

**ADDENDUM
PLANNING SERVICES COMMITTEE
TUESDAY 27th JULY 2004**

<p>Schedule Item 4 04/00545/COU</p>	<p>ASHINGDON HALL</p> <p>Essex County Highways raise no objections.</p> <p>Petition of 1005 signatures received from Ashingdon Residents Association. The Petition states that residents want the Rochford District Council to reject the current application. States further that the application is contrary to Planning Objective 13:</p> <p>"To improve the quality of life of the inhabitants of the District by providing the best possible environment In the interests of the total well being of all groups within the population."</p> <p>Also: Housing Structure Replacement Plan item 2.6.3 Safeguarding Amenities (Note: this is actually a reference to paragraph 2.6.3 in the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan Second Deposit):</p> <p>"The Local Planning Authority believes that it is essential to ensure that the amenities of residential areas are safeguarded. Development proposals within or abutting residential areas likely to be detrimental to amenities will be refused."</p> <p>Additional Neighbour letters:</p> <p>8 further copies of a standard letter already reported.</p> <p>7 copies of a standard letter not previously received, which raises objections and comments previously received, plus: Lack of a Police Station in Ashingdon, part-time Police Station in Rochford, public safety law and order issues.</p> <p>1 letter has been received from the residents of "Shenley" and "Kenneth", Canewdon View Road and signed by 15 residents, which makes comments and objections previously reported.</p> <p>31 Additional letters have been received and which make the following comments in addition to those already set out in the report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal would jeopardise what is considered to be a relatively safe community and bring with it a high degree of uncertainty and outright risk that could never be ignored or accepted. • Proposal would go a long way to undoing sense of community and will destroy the face of Ashingdon, inherent values, safety and serenity. • To approve the proposal would be irresponsible. • Would cost the taxpayer much needed money for use in more deserving areas. • Concern that the Council has not undertaken research to reassure residents that no danger or threat to the local community will result. • Proposal will force the closure of the adjoining pre-school and the loss of this facility and the jobs concerned. • Do not accept that there is no material change of use that poses no threat to the local community.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NHS will not be the owner of the property, so if they withdraw, fees and reward to the owner will be higher for residents of the site, with greater risk. • Rochford already has five existing units, one at Sutton Ford Bridge and another at "Mild" close to the Police Station. • Consultation letter made no mention of the sorts of problems that could involve security. • Documentation refers to overflow parking - where is this? • Ashingdon is now a very different place than it was when this original application was granted. The current proposal should not be judged the same as the original application. • Difficult parking problems, particularly when the church has weddings, funerals and special services. • If allowed, the Council will have failed in its duty of care to the residents. • Will take away parents' peace of mind. • Loss of property value would affect the prosperity of owners, in turn affecting their health and well being, resulting in an infringement of Human Rights. • Considerable noise and disturbance will result from the activities of residents in the area. • Infringement of Human Rights, which is to live without fear. • Noticed a large advertising board that has been erected on the wall of the building, which mars the appearance. • Numerous instances of people suffering from trauma, depression or similar problems, being aggressive in anti-social ways. • The residents in the centre may or may not be ready to be integrated into society after their period of support; some may be violent with changeable emotions. It is not acceptable to feel threatened day or night. • Case officer did not have the full knowledge of the proposed use. • Proposal contravenes planning objectives to improve the quality of life of the inhabitants. • Proposal (i.e. forcing the closure of the pre-school) would contravene the objective to enable the business community to function as efficiently as possible. • Proposal contravenes objective to safeguard amenities. • Proposal contravenes reduction in journeys objective by resulting in the failure of the "Walking Bus" initiative. • Proposal contravenes planning objective to maintain and enhance local heritage and culture. • Proposal would contravene strategy to conserve and enhance buildings in their setting and areas of architectural and historical significance and retaining character of the place - the Local Planning Authority will protect and enhance the District identity and will, when assessing the design and quality of proposals, take account of the following: the contribution to the local identity and sense of the place. <p>In total 516 letters of objection have been received from 429 addresses, with one letter of support.</p>
Agenda Item 4	<p>There are some errors in the report on this item, which are as follows:- Para 3.1 states 30m (100ft) in error. This should read as 12.8m (42ft) Para 4.3 states (30m) in error. This should read as 12.8m.</p>