

<p>Item R1 08/00244/FUL</p> <p>254 High StreeC, Great Waking</p>	<p>Environment Agency</p> <p>Advise that the proposal falls outside the scope of matters on which the Environment Agency is a statutory consultee and therefore have no comment to make on the application</p> <p>Officers Comment</p> <p>In referring this item, the Member raised with officers the appropriate level of on-site car parking provision.</p> <p>Officers have reappraised this and, on reflection, consider the application of the urban standard as set out in paragraph 1.7 to be flawed.</p> <p>Great Waking Village is more appropriately placed within the rural or suburban standard than urban. This is a minimum standard and for smaller dwellings, the case in point being 4 x 2-bedroom and 2 x 1-bedroom, requires at least 1 car parking space. Applying 1 space per 1 bed and 1.5 space per 2 bed this equates to 8 car parking spaces, as proposed.</p> <p>This approach matches that now applied by County Highways who look for 1 space per 1 bed and 1.5 space per 2 bed, irrespective of location or whether new build or by way of conversion.</p> <p>Also the historical applications in 2003 and 2004 were considered against the then standard from the 1st Review Local Plan of 1.5 spaces per unit.</p> <p>To conclude then, officers consider the proposal complies with the car parking standard.</p>
<p>Item 2 08/00287/FUL</p> <p>Land rear of 26 South St, Rochford</p>	<p>Rochford Parish Council</p> <p>Object on the basis of over-development, the height of the development will have a detrimental effect on the street scene.</p> <p>Essex County Council Specialist Urban Design Adviser</p> <p>Still have some concerns about the form of this building, particularly the massing of the central roof and the width of the hipped projecting wings on the frontage. The recessed approach to the front door is also quite long and narrow.</p>

	<p>Suggest this problem could be overcome by raising the west wing to two and a half storeys; the proportions would be improved and the top floor flat accommodated and would enable the central roof to be reduced by using double pitches. The east wing needs to be reduced in width to provide better proportions and increase the width of the entrance access. The front ground floor flat would be better as a one bed to facilitate this and allow for a centralised entrance door and wider hall.</p> <p>Essex County Council Specialist Adviser on Historic Buildings and Conservation Areas</p> <p>Advise that the County Council's Urban designer has already provided comments and has no comments to add.</p> <p>Council Arboriculturalist</p> <p>Agrees with the comments provided by the County Council tree officer.</p> <p>Environment Agency</p> <p>Have assessed this application as having a low environmental risk. Unable to make a full response to this application due to workload prioritisation.</p> <p>Advise that the development should incorporate principles of sustainable construction and design, such as passive systems of natural light, renewable energy and water saving devices and water recycling.</p> <p>Three letters have been received in response to the public notification and which in the main make the following comments and objections:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Access to the development will have severe detrimental impact upon access to no. 30 South Street• Adverse impact on neighbours from rubbish bins being stored next to the entrance of No. 30 South Street.• Lack of access for the removal of waste by waste vehicles• Lack of space for recycling bins• Loss of tree cover to the detriment of the character and amenity of the area• Loss of important ancient habitat including a bat colony as bats have been seen coming from the garden• Detrimental impact upon garden birds• Significant adverse impact upon surrounding listed buildings
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of privacy to adjoining neighbours • Significant adverse impact on visual amenity, character and appearance of the Rochford Conservation Area • Significant impact upon the enjoyment of neighbours' amenity (rights enshrined in the Human Rights Act) particularly from cars being parked close to houses in South Street • Intrusive and unneighbourly development • Inadequate off street parking within the development • Adverse effect upon the stream that runs beneath adjoining houses affecting the viability of these listed buildings • Development of the site consistently turned down and there is no need to build on it now • View totally destroyed • Noise and disturbance given forced to live at the back of the property due to noise from South Street • Car park should be sited at the opposite end of the site • Too large and too high for the area • Applicant should pursue two elegant and tasteful houses on this site.
<p>Item 3 08/00241/FUL Land rear 28-32 Rocheway, Rochford</p>	<p>Rochford Parish Council</p> <p>Express concern at the increase in height and size; the site is on the flight path for Southend Airport, accessibility by public transport, the nearest bus stop is approximately a quarter of a mile away, increase in traffic movements on the relatively narrow Rocheway.</p> <p>Essex County Council Urban Design Team</p> <p>Have concerns about the kink in the roof profile mentioned in the previous application. It is visually disturbing, occurring in varying relationships in the length of the roof planes giving a concave appearance associated with collapse.</p> <p>Pleased to see that the building addresses sustainability issues but would prefer to see the photovoltaics integrated into the building design rather than a stand alone feature.</p> <p>Environment Agency</p> <p>Have assessed this application as having a low environmental risk. Due to workload prioritisation are unable to make a full response.</p> <p>Advise the applicant should be made aware that the site is within 250m of an historic landfill site.</p>

	<p>Two letters have been received in response to the public notification and which in the main make the following comments and objections:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned with the effect of the proposal upon clients at adjoining Norman House who currently are able to look out and sit out and view the area over the fields and can access the playing field via a gate which will be lost. • Would like to see the existing fence maintained with low shrubs to, say, 30 – 40 cm high. This would also aid security. • Not the right site for a building for the work they do • The east end of the college could have accommodated the proposed building well without reducing valuable playing field space. • No consultation with neighbours on this latest plan • Assume the car park will not allow for minibuses which will have to be parked in the college car park • The building can be viewed from footpath 38 so the application forms should say yes at question 30. • Existing access for buggies is surely good enough and existing gate could be re – hung to give increased width • Plans show a slope for access to the centre. Wish to see that slope is included in the gate and fencing down to the car park otherwise will attract skateboarders • A chain link fence 3m high is proposed to the southern boundary. Request this be reduced to the height of adjoining fences as only boys of 8 and 10 years use this part of the field with no threat of balls coming over. • Can fence be black or dark green in colour? • No idea of the pitch of the roofs is shown. Suggest pitch of 2 – 3 degrees would be sufficient and would allow for bird nesting lost by the removal of trees • No idea given of the height of the solar energy canopy but should be lowered to 1.8m so as not to intrude on the view of adjoining residents • See little need to enlarge the entrance as already serves the college but if required can it be to the eastern side of the access • Fences to the rear of Nos. 30 and 32 are privately owned and subject to negotiation. <p>One letter has also been received from the applicant's agent and which confirms the previous offer of £40,000 contribution to the County Council via the District Council towards improvements to changing facilities at the college. The applicant proposes precisely the same agreement as was engrossed in the previous scheme. The applicant has had prior discussions with senior officers of the County Council before the submission of this revised application.</p>
--	--

	<p>Enclose a letter from Lord Hanningfield, Leader of Essex County Council, confirming the County Council's support and commitment for the facility and which states the County Council has agreed to sell that part of the site and grant access rights across the college that are required. The legal conveyance are currently being worked upon.</p>
<p>Item 4 08/00198/FUL 299 Ferry Road, Hullbridge</p>	<p>Hullbridge Parish Council</p> <p>Object on the grounds of over-development, contrary to the street scene and concerned that the current infrastructure could not support additional local residents.</p> <p>Council Arboricultural Officer</p> <p>Advise there are two pines trees to the front of the site the subject of a tree preservation order.</p> <p>There are several other trees within the confines of the site not subject to statutory protection and which do not contribute to the street scene or amenity of the area. Agree with the recommendation for their removal, following submission of a suitable landscape scheme for replacement planting. Such details should have reference to Rochford District Council Local Replacement Plan section 8 and British Standards 4428 and 3936 – 1.</p> <p>The two Pine trees are to be retained as part of the development. Contradictory comments in the Arboricultural Implication Assessment and method statement regarding their removal should be clarified.</p> <p>The report fails to provide detail on how the existing driveway will be removed without causing damage or significant disturbance to the roots of the preserved Pine Trees. This information should be supplied.</p> <p>The report fails to mention the type and construction method of the surface on the south side beneath the preserved trees. This information should be supplied.</p> <p>The tree works involving the removal of deadwood is acceptable. The construction method for the parking bays and bin store are acceptable. The construction of the new access road and parking bays should be completed as first phase and to include the demolition of the existing structure. The protection measures as discussed in the report are acceptable.</p>

	<p>In view of the above considerations the REVISED RECOMMENDATION IS APPROVAL, subject to the following additional heads of conditions in addition to those set out in the report:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 21) Provision of mobility scooter parking and recharging 22) Clarity that, notwithstanding the details of the accompanying Arboricultural Implication Assessment and method statement submitted in support of the application, the existing two preserved Pine Trees the subject of Tree Preservation Order 35 / 83 shall be retained. 23) Submission of details and method statement for the removal of the existing driveway 24) Submission of details for the construction method of the surface on the south side beneath the preserved Pine Trees 25) Subject to the requirements of conditions 22, 23, 24, the development shall be implemented in accordance with the recommendations contained within the Arboricultural Implication Assessment and method statement submitted in support of the application.
<p>Item 5 08/00323/FUL 2 Wedds Way, Great Wakering</p>	<p>Members are advised that this front extension and porch are in an advanced stage of construction.</p> <p>Essex County Council Historic Buildings Adviser</p> <p>Opinion expressed that, although this type of spurious historicism should not be encouraged, the building cannot readily be seen and is well away from any listed buildings.</p> <p>View that that the character or appearance of the Conservation Area could not be said to be harmed by the proposal and raises no objection on conversation grounds.</p>
<p>Item R6 08/00279/FUL 76-78 West St, Rochford</p>	<p>Environment Agency</p> <p>Advise that, having reviewed officer comments, remove the Environment Agency objection on sequential test grounds.</p> <p>Advise that, having received an FRA prepared by the applicants' consultants, however, maintain previous objection on flood risk grounds.</p> <p>The flood risk assessment does not demonstrate that the development and its occupants / users will be safe for the lifetime of the development, does not increase flood risk elsewhere and does not reduce risk overall.</p>

	<p>The further information required is a site survey to obtain land levels necessary to determine floor levels and access / egress routes. Land drainage plans including SUDS need to be planned in advance of construction and shown within the FRA. This will mean infiltration tests around the site to determine areas where soakaways and SUDS are acceptable and what rates they will perform.</p> <p>Advise that it is likely this objection may be overcome following the receipt of the above information.</p> <p>Essex County Council Highways and Transportation</p> <p>Provide the following additional comments to the received recommendation:-</p> <p>Prior to the occupation of the site the applicant shall make a contribution of £50,000 towards the betterment of the area, which shall mean junction improvements at West Street and Bradley Way, together with re – location and upgrading of the existing pedestrian crossing.</p> <p>The works comprising the junction improvement, together with the re – location and upgrading of the pedestrian crossing facility, are required to improve pedestrian safety and vehicle movements at the junction of West Street and Bradley Way. The new store is likely to generate additional pedestrian movements to and from the railway station as it will be convenient for passengers before and after journeys. The relocation of the crossing on or close to the likely desire line for pedestrians trying to cross West Street will reduce the risk of accidents.</p> <p>One further letter has been received in response to the public notification and which makes the following comments and objections in addition to those set out in the report:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Do not see a requirement for two similar types of store, ie, Sainsbury's and Tesco, to occupy adjacent sites. Do not object to the proposed style of the building as it is in keeping with other buildings in the vicinity.• Express concern that the store will undoubtedly open late into the evening and which will attract youths and other groups of people and may encourage people to congregate in our car park (No. 82 West St.) increasing the risk of vandalism• Have concerns that actual building work may affect the fabric of No. 82 which does not have any foundations• Have concerns regarding noise levels during the construction process because the adjoining Listed Building does not have double glazing and excessive noise and disturbance would be detrimental to the well being of clients and employees.
--	---

	<p>The applicants have responded to the request by the County Highway Authority for a financial contribution.</p> <p>The applicant has substantial holding costs including the cost of having to lay off contractors having commenced on the site only to discover constraints with the sewers necessitating a revised application. In that time the housing market is depressed and will not recover during the period of construction. In view of the change in circumstances which affect the viability of the project the applicant has agreed to make a financial contribution of £15,000 and hopes the Council view this as an acceptable offer, given the circumstances.</p> <p>The REVISED RECOMMENDATION is that the development be approved, subject to the applicants entering into a Unilateral Obligation to provide a financial contribution of £15,000 towards highway improvements in the vicinity of the site and to the conditions as set out in the report.</p>
--	---