

PLANNING DECISIONS – June 2008

Application No : 03/00446/OUT Decision : **Application Withdrawn**
Location : Land Adjacent Grange Villa London Road Rawreth
Proposal : Erect Club House 6 Tennis Courts With Floodlights, Layout
And Construction Of Car Park, New Access into London
Road (Outline Application)
Applicant : Silver City Estates Ltd

Application No : 04/00152/FUL Decision : **Application Withdrawn**
Location : Trinity Wood House Trinity Wood Road Hockley
Proposal : Front Bay Window and Single Storey Side Conservatory
Applicant : Mark Cottis

Application No : 07/00986/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**
Location : 5 Exhibition Lane Great Wakering
Proposal : Two Storey Flat Roof Rear Extension
Applicant : Eddie Odysseus

- 1 The two storey flat roofed extension forms an angle greater than 45 degrees with the nearest habitable room of the adjacent dwelling at No.7 Exhibition Lane and the height and depth of the extension would have an unacceptable overbearing impact on this property to the detriment of the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers.

Application No : 07/01010/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**
Location : 80 - 80C West Street Rochford
Proposal : Demolish Existing Building and Construct Two Storey
Building Comprising Retail Store at Ground Floor With 3
No. First Floor Two Bedroomed Flats With Access Parking
Area.
Applicant : Tesco Stores Ltd



- 1 The proposal is of a design inappropriate to the context of Rochford Conservation Area. The large turning area in front of the store, lack of enclosure and the car parking area down the side of the building will have an adverse impact on the street scene and would not enhance the Conservation Area. The proposed building would present bland ground floor frontage with wide plate glass windows with no relief in the brickwork. The upper floor windows on the elevations are half blanked with an insert panel which appears incongruous. The proposals indicate three walling materials creating a vertical hierarchy in the elevations, excessive for a two and a half storey building. The trespas panel is a laminate which has a rather uniform and hard appearance which will not weather like a natural material and is inappropriate in this location. If allowed the proposal would fail to respect the townscape character of the Rochford Conservation Area, appears to erroneously show the roof on the front elevation and would not logically form part of the larger composition of the area in which it is situated, would be of an unsuitable mass and scale lacking harmony with adjoining buildings and the area as a whole, would fail to use appropriate architectural detailing, would fail to use appropriate external materials and show a poor standard of shop front design contrary to Policy BC1 to the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006).

- 2 The Flood Risk Assessment submitted in support of the proposal fails to have regard to GPS verified levels. Furthermore, the Flood Risk Assessment fails to demonstrate by way of a required ground investigation report as to whether sustainable drainage systems are appropriate, the storage requirements of the soakaway or other infiltration devices and future maintenance. If SuDS are not appropriate the alternative proposals to store the excess water in a 1 in 100 year storm have not been provided. If allowed the proposal would otherwise be susceptible to flooding or result in the increase in flood risk to other properties.

- 3 The submitted application includes insufficient information in relation to the loss or retention of the existing trees on site which are protected by virtue of being in the Conservation Area. In particular, the tree towards the front eastern part of the site makes a significant contribution to the amenity of the area.

Application No : 08/00015/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
 Location : 4 Kings Road Rayleigh
 Proposal : Rear Extension and First Floor Side and Rear Extension
 Applicant : Mr Lee Brown

Application No : 08/00045/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
 Location : 43 High Street Rayleigh
 Proposal : Install Air Conditioning Units to Flat Roofed Area to Rear.
 Applicant : Royal Bank Of Scotland



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

Application No : 08/00119/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 22 Elm Grove Hullbridge
Proposal : Erect Detached Building at Rear For Use as a Boarding
Cattery for 20 Cats.
Applicant : Mr R. Dunn

Application No : 08/00156/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**
Location : Site Of 8 And 10 Weir Gardens Rayleigh
Proposal : Demolition of Existing Dwellings at Nos. 8-10 Weir Gardens
and Construct Two Storey Building Containing 14 No. Two
Bedroomed Flats With Access and Associated Parking.
Applicant : Mr S Barker

- 1 The proposal, by reason of its height and bulk, would be an intrusive and unneighbourly development, out of scale and character with the prevailing pattern of residential development in the locality.

Application No : 08/00214/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**
Location : Lords Golf And Country Club Hullbridge Road
Rayleigh
Proposal : Reshaping and Landscaping of Parts of Existing Golf
Courses Including Raising Land Levels to Parts of Site by
up to 4m to Improve Quality and Safety of Facilities and
Creation of New Reservoirs for Irrigation Water Supply.
Construct Temporary Site Access Onto Hullbridge Road for
Duration of Construction Period. Remove Existing Ball
Safety Fencing to Practice Range and Remodel Practice
Range to be Contained Within Raised Mound up to 5m
High and Provide 2m High Fence on Mound Top With
Landscaping.
Applicant : Mr Derek Govey



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

1. The use of the waste material for land raising would be contrary to policy W9B of the Essex and Southend Waste Local Plan September 2001 (WLP). Furthermore, insufficient information has been submitted with the application to demonstrate that the need is justified. The supporting statement to the application states that the three main reasons to justify the remodelling works to the Golf Course are 'Course Quality', 'Safety Issues' and 'Irrigation and Water Sourcing'. It is considered that in view of the scale of the importation of waste materials proposed (350,000 cubic metres) that this justification should be substantiated by independent reports. Without that independent assessment, and in light of the information supplied with the application, it is concluded that this proposal is waste importation and landraising for its own sake and not course improvement.
2. Policy W3C of the WLP requires that non-landfill proposals with a capacity in excess of 50,000 tonnes per annum will be restricted to sources of waste from the plan area. The applicant has stated that the material used for remodelling would be sourced from a 20 mile radius of the site. In light of this, there is potential for the material to be sourced outside of Essex, in which case the proposal would be contrary to the requirements of policy W3C. Moreover, information should be supplied as to these potential sources including the timescales for importation to ensure the scheme can be completed within a reasonable timescale.
3. Policy W9B of the WLP states: 'Landfill, or land raising, for its own sake, without being necessary for restoration, will not be permitted.' It is considered that the applicant has not demonstrated any overriding justification for the proposals and that alternative solutions to the problems of golf course quality and safety could be sought without the need for large scale importation of inert material, the proposal would therefore be contrary to the provisions of Policy W9B. In respect of the latter point, unnecessary land raising in the green belt would be contrary to green belt policy due to the level of unnecessary activity and potential for landscape harm.
4. The proposal contains insufficient information to demonstrate how potential impacts on protected species and in this case Great Crested Newts will be mitigated and consequently whether or not the development would have an adverse effect on such species. In the submitted material no discussion has been made nor measures suggested to mitigate against the likely adverse effects upon Great Crested Newts. The Local Planning Authority is therefore unable to consider this matter or take specialist advice into consideration prior to determining the development proposed which if allowed could prove detrimental to protected species known to be present on part of the site.



5. Insufficient information has been provided to allow the Local Planning Authority to properly consider the impact of the proposal upon the network of hedgerows and aged trees present on the site and in the vicinity of the development proposed. Such a full tree impacts assessment should be in accordance with BS 5837 and is required to ensure the most suitable trees are retained and protected and the most suitable construction techniques are employed in the interests of the health and longevity and amenity afforded by those hedgerows and trees on the site.
6. The scale, extent and excessive height of the proposed raising of land levels would change the landscape to reduce the openness on those parts of the site to the detriment of the character and appearance of the Metropolitan Green Belt contrary to Policy R1 to the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006). Furthermore, the level of noise and disturbance arising from the works to reform the land and import the material over the construction period would result in the loss of the open outlook and prove detrimental to the level of amenity of local residents as well as those residents fronting the road network serving the site.

Application No : 08/00217/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning Permission**

Location : Makro Rawreth Industrial Estate Rawreth Lane Rayleigh

Proposal : Application to Vary Condition 4 of Permission
06/00079/FUL to Allow Store Opening 0600-2200 Monday to Friday, 0600-2100 Saturday and 0930-1900 Sundays and Bank Holidays.

Applicant : Mr Graham Noble

- 1 The proposal by way of the extension of increased trading hours into the quiet of the morning and evening Monday to Saturday would give rise to further noise and disturbance by way of traffic and the movement of customers to and from the store. No evidence has been provided to allow the Council to assess the ambient background noise levels for the extended hours proposed. In the absence of evidence to the contrary the proposal is likely to result in a loss of amenity to the occupiers of dwellings in the vicinity of the site detrimental to the expectations those occupiers ought reasonably expect to enjoy and contrary to parts (iii) and (iv) to policy PN 5 to the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006).

Application No : 08/00221/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 39 Wyburns Avenue Rayleigh

Proposal : Construct Pitched Roofed Garage and New Vehicular Crossing

Applicant : Mrs Louise Dowman



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

Application No : 08/00228/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : Fair Meadows Hall Road Rochford
Proposal : Construct Two Storey Pitched Roofed Side Extension With
Pitched Roofed Front and Rear Dormers and Part Two
Storey, Part Single Storey Pitched Roofed Rear Extension.
Construct New Vehicular Crossover and 1.8m High Brick
Wall With Railings.
Applicant : Mr C Humphries

Application No : 08/00239/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 135 The Chase Rayleigh
Proposal : Part Two Storey, Part Single Storey Side and Front
Extension. Convert Integral Garage to Habitable Rooms.
Applicant : Mr Darren Hemmings

Application No : 08/00241/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : Land Rear Of 28 - 32 Rocheway Rochford
Proposal : Revised Application For Single Storey Pitched Roofed
Building to Provide Administration and Training Centre for
Disability Essex. Construct Driveway and Parking Areas,
Widen Pedestrian and Vehicular Access.
Applicant : Mr Richard Boyd

Application No : 08/00242/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**
Location : 3 Station Avenue Rayleigh
Proposal : Construct Two Storey Side and Rear Extensions and
Convert Resultant Building into 2 No. Self Contained Flats
Applicant : Mr Perry Carter

- 1 The proposal by way of the height and depth of the proposal in relation to the adjoining dwelling at Nos. 1 and 5 Station Crescent would prove dominant and overbearing upon the rear of these neighbouring dwelling to the detriment of the amenity those adjoining residents ought reasonably expect to enjoy and contrary to part (iii) to Policy HP16 of the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006).



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

- 2 The proposal would result in an overdevelopment of the site failing to provide sufficient side isolation space between the resultant building and the plot boundary which in this case should not be less than a minimum of 1m between the external face of the side wall and the site boundary to accord with the Council's adopted guidance. If allowed the proposal would prove contrary to part (ii) to Policy HP16 and part (ix) to Policy HP6 of the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006) resulting in a development of mean and cramped appearance to the detriment of the character and appearance of the street scene.
- 3 The proposal by way of the provision of the first floor side facing window depicted in the left elevation of the proposed development would give rise to unacceptable loss of privacy between future occupiers of the development proposed and occupiers of the adjoining dwelling No. 1 Station Avenue contrary to part (viii) to Policy HP6 and part (iii) to policy HP 16 to the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006).
- 4 The proposed layout fails to show the distribution of room uses within the development proposed. As such it is not possible for the Local Planning Authority to consider the affects of the increased use of upstairs rooms to main living room areas particularly through the party boundary with the adjoining dwelling No. 5 Station Avenue. If allowed the proposal could give rise to conditions of noise and disturbance detrimental to the amenity that ought reasonably be expected to be enjoyed by those adjoining occupiers and contrary to parts (iii) and (iv) to Policy HP16 to the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006).

Application No : 08/00243/FUL

Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**

Location : 9 Spa Road Hockley

Proposal : Install External Security Roller Shutters

Applicant : Mr K Patel

- 1 The external roller shutters proposed would be detrimental when in use to the appearance and character of Hockley Town Centre in which it is located creating a dead frontage with a foreboding appearance potentially attracting graffiti and/or increasing the public perception of criminal activity occurring in the locality. If permitted, these shutters would set a precedent that may be difficult to resist. If repeated on nearby premises the cumulative effect of a number of premises with such shutters would have an increasingly harmful effect on the visual amenity of the street scene and the character of the area generally.



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

Application No : 08/00246/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 72 The Chase Rayleigh
Proposal : Construct New Roof Over Entire Property, with Pitched
Roof Dormers to Front and Rear and Rooflights to Rear.
Construct Two Storey Pitched Roofed Side and Rear
Extension.
Applicant : Mr And Mrs Reed

Application No : 08/00253/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**
Location : 67 Ashcombe Rochford
Proposal : Demolish Existing Garage at Rear. Construct Single Storey
Flat Roofed Rear Extension and Single Storey Flat Roofed
Side Extension. First Floor Flat Roofed Rear Extension to
Dormer.
Applicant : Mr Lee Hughes

- 1 The proposal by way of the resultant size, depth and bulk of the rear dormer extension proposed would take an unsatisfactory form contrary to part x) to policy HP6 to the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006) and would if allowed lack harmony with the original semi-detached dwellings and fail to respect the scale and original form of the existing dormer character in the locality.

Application No : 08/00254/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 30 St Andrews Road Rochford
Proposal : Demolish Existing Garage and Erect Part Single Part Two
Storey Side and Rear Extension with Pitched Roof and First
Floor Rear Extension with Pitched Roof.
Applicant : Mr Rick Jackson

Application No : 08/00258/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**
Location : 29 Ferry Road Hullbridge
Proposal : Hip to Gable Roof Extension, First Floor Rear Extension to
Dormer and Side Extension to Front Dormer.
Applicant : Mr And Mrs Horsley

- 1 The proposed rear dormer by reason of its size, design and appearance together with the flat roofed expanse from the ridge would result in an intrusive addition out of scale and character with the existing dwelling. Further more the appearance would be detrimental to the street scene and area generally.



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

- 2 The proposal by way of the formation of a gable end to the roof would detract from hipped roofed character of the dwellings and undermine the symmetry of this pair of semi detached properties, proving detrimental to the visual amenity afforded to the street scene arising from the established character of the dwellings in the street.

Application No : 08/00262/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 154 London Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Side Dormer with Flat Roof
Applicant : Mrs S Oakley

Application No : 08/00265/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 319 High Street Great Wakering
Proposal : Loft Conversion to Create Rooms in Roofspace with Rear Dormer and Window to Side Elevation
Applicant : Mr And Mrs J Robinson

Application No : 08/00267/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : Rose Glen Broom Road Hullbridge
Proposal : Convert Garage into Habitable Room
Applicant : Mr P. Rodgers

Application No : 08/00270/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning Permission**
Location : St Peters Church Church Road Hockley
Proposal : Site a Storage Container in the Car Park
Applicant : Hockley Parochial Church Council

- 1 The Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006) shows the site to be within the Metropolitan Green Belt and the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy R1 of the Local Plan. Within the Green Belt, as defined in this policy, planning permission will not be given, except in very special circumstances, for the construction of new buildings or for the change of use or extension of existing buildings (other than reasonable extensions to existing buildings, as defined in Policies R2 and R5 of the Local Plan).

The proposed container would result in a new building of a scale design and siting leading to a loss of openness and of an appearance detrimental to the rural setting and character of that part of the Metropolitan Green Belt in which the site is situated.



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

- 1 The proposed variation in hours to allow deliveries by service vehicles from 06:00hrs would by way of the noise levels created by the delivery vehicles during their entry in to/exit of the delivery yard, have a significant adverse effect upon nearby residential premises. A level of 73dBLAF,max or lower must be achieved at the outside of a closed bedroom window in order to attain a reasonable internal night-time level. The Delivery Noise Assessment submitted in support of the application indicates that this can not be achieved at the façades of nearby closed bedroom windows. Therefore, a reasonable internal noise environment is not attainable, and certainly not during warmer weather when bedroom windows may reasonably be expected to be open. The proposal would therefore prove detrimental to the amenity that ought reasonably be expected to be enjoyed by residents in Priory Chase adjoining the site contrary to parts (iii) and (iv) to Policy PN5 to the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006).

Application No : 08/00284/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 1 Fountain Lane Hockley
Proposal : First Floor Extension to Existing Property, Raising Ridge Height to Create 4 Bedroomed Two Storey Dwelling with Front Juliette Balcony and Rear Inset Balcony.
Applicant : Miss Sharon DeAngelis

Application No : 08/00285/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 310 High Street Great Wakering
Proposal : Rear Conservatory
Applicant : Mr Graham Pascoe

Application No : 08/00288/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 59 Nelson Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Single Storey Rear Extension
Applicant : Mr N Bragg

Application No : 08/00289/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 51 Mansted Gardens Rochford
Proposal : Rear Conservatory
Applicant : Mr And Mrs Aldridge

Application No : 08/00293/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 70A High Road Hockley
Proposal : Alterations to Front Door and Entrance Foyer Incorporating Glazed Roof Section and Sloping Glazed Canopy to Front
Applicant : Mr Tim Pocock



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

Application No : 08/00297/ADV Decision : **Grant Advertisement Consent**
Location : Car Dealership B Cherry Orchard Way Rochford
Proposal : One Illuminated Totem Sign, Three Illuminated Fascia Signs, One Illuminated Lion Sign and Two Illuminated Corner Signs.
Applicant : Peugeot Motor Company

Application No : 08/00300/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 2 Shopland Hall Cottages Shopland Road Sutton
Proposal : Two Storey Pitched Roofed Front Extension, Single Storey Sloped Roofed Side Extension, Form Hip End to Main Roof and External Alterations to Windows and Exterior to Provide Oak Beams and Render.
Applicant : Mr S Abel

Application No : 08/00303/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 12 Purdeys Way Rochford
Proposal : Insert 5no. Windows to Front Elevation (2no. at Ground Floor and 3 no. at First Floor)
Applicant : Electrothermal Engineering Ltd

Application No : 08/00308/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 25 Woodlands Avenue Rayleigh
Proposal : Convert Existing Integral Garage to Habitable Room
Applicant : Mr Morgan

Application No : 08/00309/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 23 Barbara Close Rochford
Proposal : Construct Hip to Gable Roof Extension and First Floor Pitched Roofed Rear Extension.
Applicant : Mr Neil Ruffy

Application No : 08/00310/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning Permission**
Location : 138 Down Hall Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Construct Single Storey Rear Extension With Balcony Above, Two Storey Front and Side Extension, New Roof With Habitable Accommodation Within and Convert to 4 No. Self Contained One Bedroomed Flats With Car Parking to Rear and New Access.
Applicant : Mr Thomas Devlin-James



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

- 1 The proposed rear balcony is considered to give rise to an unreasonable amount of overlooking to the residents of the neighbouring property at no. 138A Downhall Road to the detriment of the level of amenity that the residents of no. 138A ought reasonably be expected to enjoy. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy HP 6 part viii of the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006).

Application No : 08/00312/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning Permission**

Location : 1 Harrogate Road Hockley
Proposal : Addition of First Floor to Existing Bungalow to Create Two Storey Dwelling
Applicant : Mr And Mrs R Brown

- 1 The proposed extension, by reason of the height and mass of the roof would be an intrusive alteration out scale and form with the existing dwelling and furthermore would detract from the prevailing character of the semi-detached chalets and bungalows of which the site forms part, to the detriment of the street scene and the surrounding area.

Application No : 08/00313/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 6 Reynolds Gardens Ashingdon Rochford
Proposal : Construct Rear Conservatory
Applicant : Mr And Mrs Vinn

Application No : 08/00319/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 21 Southview Road Hockley
Proposal : Create Additional Room in Roofspace Incorporating Flat Roofed Front Dormer
Applicant : Mr And Mrs Allen

Application No : 08/00320/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 290 Eastwood Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Widen Existing Vehicular Access
Applicant : Mr Allen Groves

Application No : 08/00321/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : Wyburns County Junior School Nevern Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Single Storey Pitched Roofed Extension to Form Entrance and Meeting Room
Applicant : Mr Mervyn Pocock



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

Application No : 08/00323/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 2 Wedds Way Great Wakering
Proposal : Single Storey Front Extension with Pitched Roof and Oak Framed Porch
Applicant : Mr And Mrs C. Seagers

Application No : 08/00324/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : Walkers Farm Cottage Barling Road Barling Magna
Proposal : Garden Room Extension to Garage Outbuilding
Applicant : Mr And Mrs Byford

Application No : 08/00325/LBC Decision : **Grant Listed Building Consent**
Location : Walkers Farm Cottage Barling Road Barling Magna
Proposal : Garden Room Extension to Garage Outbuilding
Applicant : Mr And Mrs Byford

Application No : 08/00326/FUL Decision : **Application Withdrawn**
Location : 18 Kingsmans Farm Road Hullbridge
Proposal : Three Storey Flat Roofed Building to Provide House and Detached Garage
Applicant : Mr Mark Hale

Application No : 08/00330/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 15 Glasseys Lane Rayleigh
Proposal : Insert Front Bow Window and Construct Tiled Roof Canopy to Front Elevation
Applicant : Mr Peter Bowden

Application No : 08/00334/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 41 Albert Road Ashingdon Rochford
Proposal : Construct Part Two Storey, Part Single Storey Rear Extension. Construct Detached Pitched Roofed Garage.
Applicant : Mr Ian Walker

Application No : 08/00339/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : Newlands Woodside Road Hockley
Proposal : Bay Window to Front Elevation
Applicant : Ms Marie Leonard



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

Application No : 08/00350/ADV Decision : **Refuse Advertisement Consent**

Location : Hullbridge Post Office 141 Ferry Road Hullbridge
Proposal : Install One Internally Illuminated, Double Sided, Free Standing Display Sign Unit.

Applicant : Primesight

- 1 The proposed advertisement because of its size, illumination, and location would be an intrusive commercial advertisement display unit not directly connected with the application site. Such commercial advertisement material would add unnecessary visual clutter to the site within a residential area to the detriment of the amenity, character and appearance of the street scene.

Application No : 08/00354/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 55 Hockley Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Insertion of Flat Roofed Rear Dormers and Front Rooflights to Create Rooms in Roof

Applicant : Mr D E Lucas

Application No : 08/00359/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning Permission**

Location : Church Road Nurseries Church Road Hockley
Proposal : Small Scale Wind Turbine System with 9 Metre High Mast
Applicant : Mrs J Mann

- 1 The proposed wind turbine by virtue of its height, size and location on high ground in attractive countryside, where the land falls away significantly to the north before it rises up again to the church, would if permitted, result in an intrusive installation alien to its setting. It would detract from the visual amenities of the area, those enjoyed by local residents generally and in particular the occupiers of Blounts Farm.
- 2 The proposal by virtue of its height, size and siting will be contrary to Policy UT3 of the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006) being detrimental to the amenities of local residents as detailed above and to local bird life interests.

Application No : 08/00360/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 125 Shoebury Road Great Wakering
Proposal : Construct Pitch Roof Over Existing Rear Extensions and Alterations to Rear Windows and Doors

Applicant : Mr Trevor Saxon



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

Application No : 08/00361/ADV Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : Rochford Business Park Cherry Orchard Way Rochford
Proposal : Erect 2 no. Internally Illuminated Totem Signs adjacent to
Cherry Orchard Way Roundabout
Applicant : Mr Jonathan Brook



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE