

<p><b>Item 7</b></p> <p><b>16/00123/FUL – Land South of Roundabout at End of Priory Chase, Rayleigh</b></p>	<p><b>Item Description</b></p> <p>The report was initially circulated with the wrong item description. This error was quickly rectified and a corrected version detailing the following item description posted up to the Council website:-</p> <p>“Provision of a Scout building, access and car parking”</p>
<p><b>Item 8</b></p> <p><b>16/00364/FUL 34 Rocheway, Rochford</b></p>	<p><b>Contents:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Item Description</b></li> <li><b>2. Alteration to Proposed Condition and Revised Recommendation</b></li> <li><b>3. Email Received from Cllr Williams</b></li> </ol> <p><b>1. Item Description</b></p> <p>The report was initially circulated with the wrong item description. This error was quickly rectified and a corrected version detailing the following item description posted up to the Council website:-</p> <p>“Application to remove or vary condition 15 to application 08/00241/FUL to allow use of the former Disability Essex building to be no longer limited for use by Disability Essex.”</p> <p><b>2. Alteration to Proposed Condition</b></p> <p>Following further assessment of the application, the condition proposed within the application has been amended. The reason for the restriction of use within Class D1 is that the impact of the full application has only been assessed based on use as an education and training centre, and the suitability of other uses within the broader D1 use class has not been fully assessed.</p> <p>The amended condition that accompanies the <b>REVISED RECOMMENDATION</b> is as follows:-</p> <p>“The use hereby approved shall be restricted to use as a non residential education and training centre only, and no other use within Class D1 of the Use Classes Order 1987 (or as otherwise amended).”</p> <p>REASON: In order to allow the Local Planning Authority to review the wider use of the building in the interests of the residential amenity of nearby occupiers, given the close proximity of nearby homes.</p>

**3. Email Received from Cllr Williams**

This email alerted us to the fact that Rayleigh Town Council was stated as consultee and this should instead have been Rochford Parish Council. Rochford Parish Council made a comment that they have no objections to this change as long as it was for the sole use of 'Trustlinks'.

This comment was made at around the time that the planning portal was playing tricks so this may not have got logged; perhaps you could look into this.

It is not change of use that is the concern although D1 seems to be what it has been used for; the concern is that if condition 15 was to be removed and if use was to be allowed by anyone the value of this property would rise and lead to misuse in the future. The local residents would also like this condition 15 to read 'Trustlinks'.

**Officer comment:** The reference to Rayleigh Town Council at paragraph 3.1 to page 8.3 of the report is an error. The reference should instead refer to Rochford Parish Council.

The system acknowledges that a reply was received on 19 May from Rochford Parish Council. However, details of that reply are not stored or logged on the Council's electronic file. It is not possible therefore for officers to verify in this case the Parish Council's response.