

PLANNING DECISIONS December 2009

Application No : 08/00177/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**

Location : Land Adjacent 43 Shoebury Road Great Wakering
Proposal : Application to Delete Condition 1 of Decision
06/00788/FUL.

'The greenhouse hereby permitted shall only be used for the cultivation of produce as stated on Page 2 of the Design and Access Statement date stamped 23 October 2006 and for no other purpose, including any use otherwise permitted within Class B1, B8 or A1 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) Order 2005 (including any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order, with or without modification)' as Dated 16th August 2007 and Allow Unrestricted Use of Greenhouse.

Applicant : Mr F Vasile

- 1 The greenhouse to which this application relates was only deemed to be acceptable on the basis that it was to be used for a purpose directly relating to the agricultural/horticultural use of the adjoining land. The proposal to remove the condition and to use the greenhouse for a non-agricultural purpose is considered unacceptable as this would amount to inappropriate development within the Green Belt for which no very special circumstances exist which would overcome the harm to the Green Belt arising by definition contrary to PPG2: Green Belts and by virtue of the increase in activity at the site associated with the introduction of the retail use. Furthermore the proposal would be contrary to Policy R9(v) and (vi) and to Policy R10 of the Local Plan (2006) as saved by ministerial direction dated June 2009.

Application No : 08/00713/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**

Location : Land Opposite Prospect Villa Trenders Avenue Rayleigh
Proposal : Redevelop Site to Construct Two Detached Bungalows with
Semi-Detached Garages.

Applicant : Mr Graham Marlow

- 1 The Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006) shows the site to be within the Metropolitan Green Belt . The proposal is considered to be inappropriate development contrary to established Green Belt policy where 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), for purposes other than agriculture, mineral extraction of forestry, small scale facilities for outdoor participatory sports and recreation, cemeteries or similar uses which are open in character. Any development which is permitted shall be of a scale, design and siting, such that the appearance of the countryside is not impaired.

The proposal for the development of this site does not fall into any of the above categories and it is the opinion of the Local Planning Authority that development will adversely impact on the openness of the area and that the evidence that has been presented does not amount to very special circumstances to override the strong presumptions against the construction of new dwellings in the Green Belt.

Application No : 09/00345/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : The Day Nursery Church Road Rawreth
Proposal : Retain Two Demountable Outbuildings for a Further Five
Years and Form Access and Parking Area .
Applicant : Mr & Mrs R Mitchell

Application No : 09/00444/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 176 Rawreth Lane Rayleigh
Proposal : Construct Rear Conservatory
Applicant : Mr Peter Jones

Application No : 09/00467/LDC Decision : **Refuse Lawful
Development
Certificate**

Location : Willow Pond Farm Lower Road Hockley
Proposal : Application for a Certificate of Lawfulness for Use of
Existing Building as Residential Bungalow.
Applicant :



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

Application No : 09/00500/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 63 - 65 High Street Rayleigh
Proposal : Install One Additional Air Condenser Unit to Rear and One Security Camera and New ATM Surround to Front.
Applicant : Mr Simon Bailey

Application No : 09/00529/OUT Decision : **Refuse Planning Permission**

Location : Land Between Main Road And Rectory Road And Clements Hall Way Hawkwell
Proposal : Outline Application to Provide Comprehensive Development of Approximately 330 Dwellings, Associated Infrastructure, New Vehicular Accesses onto Rectory Road, New On-Site Accesses and Road Network, Cycleway and Footpath Network, Public Open Spaces, Landscaping, Health Facilities and Local Amenities.
Applicant : David Wilson Homes

- 1 The proposed development of up to 330 residential dwellings and associated infrastructure would not accord with the adopted development plan – the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006)- and would also not accord with the emerging Core Strategy submission which is currently at an advanced stage with submission to the government scheduled to occur before the end of 2009. There are no material planning considerations which indicate that this proposal should be determined favourably and not in accordance with the adopted development plan.
- 2 The Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006) shows the site to be within the Metropolitan Green Belt .Within the Green Belt as defined in Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: Green Belts, planning permission will not be given for inappropriate development, except in very special circumstances. The proposal by way of the excessive number of dwellings over and above that advocated in the emerging Rochford Core Strategy would result in inappropriate development leading to the unnecessary urbanisation and over development of the site to the detriment of the open character and appearance of the location.
- 3 Notwithstanding the indicative nature of the submitted layout, it is considered the development would result in an overall form of development uncharacteristic and poorly related to the surrounding development pattern. The lack of integration by design and lack of sensitivity to the semi rural character of the site locality would fail to become part of the greater area of which it would adjoin to the detriment of the visual appearance and local distinctiveness of the area.



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

- 4 The proposal by way of the introduction of three storey built form in prominent positions in the locality would provide a sharp contrast to the notable single storey character of the Rectory Road and Thorpe Road areas, that would, if allowed, prove over dominant and ill-fitting alongside established dwellings failing to respect local distinctiveness to the detriment of the character and appearance of the site locality.
- 5 As far as can be determined from the submitted plans the proposal includes the upgrade to adoptable standards of a section of Thorpe Road. This would encourage the inappropriate use of Thorpe Road by vehicles wishing to bypass the B1013/Rectory Road junction. The movement of vehicles associated with this use would lead to conflict and interference with the passage of vehicles to the detriment of that principle function and introduce a further point of possible conflict, being detrimental to road safety.

Application No : 09/00533/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : Glenmore House East Street Rochford
Proposal : Remove Existing Timber Frame Windows and Doors and Provide Aluminium Framed Windows and Doors.

Applicant : Springboard Housing Association Ltd

Application No : 09/00536/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 204 Hockley Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Demolish Existing Dwelling and Construct New Detached Four Bedroomed House With Pitched Roofed Dormers to Front and Rear and Attached Garage With Habitable Area in Roof.

Applicant : Mr And Mrs Downing

Application No : 09/00549/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning Permission**

Location : 12 Orchard Avenue Hockley
Proposal : Demolish Part of Existing Dwelling and Subdivide Plot to Construct Two Bedroomed Bungalow at Rear with Access Drive.

Applicant : Mr Nigel Sparkes



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

- 1 The proposal by way of the very close proximity of the proposed access drive to the western elevation of the dwelling and the garden at no.12 Orchard Avenue, no. 10 Orchard Avenue and the rear gardens of no. 1, 2 and 3 Jasmine Court would give rise to noise, vibration and disturbance detrimental to the amenity that residents of these dwellings ought reasonably be expected to enjoy. The proposal therefore would fail to provide a satisfactory means of access contrary to Policy HP14 (i) and (iv) to the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006).
- 2 The proposal would result in an over development of the site failing to provide sufficient private amenity space for the existing dwelling (12 Orchard Avenue). If allowed the development would provide insufficient private amenity space for sitting out, limited open storage, drying and limited recreation for occupiers of the dwelling, detrimental to the expectations those occupiers ought reasonably expect to enjoy.

3

Application No : 09/00553/COU Decision : **Refuse Planning Permission**

Location : Land Adjacent The Pumping Station Watery Lane Rawreth
 Proposal : Change Use of Mobile Home From Restroom to Use as a Dwelling, Construct Revised Access.

Applicant : Ms Patricia Everitt

- 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 established policy whereby 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), for purposes other than agriculture, mineral extraction or forestry, small scale facilities for outdoor participatory sports and recreation, cemeteries or similar uses which are open in character. Any development which is permitted shall be of a scale, design and siting, such that the appearance of the countryside is not impaired.

The proposal for the change of use of the existing mobile home and the construction of the revised access on and serving this site does not fall into any of the above categories and it is the opinion of the Local Planning Authority that no evidence has been presented to sufficiently justify overriding the strong presumptions against the provision of new dwellings in the Green Belt. If allowed the proposal would consolidate at present unauthorised use and buildings proving detrimental to the open character and appearance of that part of the Metropolitan Green Belt in which the site is situated.

- 2 The proposed development would lead to an increase in unnecessary traffic movements to and from the site in direct conflict with the aims and objectives of Policy P4 Sustainable Transport and Policy P3 Accessibility.



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

- 3 The location, the lack of footways and limited access to public transport would mean that virtually all journeys generated by the proposal would be by private vehicles. The proposal is not considered to be sustainable due to the reliance on the use of the private car which is contrary to the aims and objectives of Policy P1 Sustainable Transport and Policy P3 Accessibility.
- 4 The Highway Authority seeks to ensure that the number of access points onto the highway is kept to a minimum. Therefore, the proposal for an access incorporating two vehicle crossings will not be allowed. The development would therefore be contrary to Development Control Policy P1.2 (Highway Access) of Appendix G of the Local Transport Plan 2006/2011.
- 5 The proposed use of the mobile Home is located within Flood Zone 2 with medium risk of potential flooding. Mobile Homes are regarded as development vulnerable to flooding in such locations. The proposal fails to provide a satisfactory and adequate Flood Risk Assessment. The submitted Flood Risk Assessment fails to take into account different types of flooding or the impact of climate change together with access and egress from the mobile home in the event of a flood. If allowed the development would result in future occupiers of the mobile home being at risk from flooding.

Application No : 09/00556/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning Permission**

Location : 179 Daws Heath Road Rayleigh
 Proposal : Single Storey Rear Extension and First Floor Rear Extension.
 Applicant : Mr J. Cope

- 1 The proposal would result in a bulky and disproportionate flat roofed addition to the existing chalet style dwelling to the detriment of the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers of 177 Daws Heath Road particular the aspect from their front door and to the; contrary to saved Policy HP6 of the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan.
- 2 The proposed extension by reason of the design, bulk and disproportionate flat roof addition at first floor level will create an inappropriate design and appearance to the existing property to the detriment of it's appearance in the street scene and area generally.

Application No : 09/00557/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : Land Rear Of 27 To 31 Broadlands Road Hockley
 Proposal : Subdivide Plot and Construct One Four Bedroomed Chalet Style Dwelling with Attached Garage with Access onto Greensward Lane via 92 Greensward Lane.
 Applicant : Mr And Mrs B. Mead



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

Application No : 09/00561/COU Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : Units A To C Swaines Industrial Estate Ashingdon Road
Ashingdon

Proposal : Change Of Use From Light Industrial Unit (B1)to Fitness
Centre (D2)

Applicant : Mr Tom Ashton

Application No : 09/00564/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**

Location : Chadwell Lambourne Hall Road Canewdon

Proposal : Construct Ground Floor Rear Extension and Construct New
Pitched Roof Over with Front and Rear Dormers to Convert
Bungalow to Chalet. Demolish Outbuildings.

Applicant : Mr & Mrs M Davies

- 1 The Replacement Rochford Local Plan (2006) shows the site to be within the Metropolitan Green belt. Within the Green Belt, 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 on Policies R2 and R5 of the Local Plan). Any development, which is permitted, shall be of a scale, design and siting, such that the appearance of the countryside is not impaired.

Policy R5 (i) of the Local Plan provides that the total size of a Green Belt dwelling as extended, including any extension which may have previously been added, will not normally exceed the original floor space by more than 35 square metres. The proposal is considered excessive, rather than reasonable, resulting in a substantial change in the appearance and character of the property contrary to the above policy. Furthermore the development by virtue of the altered design and raising the roof of the dwelling and the incorporation for four dormers is considered to result in a material increase in the height and bulk of the dwelling house adding further additional volume, mass and scale which is considered to be inappropriate and harmful to the openness and character of the Metropolitan Green Belt contrary to Policy R5 parts (ii) and (iii) of the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006).



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

Application No : 09/00567/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 10 Kingsmans Farm Road Hullbridge
Proposal : Revised Second Floor Side Window to East Elevation to
Approved Dwelling Under Application 07/00911/FUL
Changing from 2000mm Wide by 400mm High to 1500mm
Wide by 1800mm High.
Applicant : Miss Jane Rawson

Application No : 09/00560/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**
Location : Land Rear Of 16 To 24 Kingswood Crescent Rayleigh
Proposal : Construct Detached Two Bedroomed Bungalow to Rear of
No. 16 and Construct Access Driveway.
Applicant : Page Estates Ltd

- 1 In conjunction with the extant planning permission granted under 08/00403/FUL for the adjoining site, the proposal, by way of introducing an additional bungalow, would represent the over-development of an area of backland resulting in a loss of openness which would be out of character with the more spacious prevailing pattern of development in the area giving rise to an unsatisfactory relationship between the development proposed and existing dwellings detrimental to the character of the area in the locality contrary to part (ii) to policy HP14 to the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006).

Application No : 09/00568/LBC Decision : **Grant Listed Building
Consent**
Location : Blew House Cottage Barling Road Barling Magna
Proposal : Construct Single Storey Pitched Roofed Rear Extension
Applicant : Mr Brian Hill

Application No : 09/00569/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 31 Nore Road Eastwood
Proposal : Construct Pitched Roofed Extension to Form New Double
Garage and Convert Existing Garage Space to Habitable
Room.
Applicant : Mr Howard Pannell



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

Application No : 09/00574/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 26 Cordelia Crescent Rayleigh
Proposal : Demolish Existing Rear Extension and Construct Single Storey Flat Roofed rear Extension.
Applicant : Miss Kate Buddle

Application No : 09/00575/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning Permission**

Location : Woodside Farm Rayleigh Avenue Leigh-On-Sea
Proposal : Retrospective Application to Construct Single Storey Pitched Roofed Side and Rear Extensions
Applicant : Mr G Nicholls

- 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 the saved Policy R5. Within the Green Belt, as defined in this policy, planning permission will not be given, except in very special circumstances, for the extension of existing buildings (other than reasonable extensions to existing buildings, as defined in Policy R5 of the Local Plan). Any development which is permitted shall be of a scale, design and siting, such that the appearance of the countryside is not impaired. Policy R5 provides that the total size of a Green Belt dwelling as extended, including any extension which may have previously been added, will not normally exceed the original floor space by more than 35 square metres. The proposal is considered excessive, rather than reasonable, resulting in a substantial change in the appearance and character of the property contrary to the above policy.

Application No : 09/00576/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 50 Windermere Avenue Hullbridge
Proposal : Convert Garage and Increase Roof Height to Form Habitable Space.
Applicant : Mr Ben Harris

Application No : 09/00577/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning Permission**

Location : 17 North Street Rochford
Proposal : Retention of First Floor Rear Door and Juliet Balcony.
Applicant : Mr B Kuganeswaran



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

- 1 The visual mass and bulk of the Upvc door at first floor level on the building and the appearance of the materials used are out of character within the Rochford Conservation Area contrary to the Replacement Local Plan saved Policy BC1.
- 2 The door would give access to the roof of the rear extension to the building, resulting in overlooking of private garden areas in the immediate vicinity and such access could not be sufficiently controlled by the provision of the Juliet balcony.

Application No : 09/00578/FUL

Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**

Location : Hyde Wood Farm Hyde Wood Lane Canewdon
Proposal : Demolish Existing House and Bungalow Annex and Erect
One Four Bedroomed House.
Applicant : Mrs S Noad

- 1 The site is located within an area of Metropolitan Green belt as defined in The Rochford District Replacement Local Plan as adopted on 16th June 2006 and as saved by Direction of the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and dated 5th June 2009 in exercise of the power conferred by paragraph 1(3) of schedule 8 to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Policy R6 to the adopted Local Plan requires that replacement dwellings should be of a total size no greater than the size of the original dwelling together with the maximum permitted development provided for by virtue of schedule 2 , Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning general Permitted Development Order 1995 (as amended) subject to an overall increase in size no greater than 35 square metres above the size of the habitable floorspace of the original dwelling taking into account the habitable building also within 5 metres of the existing dwelling or the size of the habitable floorspace of the dwelling lawfully existing at the time of the application.

The proposal is considered excessive, rather than reasonable, resulting in a substantial change in the appearance and character of the property and a replacement dwelling disproportionate in size over and above the size of the original building and that existing or that can lawfully exist on the site. The proposed building would be materially larger in terms of floorspace and the bulk of the building proposed in comparison the existing dwelling on the site and as such the proposal would result in a significant increase in the visual mass of the new dwelling significantly greater than the existing dwelling and detrimental to the openness, visual amenity and character of the Metropolitan Green Belt



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

Application No : 09/00579/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 62 - 64 High Street Great Wakering
Proposal : Change Existing Black Colour Weatherboard Finish to Lean
To Extension at Rear to White Painted Finish.
Applicant : L. Rowland & Co. (Retail) Ltd

Application No : 09/00581/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 30 Branksome Avenue Hockley
Proposal : Widen Existing Vehicular Crossover and Convert Integral
Garage to Habitable Room (Retrospective Application)
Applicant : Mr & Mrs Peacham

Application No : 09/00582/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 104 Ashingdon Road Rochford
Proposal : Single Storey Hipped Roofed Side Extension.
Applicant : Mr D Wells

Application No : 09/00583/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 4 Talbot Avenue Rayleigh
Proposal : Loft Conversion, Raise Ridge and Form Front Gable,
Pitched Roofed Front Dormer and Pitched Roofed Rear
Dormers.
Applicant : Mr & Mrs Stone

Application No : 09/00587/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 54 Love Lane Rayleigh
Proposal : Extend Existing Front and Rear Dormers
Applicant : Miss Juliet Smith

Application No : 09/00590/LDC Decision : **Refuse Lawful
Development
Certificate**
Location : 19 Broad Way Hockley
Proposal : Application for a Certificate of Lawfulness for Proposed Use
of Ancillary Residential Outbuilding as Ancillary Residential
Accommodation
Applicant : Mr Leigh Goodliffe



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

Application No : 09/00592/OUT Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**
Location : Land Opposite 1 To 10 Disraeli Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Outline Application to Erect Nine Detached Houses.
Applicant : Mr D Cowlin

- 1 The proposed development of nine residential dwellings would not accord with the adopted development plan, the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006) and would also not accord with the emerging Core Strategy submission, which is currently at an advanced stage with submission to the Government scheduled for before the end of the year. There are no material planning considerations that indicate that this proposal should be determined favourably and not in accordance with the adopted development plan.

The Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006) shows the site to be within the Metropolitan Green Belt. Within the Green Belt, as defined in Planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts, planning permission will not be given for inappropriate development, except in very special circumstances.

The proposed development by way of the residential use of the land would amount to inappropriate development in the Green Belt, which is by definition harmful. In addition, further harm to the Green Belt would be caused as a result of the unnecessary urbanisation of the site to the detriment of the open character and appearance of the location.

No very special circumstances exist that would overcome the harm to the Green Belt and consequently the proposed development would be contrary to Planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts.

- 2 The application has not been supplemented by any ecological survey, and as such there has been no assessment of the likely habitat for legally protected mammals, reptiles and amphibians or of the impact that the proposal is likely to have on the adjacent Local Wildlife Site.

In the absence of this information the local planning authority is unable to determine whether the proposed development of the site would be likely to have an adverse impact upon legally protected species and therefore considered to be contrary to the advice contained in Planning Policy Statement 9.

- 3 The proposal by way of the increase in unnecessary traffic movements in an un-sustainable location would result in the unacceptable intensification of use of a substandard road and surrounding road network to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety.



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

Application No : 09/00594/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning Permission**

Location : 16 Westbury Rochford
Proposal : Construct Two Storey Pitched Roofed Side Extension
Applicant : Mr & Mrs Nash

- 1 The proposal by virtue of the part of the proposed extension being sited on amenity land which is currently open and soft landscaped would result in a further loss of an important amenity area which is part of the original layout of the estate and contributes to the spacious character and appearance of the estate. If allowed the proposal would result in the further loss of an open area of land on the estate which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the estate and to residential amenity more generally, contrary to part (viii) of Policy HP6 of the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006).
- 2 Parking provision requirements for new development in Essex are detailed within the document entitled 'Parking Standards – Design and Good Practice (September 2009)', produced by Essex County Council. The application would provide inadequate off street parking provision which would fail to meet the minimum level of on-site parking provision required. Failure to provide sufficient off street parking for a four bed roomed dwelling is likely to result in the displacement of vehicles onto the highway, giving rise to on street parking to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety.

Application No : 09/00593/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 36 Hawkwell Park Drive Hawkwell
Proposal : Raise Ridge Height and Form Rooms in Roofspace
Incorporating Pitched Roofed Front Dormers, Front
Rooflight and Flat Roofed Rear Dormer. Construct Pitched
Roofed Canopy to Front.
Applicant : Mr Sadler



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

Application No : 09/00595/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**
Location : Land Rear Of 28 - 32 Rocheway Rochford
Proposal : Application to Remove Condition 15 of Planning Permission
08/00241/FUL dated 11th June 2008.

Condition 15: The Development Hereby Permitted Shall be Occupied by Disability Essex.

And to Allow Authorised Building to be Used by Other than Disability Essex Subject to a Unilateral Undertaking Requiring the District Councils Prior Approval of Alternative Future Occupiers.

Applicant : Mr Richard Boyd

- 1 The site is located within an area of Metropolitan Green Belt as identified in the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006) as saved by Direction of the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government in exercise of the power conferred by paragraph 1(3) of schedule 8 to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Within the Green Belt the construction of new buildings is inappropriate development and harmful to the character and openness afforded the Green Belt. The building to which this application relates was allowed in very special circumstances as demonstrated by the applicant in the need for the applicant , amongst other things to be located alongside a mainstream educational establishment and the necessary synergy with the existing college facilities. The proposal to remove the condition limiting the use of all or part of the building to future users other than the applicant on the basis of funding and operational constraints does not amount to very special circumstances that now justify the use of that part or parts of the building against established Green Belt policy. If allowed the proposed alternative agreement would prove impractical and would avoid the proper consideration of the merits of a particular user that ought to be considered formally by way of a variation to the existing condition.

Application No : 09/00596/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**
Location : 36 The Approach Rayleigh
Proposal : Demolish Existing Dwelling and Construct Two Storey
Building Comprising Six x One Bedroomed Flats with
Parking to Front.
Applicant : Mr Peter Shelts



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

- 1 The proposal would fail to provide sufficient space within the site to achieve the satisfactory parking of the vehicles in the manner proposed and would if allowed fail to provide sufficient depth and width to allow the vehicles to park clear of the street and poor visibility for the cars existing the site to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety.
- 2 The proposal by way of the reliance upon forecourt parking would result in a harsh site frontage dominated by hard surfacing and parked vehicles that would prove visually detrimental to the character and appearance of the street.

Application No : 09/00598/COU Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : Yard 7 Imperial Park Rawreth Lane
Proposal : Use of Yard for the Storage of Furniture Type Commercial Vehicles and for Containerised Storage to be Used in Conjunction with Furniture Removal Business.
Applicant : Mrs Lesley Dunne

Application No : 09/00597/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 4 Temple Way Rayleigh
Proposal : Pitched Roofed Rear Conservatory
Applicant : Mr B Adkins

Application No : 09/00601/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 56 Somerset Avenue Rochford
Proposal : Hipped to Gable Roof Extension Incorporating Pitched Roof Front Dormer, Flat Roofed Rear Dormer to Create Rooms in Roofspace.
Applicant : Mr And Mrs Bell

Application No : 09/00602/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 6 Greensward Lane Hockley
Proposal : Demolish Existing Bungalow and Construct One Detached Bungalow (Amended Design Following Approval at 09/00285/FUL)
Applicant : Mr K Fennell



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

Application No : 09/00605/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 14 Twyford Avenue Great Wakering
Proposal : Part Single Storey, Part Two Storey Pitched Roofed Rear Extension.
Applicant : Mr A Silberstone

Application No : 09/00606/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 77 Barling Road Great Wakering
Proposal : Pitched Roofed Extension to Existing Detached Garage Incorporating Roof Lights and Cupola/Weather Vane.
Applicant : Mr And Mrs B French

Application No : 09/00607/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning Permission**

Location : Southcot Lower Road Hullbridge
Proposal : Demolish Existing Pre-Fabricated Garage and Construct New Pitched Roofed Detached Garage.
Applicant : Mr Ian Hawkins

- 1 The proposed development, by virtue of its height and bulk would amount to inappropriate development within the Metropolitan Green Belt, resulting in a detrimental effect on the openness, character and appearance of the Green Belt contrary to Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: Green Belts. No very special circumstances have been demonstrated which would overcome the harm to the Green Belt which would result from the proposed development.

Application No : 09/00609/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 52 Cheapside West Rayleigh
Proposal : Demolish Existing Rear Extension and Construct New Single Storey Sloped Roofed Rear Extension.
Applicant : Ms Capitelli

Application No : 09/00610/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 11 Evelyn Road Hockley
Proposal : Hipped to Gable First Floor Side Extension and Extend Existing Flat Roofed Rear Dormer.
Applicant : Mr Russell Clifton



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

Application No : 09/00611/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**

Location : Wychwater The Chase Ashingdon
Proposal : Raise Ridge and Form Rooms in the Roofspace
 Incorporating Side Dormers. Construct New Roof to
 Conservatory.
Applicant : Mr Reg Holmes

- 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 R5 of the Local Plan. Within the Green Belt, as defined in these policies, planning permission will not be given, except in very special circumstances, for the extension of existing buildings, other than reasonable extensions to existing buildings, as defined in Policies R2 and R5 of the Local Plan. Any development, which is permitted, shall be of a scale, design and siting, such that the appearance of the countryside is not impaired.

The proposed development by virtue of the proposed increase in the overall height and mass of the existing dwellinghouse and the creation of further additional habitable floor space above the level which is considered acceptable in the Green Belt, is considered to be inappropriate and harmful to the openness and character of the Metropolitan Green Belt contrary to parts (i), (ii) and (iii) of Policy R5 of the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan 2006. No very special circumstances have been demonstrated which would overcome the harm to the Green Belt.

- 2 The proposed development, by virtue of the proposed extension to the rear dormer is considered to result in extensions which are excessive in relation to the mass and design of the existing property, contrary to part (x) of Policy HP6 of the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan 2006

Application No : 09/00613/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**

Location : 48 Nutcombe Crescent Rochford
Proposal : Single Storey Flat Roofed Side Extension
Applicant : Mr And Mrs Price

- 1 The proposed development is considered unacceptable by virtue of the impact that the introduction of the flat roofed extension would have on the overall form of the building and the negative impact that this building form would have on the character and appearance of the street scene, contrary to parts (viii) and (x) of Policy HP6 of the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006) as saved by Ministerial direction dated June 2009.



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

- 2 Parking provision requirements for development in Essex are detailed within the document entitled 'Parking Standards – Design and Good Practice (September 2009)', produced by Essex County Council. The proposed development would result in the provision of only one on-site car parking space which is considered inadequate and would fail to meet the minimum level of on-site parking provision required. Failure to provide sufficient off street parking for is likely to result in the displacement of vehicles onto the highway, giving rise to on street parking to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety.

Application No : 09/00614/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning Permission**

Location : Land Rear Of 28 - 32 Rocheway Rochford
Proposal : Construct 13M High Wind Turbine
Applicant : Disability Essex

- 1 The proposal by way of the size, height and siting of the proposed turbine would overshadow and dominate the rear garden areas and rear windows to the adjoining Bungalows Nos. 30 and 32 Rocheway to the detriment of the amenity those occupiers ought reasonably expect to enjoy.

Application No : 09/00615/LBC Decision : **Grant Listed Building Consent**

Location : 15 West Street Rochford
Proposal : Internal Alterations, Install Lamp to ATM to Provide New Branch Name Plate, Remove Brass Door Entrance Handles and Hanging Basket Fixing, Provide Non-Illuminated Letter Sign and Non-Illuminated Hanging Sign, Install Air Conditioning Units and Provide Three New Condensers to Roof Area and New Door.
Applicant : Barclays PLC

Application No : 09/00616/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 8 Southview Road Hockley
Proposal : Hip to Gable Side Extension, Loft Conversion Incorporating Two Pitched Roofed Dormers to Front Elevation and One Flat Roofed Dormer to Rear Elevation.
Applicant : Mr M Treacher



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

Application No : 09/00617/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 127 London Road Rayleigh
Proposal : First Floor Hipped Roofed Side Extension Incorporating
Rooms in the Roofspace Including Flat Roofed Rear
Dormer and Rooflight to Front.

Applicant : Mr & Mrs Newton

Application No : 09/00618/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 25A Trinity Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Two Storey Hipped Roofed Side Extension.

Applicant : Mr Peter Everett

Application No : 09/00619/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 63 London Hill Rayleigh
Proposal : Part Single Storey Part Two Storey Side Extension.

Applicant : Mr M Doost

Application No : 09/00620/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**

Location : 10 Ashcombe Rochford
Proposal : Single Storey Pitched Roofed Side Extension, Single
Storey Flat Roofed Rear Extension and Loft Conversion
Incorporating Flat Roofed Dormers to Front and Rear.

Applicant : Mr And Mrs Dabbs

- 1 The proposed flat roofed rear dormer addition by reason of its size, design and appearance would result in an intrusive addition out of character and scale with the existing dwelling. The cumulative effect of the introduction of the rear dormer with the flat roofed front dormer to the proposed dimensions, present disproportionate additions to the dwelling which appear intrusive and excessive upon the modest sized semi detached bungalow, to the detriment of the appearance of the dwelling and the street scene contrary to Policy HP 6 of the Replacement Local Plan (2006).

Application No : 09/00621/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 167 Ferry Road Hullbridge
Proposal : Single Storey Pitched Roofed Rear Extension to Form New
Store Room

Applicant : Mr And Mrs Patel



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

Application No : 09/00622/COU Decision : **Refuse Permission (COU)**

Location : 167 Ferry Road Hullbridge
Proposal : Convert First Floor Stock Room to Form Two Bedroomed Flat

Applicant : Mr And Mrs Patel

- 1 Parking provision requirements for new development in Essex are detailed within the document entitled 'Parking Standards – Design and Good Practice (September 2009)', produced by Essex County Council and the EPOA. The application would provide inadequate off street parking provision which would fail to meet the minimum level of on-site parking provision required. Failure to provide sufficient off street parking for a two bed roomed dwelling is likely to result in the displacement of vehicles onto the highway, giving rise to on street parking to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety.

Application No : 09/00629/FUL Decision : **Application Withdrawn**

Location : Land North Of 36 High Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Construct Detached Three Bedroomed House
Applicant : Autosecond Ltd

Application No : 09/00634/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 24 Estuary Gardens Great Wakering
Proposal : Roof Alteration to Convert Existing Flat Roof to Sloped Roof

Applicant : Mrs Clare Godfrey

Application No : 09/00635/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 4 Ridgeway Rayleigh
Proposal : Hipped Roofed Two Storey Side Extension and First Floor Rear Extension

Applicant : Mr P Watson

Application No : 09/00644/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning Permission**

Location : Yard 2 Imperial Park Rawreth Lane
Proposal : Construct Factory Unit
Applicant : Metro Ltd



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

- 1 Parking provision requirements for new development in Essex are detailed within the document entitled 'Parking Standards – Design and Good Practice (September 2009)', produced by Essex County Council and the EPOA. The application would provide inadequate levels of parking provision for a B2 use which would fail to meet the maximum level of parking provision required. Failure to provide sufficient on site parking for a B2 factory unit is likely to result in the displacement of vehicles in to the wider industrial estate creating an unacceptable hazard to all industrial estate users. Furthermore it is considered that inadequate information has been supplied in order for the Local Planning Authority to accurately determine whether the existing car parking spaces/areas within the area edged blue on the submitted plans together with communal spaces and those shown within the application site can provide adequate car parking space provision for all the units operated by the applicants.

Application No : 09/00651/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : Land Between 48 And 52 Waxwell Road Hullbridge
Proposal : Construct Detached Four Bedroomed House with Integral Garage, New Vehicular Crossing and Parking to Front
Applicant : Mr James Thornton

Application No : 09/00667/NMA Decision : **Refuse Permission**
Location : Land Adjacent Rosedale Gladstone Gardens Rayleigh
Proposal : Non-Material Amendment following approval 07/00829/FUL
Applicant : Mrs Karen Playle

Application No : 09/00669/NMA Decision : **Refuse Permission**
Location : 24 Hillcrest Road Hockley
Proposal : Non-Material Amendment following approval at 09/00292/FUL
Applicant : Mr Daren Capel

Application No : 09/00673/NMA Decision : **Refuse Permission**
Location : 93 Greensward Lane Hockley
Proposal : Non-Material Amendment Following Approval at 09/00056/FUL
Applicant : K W Jones and Sons (Rayleigh) Ltd



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

Application No : 09/00699/NMA Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 65 Rayleigh Avenue Eastwood
Proposal : Non Material Amendment following approval at
08/00135/FUL
Applicant : Mr Paul Cooper



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE