVOLVING RE – SITING , REVISED CAR PARKING
LAYOUT
BLOCK B: TWO AND THREE STOREY BUILDING
CONTAINING 34 SHELTERED FLATS (17 TWO
BEDROOMED AND 17 ONE BEDROOMED) AND 3 No.
SHOPS AND INVOLVING REVISED ELEVATIONS AND
REVISED CAR PARKING LAYOUT
BLOCK C : TWO, THREE, AND FOUR STOREY BUILDING
CONTAINING 73 No. FLATS (44 TWO BEDROOMED AND 29
ONE BEDROOMED) AND INVOLVING REVISED
ELEVATIONS , REVISED CAR PARKING LAYOUT,
INCREASE IN HEIGHT BY 0.6M TO BUILDING PREVIOUSLY
APPROVED, PROVISION OF SLIDING GATE
AND;
PROVISION OF TWO ELECTRICAL SUB – STATIONS
AND;
VARIATION OF CONDITION 23 OF CONSENT 03/00947/ FUL
TO ALLOW REVISED DESIGN OF TURNING HEAD
AND;
VARIATION TO CONDITION 27 OF CONSENT 03/00947/ FUL
TO ALLOW REVISED LAYOUT OF CAR PARKING AREA
FOR THE SUPERMARKET AND REVISED ARRANGEMENTS
FOR DEDICATION OF RESIDENTS CAR PARKING
LAND NORTH OF MARKET SQUARE/WEST STREET AND
WEST OF NORTH STREET ROCHFORD**

APPLICANT : **HOUSECHERRY LTD**

ZONING : **PROPOSED SUPERMARKET AND HOSPITAL**

PARISH: **ROCHFORD PARISH COUNCIL**

WARD: **ROCHFORD**

PLANNING APPLICATION DETAILS**The site**

- 4.1 The application site comprises an area of land covering 1.25ha (3.08acres) situated to the north of the Market Square and West Street and west of North Street and south of more recent development at Pollards Close. The remaining hospital buildings exist to the west of the site.
- 4.2 The southern part of the site comprises two fields used amongst other things for grazing. The dilapidated and vacant elderly persons home known as "The Bungalow" and Roche Lodge are situated on the northern part of the site.

The Proposal

- 4.3 This amended application has arisen from the further analysis of the approved drawings by the applicant and detailed survey work dealing with issues arising since the consideration of the application. There has also been a need to respond to client requirements and boundary discrepancies. Fundamentally the application is largely the same as that considered by the Committee on 20 May 2004.
- 4.4 The schedule of residential accommodation approved to Block A has been revised to delete the two bedsits and reducing the two bedroomed accommodation from 30 units to 24 and increasing the one bedroomed units from 10 to 18. The overall number of units remains unchanged at 42.
- 4.5 The schedule of residential accommodation approved to the Sheltered Housing at Block B changes slightly reducing by one two bedroomed unit and increasing by one one bedroomed unit. The overall provision of 34 units remains unchanged and is now proposed to be divided equally into 17 one and two bedroomed units.
- 4.6 The schedule of residential accommodation approved to Block C reduces the two bedroomed accommodation from 49 to 44 units and increases the one bedroomed accommodation from 24 to 29 units. The overall number of units remains unchanged at 73 units.
- 4.7 The main areas of change relate to the minor repositioning of the buildings on site by no more than 1 metre within the boundaries and re-planning some of the car parking areas within the overall scheme.
- 4.8 There has been a need to revise the building to Block C to account for the sewers that run through the site.



- 4.9 Two sub stations added on the east boundary to the rear of Block B and west boundary between Blocks A and C in accordance with statutory undertakers' requirements.
- 4.10 Car parking provision has been updated to ensure spaces are usable
- 4.11 The detailed changes are described and analysed under material considerations below.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.12 The site currently accommodates a dilapidated building known as "The Bungalow" formerly run by the County Council as an elderly persons home. This building is now vacant and suffering the effects of vandalism.
- 4.13 The following applications relate to the southern part of the site, which has not been redeveloped:
- 4.14 ROC/459/68
Erection of Supermarket and 19/23 and 25/27 North Street, Rochford.
This comprised the frontage onto North Street outside the current application site, but the rear part of the two sites overlap.
Permission refused – Demolition would adversely affect character and visual amenities of the townscape, conservation area and historic core of Rochford.
- 4.15 ROC/479/89
Erect 42 Sheltered Housing Units – Approved. This permission has been commenced and therefore remains valid.
- 4.16 95/00051/ROC – Renewal of application ROC/479/89 to erect 42 Sheltered Housing Units.
Permission Refused – for the following reason
"The application falls within an area designated as a site for a retail food store in the Rochford District Local Plan First Review, as now modified, and as such the proposed residential use is contrary to the provisions of Local Plan First Review Policy SAT 20."
- 4.17 98/00580/CPO
Conservation Area Consent application to demolish "The Bungalow" former elderly persons home and Roche Lodge
Application not Proceeded with.



- 4.18 02/01123/FUL
Erect 12 one bedroomed and 12 two bedroomed flat units (Total 24) in 3 three storey residential blocks, layout access, car parking and amenity areas
Withdrawn.
- 4.19 03/00947/FUL
(A) Two and three storey building containing Supermarket, Library, 3 No. Shops, 42 No. Flats (1-bed, 2-bed and bedsits) and basement car park
(B) Two and three storey building containing 34 No. Flats (1 bed and 2 bed) and 3 No. Shops
(C) Two, three and four storey building containing 73 No. Flats (1- bed and 2 – bed)
Car parking and associated works

Permission Granted 4th March 2005.

- 4.20 05/00262/FUL
Resurface Car Parks and Pedestrian Link, provide bollards to access alignment, enclose car parks with 1.8m high railings and brick wall and construct 7 car parking spaces.
Permission Granted 1st June 2005

CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS

- 4.21 **Essex County Council Highways and Transportation**
Request an extension of time to consider the application - comments awaited
- 4.22 **Environment Agency**
Objects to the proposal on the basis that no Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted.
- 4.23
Aware that the current application constitutes amendments to the original application and advise that a Flood Risk Assessment should have been required on the original application, but as the application stated mains sewers for drainage, the Agency did not request an FRA. The Agency is, however, now taking a more precautionary approach to surface water management.
- 4.24
Require an assessment that includes confirmation that this drainage will be acceptable to the sewerage provider and how the excess water will be managed. Advise that historically problems have been associated with drainage in excess of the sewers' capacity and this should also be addressed by the FRA.



-
- 4.25 **OFFICER COMMENT** – The site is traversed by two major trunk sewers, being public foul and surface water. Both Anglian Water and the Environment Agency were consulted on the previous application and did not raise any concerns, a point acknowledged by the Environment Agency in response to the current application. The applicant has since revised the scheme to accommodate the requirements of Anglian Water and which necessitate changes discussed in this current application, particularly to Block C.
- 4.26 Under the provisions of Planning Policy Guidance 25 Flooding officers have written to the Environment Agency explaining why the objections now specified relating to the principles of the scheme cannot be given weight sufficient to recommend that the revised scheme should be refused. The final response from the Environment Agency will be reported at the meeting.
- 4.27 **Anglian Water** – comments awaited.
- 4.28 **Essex County Council Specialist Archaeological Advice** -Recommends trial trenching and possible excavation
- 4.29 **English Nature** - Advises that as part of the design brief the presence of protected species within or close to the site should be established.
- 4.30 Note that the site is the subject of a previous application and refer to previous correspondence. Presence of protected species is a material consideration and advise that if protected species are suspected or present on a proposed development site then the site should be surveyed by an appropriately qualified consultant to:
- establish the species concerned
 - the population level at the site or affected by the proposal
 - the impact the proposal is likely to have upon the species present
 - what can be done to mitigate against this impact
 - whether the impact is necessary or acceptable
 - whether a licence is required from English Nature or Defra
- 4.31 **Essex Police Architectural Liaison Officer** - No objections to the proposed layout and revised car parking and various variations.
- 4.32 Suggests the Council make the development subject to secured by design certification.
- 4.33 **Essex County Council Specialist Urban Design Advice** - Consider that the recently approved footpath access from the market square and between the parking areas is a worse solution and suggest amendments should the library site become available in future for redevelopment.



- 4.34 Consider that new trees should be planted to screen the view from the pedestrian access across into the parking area to the rear of Block B. By slightly realigning the access to the bank it should be possible to plant some trees along the rear boundary with the existing library parking area.
- 4.35 Trees should be located between parking rows and adjacent to spaces 18 and 25 to screen and divide up the area. At the moment the extensive hard surfaced area is totally exposed without the relief of any landscaping. Grassed amenity area could benefit from tree planting, trees could also be provided at the end of Block B to lead the pedestrian into the new development.
- 4.36 The replacement of previously proposed trees with planting columns and refuse bins will not contribute to providing an attractive public space.
- 4.37 Consider that the height and bulk of the buildings are excessive for the location.
- 4.38 On Block A the projecting single storey canopies destroy the clarity of built form and appear superfluous as a continual covered walkway is not proposed.
- 4.39 Upper floors of the façade are divided vertically into separate visual units, but these are sometimes not reflected at ground floor level.
- 4.40 The use of pantiles on anything other than single storey is against the recommendations of the Essex Design Guide.
- 4.41 There are too many octagonal turrets. The Octagonal roofs also sit uncomfortably with the short lengths of high corner roofs behind them.
- 4.42 On Block B south elevation, the projecting window on the first and second floors needs to be centrally placed under the Apex of the gable end.
- 4.43 Block C particularly has a proliferation of dormers and stylistic treatments.



MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Development Plan

- 4.44 The previous application determined the acceptability of the scheme in planning terms against the background of national and local policy and supplementary planning guidance. There can be no objection to the principle of the scheme. Consideration of the application turns therefore on the assessment overall of the particular revisions and their merits individually and collectively in comparison to the previously approved scheme.

BLOCK A:

- 4.45 Block A comprises the Supermarket, Library and three shops with flats above. It is proposed that this be resited to achieve a nominal 1m distance from the western boundary to enable a maintenance strip and take into account boundaries as a result of a topographical survey of the site. This resiting of the whole building reduces the width of the pedestrianised area by 1 metre but this improvement in relationship to the boundary and slight narrowing of the public area within the scheme would not prove visually detrimental to the scale and appearance of the revised scheme.
- 4.46 The entrance to the supermarket is proposed to be moved from the middle of the elevation of the building fronting onto the pedestrian area and is now proposed to be relocated to the tower on the south eastern corner of the building to the rear of the Natwest Bank car park. The applicants favour this revision to provide a more prominent focal point for customers within the southern part of the pedestrianised area and those accessing the development from Market Square. The resultant revisions to the elevation are not detrimental in Planning terms.
- 4.47 The individual shop units within the building are revised to take into account the changes to the supermarket entrance but are generally of the same size.
- 4.48 The ground floor south elevation facing to the rear of properties fronting West Street deletes the previously approved shop windows to the supermarket in favour of rendered panels and brick plinths. This change is at the supermarket operator's request in the interests of security and display requirements for the internal workings of the shop. The rendered bays would retain the proportions of the building as approved and the resultant appearance would not detract from the character of the building.



- 4.49 The supermarket loading bay has been reconfigured revising the layout to accommodate refuse bins, widen the loading bay and provide an internal refrigeration plant room in accordance with the client requirements. The revised arrangement does not reduce the access width to the basement car park. The elevational changes incorporate an extension to the pitched roofed area above the ramped entrance areas that would not be visually detrimental to the appearance of the building.
- 4.50 The layout of the flatted accommodation on first and second floors to Block A has been revised to the developers' requirements. The schedule of residential accommodation approved to Block A has been revised to delete the two bedsits and reducing the two bedroomed accommodation from 30 units to 24 and increasing the one bedroomed units from 10 to 18. The overall number of units remains unchanged at 42.
- 4.51 The revisions to the flats necessitate changes to the window openings on north, south and west elevations but retaining the east elevation facing onto the pedestrianised area, as previously approved. The revisions to the openings would not detract from the character and merits of the appearance of the building. The incorporation of two roof lights to the stair well on the western elevation facing the hospital buildings would not give rise to overlooking issues.

BLOCK B:

- 4.52 The south eastern corner footprint of this building is proposed to be amended to take into account ownership and title issues allowing future maintenance of the building façade clear of the ownership of adjoining land. This necessitates a step in the plan of the building on the southern side reducing the undercroft car parking by one space but which is re-provided to the layout behind the building to the east together with a revised layout to accommodate a space lost to the access to a new sub station.
- 4.53 The revised design of the southern corner of the building necessitates a revision to the south elevation resulting in the deletion and reduction in size of windows serving the living rooms. In all other respects the appearance of the building remains unchanged. The resultant changes would not harm the character or appearance of the building.
- 4.54 The building is also shown to be revised in siting to the eastern boundary with properties fronting north street to achieve a side isolation space of 1m. The effects of this resiting narrow the pedestrian area from the eastern side. The revision improves the relationship between the building and the site boundary and would not, taking into account the similar resiting to Block A, narrow the pedestrian area to an unacceptable degree.



BLOCK C :

- 4.55 The proposal involves the diversion of an existing sewer with the result that a bedroom to a ground floor unit on the northern side of the building to Block C has been deleted and provides parking area. This will allow access for Anglian Water to maintain the sewer. The northern façade now includes a gated feature in wrought iron railings to complete the elevation and maintain security.
- 4.56 As a consequence of the need to allow the sewer to retain its current location and fall on this part of the site it is necessary to revise the height of the corresponding element of that part of the building by 0.6m. It is considered that the minor increase in height would not be significant to harm the amenity of residential properties backing onto the site in Johnson Court, which are separated from the site boundary some 11m to the north.
- 4.57 As a result of the changes to the revision to the accommodation type in the building the current application makes various changes to revise the positioning of windows and doors, revisions to their size or omitting windows and doors to allow the revised working of the floor area. The elevations have been modified to accommodate these changes but on the whole look little different to the buildings as previously approved. The minor changes now proposed would not detract from the character and appearance of the building.
- 4.58 As a consequence to changes to the ground floor footprint the courtyard has been re-planned and six additional car parking spaces achieved in addition to those previously approved.
- 4.59 The car parking area along the western boundary to Block C previously showed 22 car parking spaces broken by two landscaped built out areas. The current application deletes the landscaped areas and reduces the width of landscaping at the ends of the car parking area, so increasing provision by 6 additional spaces to 28. A sliding gate is now proposed with a fence containing 19 spaces within the control of the residents to Block C. Five of the nine spaces south of the gate would be made available as a replacement for those lost in North Street as a result of the traffic regulation order.
- 4.60 Subject to no adverse comments being received from Essex County Council Highways department the enhanced parking provision is considered acceptable in planning terms.



Urban Design Issues

- 4.61 The County Urban Designer raises concerns at the revised pedestrian link to the Market Square recently approved. This more recent scheme also shown on this current application omits the planting of trees previously shown to this walkway and takes an alignment more abrupt where it meets with the vehicle access path to the bank car park. Otherwise the recently approved scheme is to the same 2m width and line as previously approved. The concerns at the need for tree planting can be considered in detail with the necessary landscaping to be submitted as part of the current approval or as recommended by officers in this application. Officers consider that no material objection can be raised to support the County Urban Designer's preferences that would justify withholding consent on this revised scheme for those reasons.
- 4.62 The previously approved scheme featured the same canopies that extended at the front of the shop units and supermarket to Block A, but which are not continuous, to form a covered walkway. Similarly, the previously approved building included the octagonal turrets and the same vertical division of the upper elevations also of concern to the County Urban Design Adviser.
- 4.63 In the previously approved southern end elevation facing onto the pedestrian link to Block B, the projecting windows were placed similarly off centre to the gable end and beneath the valley to the roof detail. The adjoining windows were, however, also located off centre to the gable. In this revised application the number of windows are reduced and centrally placed under the easterly gable feature but remain offset in the case of the projecting bays.
- 4.64 Proliferation of dormers and stylistic treatments to Block C referred to by the County Urban Designer also featured in the previous application.
- 4.65 The concerns at the appropriateness of the overall scale of the building were considered offset by the location of the site away from any of the established historic street frontages of the town.
- 4.66 Given the comparison to the previous scheme, it is not considered that a material objection to this feature can be substantiated. These features of the design were considered acceptable previously by officers and Members in the consideration of the previous application and notwithstanding the current advice from the County Urban Designer, there are no material changes that change the view held by officers as to their acceptability in this revised application.



- 4.67 The comments concerning the use of pantiles can be addressed through the submission of materials as required by Condition 3 of the recommendation.

Variation to Conditions

- 4.68 Condition 23 of the existing Consent 03/00947/FUL states;

The raised area within the access road shall contain within its limits a side turn size 2 turning head as described on page 72 of the Essex Design Guide for residential and mixed use areas. The side turn leg of the turning head shall also serve as access for the court (pedestrian) area directly to the south of the raised area and between bocks A and B.

REASON: In the interests of Highway Safety

- 4.69 The location of the buildings and limitations of the site shape do not allow the provision of the turning head to precisely the dimensions as set out in the Essex Design Guide. The applicant has submitted details of a turning vehicle analysis for supermarket delivery vehicles accessing the delivery ramp and for refuse vehicles using the same area. The conclusions of the applicant's highway consultants demonstrate that supermarket delivery lorries could access the service bay and that refuse vehicles could manoeuvre using the turning head in front of the bollards between the pedestrian area and the access to the flatted development to Block C.

- 4.70 The comments of Essex County Council Highways department are awaited at the time of writing. Subject to no adverse comments being received as to the acceptability of the proposed layout it is recommended that condition 23 be revised to accommodate the details and layout contained in the current application.

- 4.71 Condition 27 of the existing consent 03/00947/FUL states

27. Prior to the commencement of the development the applicant shall submit details including plans to the Local Planning Authority of the segregation measures for the basement car park in Block B to ensure that 70 of the car parking spaces are retained and made available for the supermarket use and the remaining parking spaces for the other users in the building . The building identified as Block B shall not be occupied beneficially until such details have been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON : In the interests of providing satisfactory off – street parking provision for the range of uses in this part of the development in the interests of highway safety.



- 4.72 The purpose of this condition was to address issues concerning the need to ensure adequate off street parking provision for the dual use of the supermarket building in Block A. It is therefore necessary to correct the reference in the condition to Block B.
- 4.73 The plan, as approved, shows 90 car parking spaces to the basement of the supermarket building. As a result of a need to introduce disabled parking bays, cycle parking, shopping trolley bays and construction and layout considerations the area available has been reduced to 83 spaces.
- 4.74 The supermarket operator requires that all the basement car parking be made available for shoppers on a pay and display basis. Between the hours of 9.00 pm and 7.00 am the applicant proposes that the same car park be available free to residents.
- 4.75 The condition was framed to take into account the other users of the building such as the 3 shops, as well as the occupiers of the 42 flats. It would, however, be difficult to police a scheme that dedicated spaces within the car park between the users. A balance must therefore be struck between the needs of shoppers and those of other users in the building.
- 4.76 In the analysis of the previous application it was considered acceptable that no parking be provided for the three lock up shops and that 66 spaces were required to allow the supermarket to meet requirements. The detailed management of these spaces was considered to be a matter for the developer and supermarket operator. In the overall assessment a parking space was considered necessary for each flat.
- 4.77 The current application presents a practical solution that would facilitate the demand from shoppers during the day and would be practical to manage. The current proposal would accommodate overnight parking for the flats but would displace residential occupiers' cars during the daytime period. Given the location of the building within the town centre, weight must be given to the availability of alternative modes of transport. The location would be central to the town centre services and both rail and bus routes, so reducing dependency for residents of the flats on car travel. In these circumstances it is considered that condition 27 can be amended along the lines proposed by the applicant, subject to no objections being raised by County Council Highways on this issue.



CONCLUSION

- 4.78 The current application shows a number of changes to the windows and openings and design within the elevations of each building to accommodate revisions necessary to accommodate site features and constraints and individual operator or customer requirements affecting the internal layout and design of the development originally approved under application 03/00947/FUL. These revised details do not make material changes to the character and appearance of the building that would harm the appearance or principles of the scheme, as originally considered.
- 4.79 The application proposes to vary condition 23 of the consent to review the layout for the turning of service vehicles entering the site which can be achieved as demonstrated by information submitted in support of the application.
- 4.80 The application proposes to vary condition 27 of the consent to review the requirements for the sharing of parking provision to Block A in favour of daytime use by shoppers and other users outside those times. Given the town centre location, the proposed amendments are considered acceptable in planning terms.
- 4.81 The original application 03/00947/FUL otherwise remains valid in all other respects.

RECOMMENDATION

- 4.82 It is proposed that this Committee **RESOLVES to delegate to the Head of Planning Services to APPROVE, subject to the application being included as an addendum to the current legal agreement to the existing consent granted under application reference 03/00947/FUL and to:-**
- The response being received from the Environment Agency
 - and Essex County Council Highways
 - and any further conditions recommended as a result

And to the following heads of conditions:

- 1 SC4 Time Limits – Full
- 2 No redevelopment consisting of the demolition of the buildings marked Roche 1 and Roche 2 shall commence before a contract for the carrying out of works for the redevelopment of the site has been entered into and the necessary conservation area consent has been granted for the said demolition
- 3 SC14 Materials to be used
- 4 SC16 PD Restricted Model – Supermarket to be used principally retailing food
- 5 SC41 Hours of Delivery – 0700 hrs to 1900 hrs. Monday to Friday and 0800 hrs to 1300 hrs Saturdays nor at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.



-
- 6 Doors to the loading bay shall be kept closed at all times other than during
access and egress
- 7 All plant machinery and equipment installed or operated in connection with the
carrying out of this permission shall be so enclosed and/or attenuated that noise
therefrom does not exceed a noise rating level of 5dB(A) below the existing
background level when measured according to British Standard BS4142 1997,
at a point 1 metre external to the nearest noise sensitive property, at any time.
- 8 Development shall not begin until a scheme for noise attenuation measures has
been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any
works that form part of the approved scheme shall be completed before any
permitted premises or dwelling is occupied unless an alternative period for
completion is agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 9 SC38 Restrict opening hours of retail units 0700 hrs to 2200 hrs
- 10 Prior to the commencement of any development, details (including acoustic
specifications) 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 openings formed as approved and shall
be maintained in the approved form while the premises are in use for the
permitted purpose
- 11 Before the development is commenced a detailed air quality assessment
utilising a methodology previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning
Authority shall be carried out to determine the present and likely future impact of
nitrogen dioxide . The method and extent of this investigation shall be agreed
with the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of work
- 12 All windows throughout the development hereby permitted shall be made of
timber with a paint or similar applied finish. Details of this joinery and the
fenestration to all shop units to be previously agreed in writing by the Local
Planning Authority with detailed plans to a scale of 1:20.
- 13 For the avoidance of doubt, the permission hereby granted does not convey or
construe any consent for external security shutters to any of the commercial
premises or residential units, including car ports. Furthermore, prior to their
installation, the details of any wrought iron grills or gates shall be previously
submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority
- 14 SC50A Means of Enclosure
- 15 SC59 Landscape Design
- 16 SC76 Parking and Turning Space
- 17 SC84 Slab Levels Required
- 18 SC90 Surface Water Drainage
- 19 SC91 Foul Water Drainage



-
- 20 No development or preliminary groundworks of any kind shall take place until the
 applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological
 work in accordance with a scheme of investigation, which has been submitted by
 21 the applicant and approved by the Local Planning Authority.
 The provision of a Travel Information Pack for all tenants and new residents (In
 22 the interests of accessibility).
 From the internal tangent points of the North Street junction, the carriageway of
 the access road shall be laid out to the dimensions shown on Drawing No.
 SPROCHFORD. 1/01 Rev A up to the commencement of the raised area
 adjacent to unit B and shall as a result achieve a vehicle carriageway 7.7m wide
 at the junction tapering down to a width of 6.8metres over the remainder of the
 23 carriageway length.
 The turning and manoeuvring area for the accessing of the supermarket
 servicing bay and the turning of vehicles shall be laid out as detailed on drawing
 24 No. 04-0595-s-002 P6.
 The minimum footway provision, turning head and raised area within the limits of
 25 the highway shall be positively identified on the finished surface of the highway.
 The 500mm wide overhang strip included in the two access roadways off North
 Street shall be widened, where possible, to include all the available land
 26 between the strip and the adjacent boundary.
 Prior to the commencement of the development the applicant shall submit
 details of crime reduction measures and a programme for their implementation
 based upon the provisions as broadly set out in the agent's letter dated 30
 March 2004. The details shall be implemented in accordance with the scheme
 27 as may be agreed by the Local Planning Authority.
 The basement car park hereby approved to Block A shall be made available for
 customers to the supermarket between 0700hrs and 2100 hrs on any day.
 Outside these times the basement car park shall be available for the parking of
 28 vehicles associated with the users of the building more generally.
 The sheltered housing to Block B shall be restricted the occupation by persons
 29 of not less than 55 years of age.
 Footway links within the boundaries of the site, to be laid out and available and
 retained for use up to the western boundary of the site to enable possible future
 connection from land to the west of the site.
 30 The use of the floorspace of the buildings identified in the application as Blocks
 A, B and C, shall be as indicated in the submitted application and plans
 notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 3, Class E to the Town and
 Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995.



REASON FOR DECISION

The proposal is considered not to cause significant demonstrable harm to any development plan interests, other material considerations, to the character and appearance of the area, to the street scene or residential amenity such as to justify refusing the application; nor to surrounding occupiers in neighbouring streets.

Relevant Development plan policies and proposals:

SAT20, H2, H11, H16, UC1 of the Rochford District Local Plan First Review

SAT2 of the Rochford District Local Plan Second Deposit Draft

H2, H4, H5, BE1, BE2, TCR2, TCR3, TCR4, HC2, HC£, T3 of the Essex and Southend on Sea Replacement Structure Plan



Shaun Scrutton
Head of Planning Services

For further information please contact Mike Stranks on (01702) 546366.



TITLE : **05/00370/FUL**
ADAPTION AND EXTENSIONS OF EXISTING SPORTS
PAVILION
KING GEORGE V PLAYING FIELD, EASTWOOD ROAD,
RAYLEIGH

APPLICANT : **RAYLEIGH TOWN COUNCIL**

ZONING : **PUBLIC OPEN SPACE**

PARISH: **RAYLEIGH**

WARD: **WHEATLEY**

PLANNING APPLICATION DETAILS

- 5.1 This application seeks permission to remodel and extend the existing sports pavilion at the King George V Playing Field.
- 5.2 The extensions relate to a front gable extension measuring 1.15m deep and 10.6m wide with a pitched roof over. The rear extension is part width and measures 13.3m wide and 6.6m deep at its deepest. In addition, a side extension is also proposed, this to be located facing the existing bowling green and measuring 12.1m wide and 2m deep. The entire extended pavilion is to be provided with a new pitched roof running parallel to the main playing field and terminated in gable walls and a gable projection towards the front facing the main playing field. The maximum height to the top of the pitched roof is 7.3m.
- 5.3 The extended building will provide accommodation for changing room facilities, public toilets, club room, kitchen and short matt bowls room.
- 5.4 The new pitched roof will enable accommodation within the roof space; this is to be accessed via a central staircase and also a lift. The uses of the first floor are not specified, but the area is indicated on the plans to be one space which also provides access to a modest balcony that overlooks the main playing field. This first floor accommodation is to be illuminated by roof lights; three that face the main playing field and one that faces the Bowls Club.
- 5.5 The external materials have not been fully specified, however the applicant has identified the need for maintenance free and vandal resistant materials to be used.



RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 5.6 02/00496/OUT Outline Application to erect new sports pavilion with first floor offices
Granted 24/10/02
- 5.7 03/00898/FUL Replacement sports pavilion/community building two storey building with pitched roof over and spectator balconies at first floor level on three elevation. Refused 22/01/04. This application was refused for the following reason:-

The proposed replacement sports pavilion and community building, by reason of its design and external appearance, would result in a building with a visual mass and bulk on this publicly prominent site that would be contrary in scale and character to its immediate surroundings in particular and the wider town centre in general.

- 5.8 In September 2003 Rayleigh Town Council undertook public consultation as part of the project to provide a new sports pavilion for King George V Playing Field. The results of the consultation indicated that 93% of the people surveyed did not want to see the existing pavilion retained in its existing form – 87% of respondents were residents of Rayleigh.

CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS

- 5.9 **Rayleigh Town Council:** (Are the applicants).
- 5.10 **County Surveyor (Highways):** No objection.
- 5.11 **Environment Agency:** No objection.
- 5.12 **Rayleigh Civic Society:** No comments on architecture but concerned about location of public toilets (vandalism due to access from public domain). Are public toilets really necessary? – If so, 24hr CCTV surveillance?
- 5.13 **ECC Archaeological D.C. Officer:** No recommendations to make.
- 5.14 **Buildings/Technical Support Engineers:** No objections/observations.

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 5.15 **Changes from the refused scheme 03/00898/FUL:-** This application seeks to overcome the concerns with the earlier refused scheme by promoting a significantly more modest development. The design principle of this scheme is to extend and remodel the existing pavilion rather than demolishing it and rebuilding.



- 5.16 The most significant changes relate to the height of the building and the design and external appearance.
- 5.17 The refused scheme proposed a full two storey accommodation with pitched roof over. This development also proposes first floor accommodation but is accommodated within the proposed roof space (the current building is effectively flat roofed). Consequently the height of the proposal has been reduced from 10.2m to the top of the pitched roof on the refused scheme to 7.3m to the top of the pitched roof on this scheme, a reduction in height therefore of 2.9 metres.
- 5.18 As a result of the design principles utilised here of extending and remodelling the existing facility the appearance of the building remains that of a 'local' sports pavilion and consequently it remains visually appropriate to its location within the existing King George V playing Field.

The Principle of the Use:-

- 5.19 The principle of a new building with first floor accommodation has already been established on this site by virtue of the outline permission granted on 24 October 2002.
- 5.20 In policy terms the site is allocated as an existing public open space. Policy LT1 sets out areas of land that are sought as additional open space provision whilst policy LT3 seeks to encourage indoor and outdoor sports clubs and similar facilities. It is considered that the proposal does not compromise the spirit of these policies and it provides accommodation that would assist in the continued uses of the playing field for both active and passive recreation. The active open space elements of the site (the playing pitches and the bowling green) are not encroached upon. This is in line with Policy LT8 of the Replacement Local Plan.
- 5.21 Some favourable weight must be given to the provision of new and improved facilities to support the open space/recreational use and also improvements to the disabled access to/through the building and provide public conveniences that will be regularly available.



Parking Provision

- 5.22 Indoor or outdoor sports and recreation attracts a requirement for 1 car parking space per 22sqm of floor area. The gross external floor area of the entire building including the extensions and the first floor accommodation would be in the region of 560 sq. m; this would generate a parking standard of 26 spaces. None are to be provided, as indeed, none are available for the current use. Given the town centre location immediately adjacent to the car park the impact is not considered to be unacceptable. And of course this issue was debated on the outline application which anticipated a similar floorspace without any car parking and this arrangement was found acceptable.

Visual Impact and Design:-

- 5.23 As commented above, it is considered that the design principle of extending and remodelling the existing building has resulted in a much more modest (in scale) building than the one previously refused.
- 5.24 As a result of the reduction in scale of the proposed building is considered not to be visually intrusive or out of scale to its location.
- 5.25 The first floor accommodation is contained within the proposed new pitched roof and is only evident visually by the proposed roof lights and the balcony which overlooks the main playing field.
- 5.26 The overall visual impression of the extended building is one of a modest sports/recreation pavilion.

CONCLUSION

- 5.27 It is considered that the design and external appearance of the building has been drastically remodelled following the previous refusal.
- 5.28 It is accepted that the proposal does not deliver a landmark designed building, however it is considered that the functional design principles of the proposed scheme (a sports/recreation pavilion) are wholly acceptable in this location and it is not a totally new build scheme. The proposed building would not be visually intrusive nor out of character with the area.

RECOMMENDATION

- 5.29 It is proposed that this Committee **RESOLVES TO GRANT** planning permission for the proposed development, subject to the following conditions:-



- 1 SC4 Time Limit
- 2 SC14 Materials to be submitted
- 3 } Use Class Restriction

REASON FOR DECISION

The proposal is considered not to cause significant demonstrable harm to any development plan interests nor harm to any other material planning consideration.

Relevant Development Plan and Policies

LT1, LT3, UC1 of the Rochford District Local Plan First Review



Shaun Scrutton
Head of Planning Services

For further information please contact Monica Palmer on (01702) 318023.

CODE OF CONDUCT FOR PLANNING MATTERS

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Members and Officers must:-

- **at all times act within the law and in accordance with the code of conduct.**
- **support and make decisions in accordance with the Council's planning policies/Central Government guidance and material planning considerations.**
- **declare any personal or prejudicial interest.**
- **not become involved with a planning matter, where they have a prejudicial interest.**
- **not disclose to a third party, or use to personal advantage, any confidential information.**
- **not accept gifts and hospitality received from applicants, agents or objectors outside of the strict rules laid down in the respective Member and Officer Codes of Conduct.**

In Committee, Members must:-

- **base their decisions on material planning considerations.**
- **not speak or vote, if they have a prejudicial interest in a planning matter and withdraw from the meeting.**
- **through the Chairman give details of their Planning reasons for departing from the Officer recommendation on an application which will be recorded in the Minutes.**
- **give Officers the opportunity to report verbally on any application.**

Members must:-

- **not depart from their overriding duty to the interests of the District's community as a whole.**
- **not become associated, in the public's mind, with those who have a vested interest in planning matters.**
- **not agree to be lobbied, unless they give the same opportunity to all other parties.**
- **not depart from the Council's guidelines on procedures at site visits.**
- **not put pressure on Officers to achieve a particular recommendation.**
- **be circumspect in expressing support, or opposing a Planning proposal, until they have all the relevant planning information.**



Officers must:-

- **give objective, professional and non-political advice, on all planning matters.**
- **put in writing to the committee any changes to printed recommendations appearing in the agenda.**

