

<p><b>Item R2</b>  <b>04/00361/FUL</b></p>	<p>A neighbour whose objections are already included within the main report at paragraph 2.6 has written two further letters asking that they be circulated to Members.</p> <p>The neighbour refers to the Member site visit held on Friday 25th June; that he was not advised of this event, but that the applicants were present and in conversation with those in attendance. Furthermore, objectors are not able to speak at Committee to ensure Members are aware of concerns.</p> <p><b>Officers' Comments</b>  The formal procedure for Members' site visits includes attendance by the applicant/agent to provide information to Members about the proposal. In terms of the objector's concerns, these are already documented in the report at paragraph 2.6</p> <p>The Council has received comments that protected species may be present on the site. Taking a cautionary approach, the <b>following Condition 8 is recommended:</b></p> <p>"No development shall commence before an ecological impact assessment of the site has been undertaken and submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The assessment shall include appropriate mitigation measures for any protected species that may be found on the site. Furthermore, before any development shall commence, all reasonable steps necessary shall be taken to implement the identified mitigation measures for all protected species on the site. No translocation of these species, should it prove necessary, shall commence until written details of receptor sites, together with a management plan including monitoring, have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved by it in writing."</p> <p>REASON: In the interests of protected species.</p>
<p><b>Item 3</b>  <b>04/00062/FUL</b></p>	<p><b>The Agent</b> has expressed at length in writing his strong concern and disappointment with the officers' recommendation to refuse, given officer indications of support during the processing of the application. He highlights many extracts from the report that are favourable to the scheme.</p> <p><b>Officers' comments</b>  This is an application that has been subject to intense debate within the Planning Division on the key issue of appropriateness of the scale and mass of the 3-storey proposal in the Village of Great Wakering.</p> <p>Revised plans were submitted, reducing the height of the building as set out in paragraph 3.2 and a full re-consultation exercise was undertaken. For clarification, all the responses in the section of the report headed "Consultations and Representations" save for 3.10 (which reads "Parish Council Second Round"), relate to the first round original consultations.</p>

	<p><b>The Second Round Consultation</b> responses are set out in full below:-</p> <p><b>Parish Council Second Round:-</b> Although the roof has been lowered on the amended application, the Parish Council's other objections still apply.</p> <p><b>Essex County Council Highways Officer</b> Same comment as before.</p> <p><b>Environment Agency</b> No further comments to make, please refer to previous response.</p> <p><b>Essex Police</b> Same comments as before.</p> <p><b>Building Control Manager</b> Comments about fire escape routes.</p> <p><b>Buildings and Technical Support</b> As previous comments.</p> <p>The residents of 5 properties have objected on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Density too great</li> <li>• Height not in keeping</li> <li>• Colouring not in keeping</li> <li>• No demand for retail in this location</li> <li>• Only petrol customers use the shop</li> <li>• Impact of retail upon residential amenity</li> <li>• Change to the building is not significant enough to overcome previous concerns</li> <li>• Height and bulk would have a detrimental effect on the character of the area</li> <li>• Enough flats already in the area</li> <li>• More cars using that part of Southend Road</li> <li>• Overlooking and loss of privacy</li> <li>• Concern over what the retail units may end up being</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternative Proposal</b></p> <p>As an alternative to the application plans before the Committee, the Agent advises that the scheme could be amended with the deletion of the retail units and replacement with residential accommodation on the main front element of the building. The resultant lower floor to ceiling height would facilitate a reduction in the height of the building. He suggests this could be in the order of 10.0 m to ridge (the all residential rear element is 10.8m to ridge); this he gauges to be 1m to 2m taller than the higher of the two adjacent properties.</p> <p>The Agent's proposition is that if Members are not minded to approve the application as it stands, he would welcome a delegation/deferral to officers to negotiate such a reduced 3 storey scheme.</p>
--	---