

PLANNING DECISIONS November 2009

Application No : 09/00417/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**

Location : Land At Old London Road Rawreth

Proposal : Provide Additional Storage Container and Additional Eight
Youth Football Pitches.

Applicant : Rayleigh Boys Youth Football Club

- 1 Notwithstanding that, prima facie, the proposed use of the land for outdoor sport falls within a category of development generally considered appropriate within the Metropolitan Green Belt, in this case, the scale of the use and the likely level of car parking being required to serve the use is considered to affect the openness of the Metropolitan Green Belt.
- 2 The proposal would give rise to an undesirable intensification of the use of an existing sub – standard access. Slowing and turning of vehicles at this point would give rise to conditions of danger and obstruction to other road users to the detriment of highway safety. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy 1.1. (Safety) Appendix G: Development Control Policies and Processes, Essex Local Transport Plan 2006 2011.
- 3 As far as can be determined from the submitted plans the applicant does not appear to be able to provide the required traffic visibility splays. The lack of such visibility would result in an unacceptable degree of hazard to all road users to the detriment of highway safety. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy 1.1 (Safety) of Appendix G: of the Local Transport Plan 2006/2011.
- 4 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 4 (sustainability) and Policy P3.1 (accessibility) Appendix G: Development Control Policies and Processes, Essex Local Transport Plan 2006/2011.

- 5 The location, 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 sustainable due to the reliance on the use of private car which is in direct conflict with the aims and objectives of Policy 4 (Sustainability) and Policy P3.1 (accessibility) Appendix G : Development Control Policies and Processes, Essex Local Transport Plan 2006/2011.
- 6 The proposed intensification in the use of the site for football, taking into account the number of spectators, players and cars likely involved, is considered likely to result in a level of noise and activities detrimental to the amenities of nearby residents.

Application No : 09/00460/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
 Location : 16 Upper Lambricks Rayleigh
 Proposal : Part Two Storey Part First Floor Rear Extension and Single Storey Rear Conservatory Extension
 Applicant : Mr Peter Cook

Application No : 09/00471/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning Permission**
 Location : The Rose Garden 33A Aldermans Hill Hockley
 Proposal : Retrospective Application to Form Hard Surface Extension to Existing Car Park
 Applicant : Mr Terry Harrold

- 1 The Rochford District Replacement Local Plan 2006 shows the site to be within the Metropolitan Green Belt within which there is a general presumption against inappropriate development, except in very special circumstances.

It is considered that the proposal is inappropriate development which by virtue of its scale, mass and the additional activity and traffic movements generated would have a materially greater impact than the lawful extend of the existing car park resulting in a substantial change in the visual appearance and character of the site, contrary to the openness of the Green Belt and Policy SS7 of the Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England (2008).

- 2 The proposal by way of the increase in size of the car park and use of materials would resulted in increased noise, traffic movements and disturbance to the detriment of the amenity that ought reasonably be expected to be enjoyed by residents backing onto and in close proximity to the site.



Application No : 09/00482/FUL Decision : **Application Withdrawn**
Location : Rectory Cottage Hall Road Rochford
Proposal : Demolish Existing Conservatory and Porch, Construct
Single Storey Pitched Roofed Side Extension and Form
Two New Pitched Roofs over Existing Extensions.
Applicant : Mr And Mrs N Hedley

Application No : 09/00483/LBC Decision : **Application Withdrawn**
Location : Rectory Cottage Hall Road Rochford
Proposal : Demolish Existing Conservatory and Porch, Construct
Single Storey Pitched Roofed Side Extension and Form
Two New Pitched Roofs over Existing Extensions, Together
with Internal Alterations.
Applicant : Mr And Mrs N Hedley

Application No : 09/00485/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 68 High Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Subdivide Plot and Construct Two Detached Dwellings and
Double Garage Building with New Vehicular Access for 68
High Road.
Applicant : Mr John Browning

Application No : 09/00487/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 5 Oakwood Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Single Storey Sloped Roofed Rear Conservatory.
Applicant : Mr Mike Williams

Application No : 09/00491/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 154 Eastwood Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Close Boarded Fence with Gates to White House Chase
Elevation
Applicant : Mr Andrew Humphreys

Application No : 09/00494/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**
Location : Asda Priory Chase Rayleigh
Proposal : Construct Three Storey Mixed Use Building Comprising
Three x Commercial Units (Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A5, D1
and B1(a)) and Twenty Four Affordable Residential Units.
Applicant : Coral Retail Projects Ltd



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

- 1 The proposed building, by way of its design and appearance would be out of keeping with the surrounding area, which essentially comprises domestic scale residential dwellings in traditional external finishes. If allowed, the building proposed would detract from that residential character to the detriment of visual amenity afforded to the street scene and the area more generally.
- 2 The proposed building would be of a scale, form, mass and bulk that would be inappropriate in its relationship with nearby residential dwellings and contrary to parts (ix) and (x) to policy HP6 to the Council's adopted Local Plan, as saved by ministerial direction dated 5 June 2009.
- 3 The proposal would fail to provide satisfactory amenity space for the residential flats proposed in accordance with the Council's standard. If allowed, the future residential occupiers of the building would lack sufficient space for limited outdoor recreation, storage and drying and would prove detrimental to the amenity that those future residential occupiers ought reasonably expect to enjoy.

Application No : 09/00501/ADV Decision : **Refuse Advertisement Consent**

Location : 63 - 65 High Street Rayleigh
 Proposal : Replacement of Existing Signage to Front Elevation with Internally Illuminated Fascia Sign and Internally Illuminated Projecting Sign and New Internally Illuminated Sign to Rear Elevation.

Applicant : Barclays Bank Plc

- 1 The proposed signage is inappropriate for the Rayleigh Conservation Area, by virtue of the materials proposed and the internal illumination, which would be detrimental to public safety and amenity within the Conservation Area and contrary to Policy SAT10.

Application No : 09/00503/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : Botelers Hall Road Rochford
 Proposal : First Floor Pitched Roofed Rear Extension
 Applicant : Mr David Timmins

Application No : 09/00510/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : Public Conveniences Adjacent 34 - 36 High Street Great Wakering
 Proposal : External Alterations, Revising Door and Window Openings and Internal Alterations.
 Applicant : Rochford District Council



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

Application No : 09/00511/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : Site Of 80 West Street Rochford
Proposal : Demolish Front Wall, Convert Existing Building into Four x Three Bedroomed Terraced Houses Incorporating Sloped Roofed Front and Rear Dormer Alterations, Construct Two Storey Building to Front Containing Two x Two Bedroomed Flats and Construct Three Bedroomed House at Rear with Access Road and Parking Areas.
Applicant : G.H.T Properties

Application No : 09/00521/ADV Decision : **Grant Advertisement Consent**
Location : 61 High Street Rayleigh
Proposal : Replacement of Existing Signage, 1 No. Externally Illuminated Fascia Lettering Sign, 1 No. Internally Illuminated ATM Header Panel, 1 No. Vinyl Window Sign and 1 No. Letterbox Coverplate.
Applicant : Abbey National Plc

Application No : 09/00515/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : Botelers Hall Road Rochford
Proposal : Two Storey Pitched Roofed Rear Extension
Applicant : Mr David Timmins

Application No : 09/00524/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 73 London Hill Rayleigh
Proposal : Construct Vehicular Crossover and Hardstanding.
Applicant : Miss Joanne Reynolds

Application No : 09/00518/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 28 Broad Way Hockley
Proposal : Single Storey Flat Roofed Rear Extension
Applicant : Mrs S Marke

Application No : 09/00519/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 6 Rookery Close Rayleigh
Proposal : Convert Existing Attached Garage to Habitable Room With New Raised Flat Roof and Construct Pitched Roofed Front Extension.
Applicant : Mr David Barnes



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

Application No : 09/00526/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 108 Lower Road Hullbridge
Proposal : Construct Detached Pitched Roofed Double Garage.
Applicant : Mr & Mrs Moore

Application No : 09/00520/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**
Location : 23 Cornhill Avenue Hockley
Proposal : Hip to Gable Roof Extension Incorporating Flat Roofed
Dormers to Front and Rear Elevations.
Applicant : Mr And Mrs Brook

- 1 The proposed flat roofed front and rear dormer additions by reason of their size, design position and appearance would result in an intrusive addition out of character and scale with the existing dwelling. Furthermore the resultant appearance would be detrimental to the street scene and contrary to Policy HP6 of the Local Plan (2006).

Application No : 09/00527/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**
Location : Land Opposite The Cottage Arterial Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Demolish Existing Workshop and Rebuild to Existing Floor
Area and Size and Provide New Hardstanding and Parking
Area.
Applicant : Mr Andrew Eden

- 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 PPG2: Green Belts consisting inappropriate development which by definition is harmful to the Green Belt. Furthermore, the new building and the likely pressure to remove, reduce or carry out works to nearby trees and hedge will create a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than currently is the case. 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).



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

Application No : 09/00528/OUT

Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**

Location : Land South Of Coombes Farm Stambridge Road Rochford
Proposal : Development of up to 326 Residential Dwellings,
Associated Accesses and Community Uses.

Applicant : Colonnade Land LLP

- 1 The proposed development of up to 326 residential dwellings and associated community uses 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.
- 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 2: Green Belts, planning permission will not be given for inappropriate development, except in very special circumstances.

The proposed development, by virtue of the proposed change of use of the land from agriculture to residential and community uses, 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 proposed development including the sprawl of a large built up area, the encroachment into the countryside, the loss of an open, attractive landscape close to where people live and the loss of opportunities for outdoor recreation close to an urban area. There is no need to release Green Belt in this location in order to retain an up-to-date supply of deliverable sites for residential development.

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.

- 3 The applicant has failed to submit information that demonstrates that acceptable mitigation can be achieved to prevent adverse impacts by way of increased recreational disturbance to the Crouch and Roach Special Protection Area (SPA) or the Crouch and Roach Estuaries Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The Local Planning Authority cannot therefore ascertain that the proposed development would not adversely affect the integrity of these wildlife sites, contrary to Regulation 48(5) of the Habitats Regulations 1994 and Planning Policy Statement 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation.



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

- 4 The proposed development would result in a change in the use of an area of land that lies within the Public Safety Zone from use for agriculture to use as public open space, which is considered unacceptable because it would result in a significant increase in the use of land by members of the public, especially given the proximity, relationship and association of the public open space within a large new residential development.

Application No : 09/00530/COU Decision : **Grant Planning
Permission (COU)**

Location : The Old Bakehouse Back Lane Rochford
Proposal : Change of Use from Conservative Club (Use Class Sui
Generis) to Indian Restaurant (Use Class A3)
Applicant : Old Bakehouse Enterprises Ltd

Application No : 09/00531/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 1 Avondale Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Construct Conservatory to Side.
Applicant : Mr Gregory

Application No : 09/00532/COU Decision : **Grant Planning
Permission (COU)**

Location : Lubbards Lodge Farm Hullbridge Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Change of Use From Farmshop Coldstore to Use for the
Production of Chocolate, Provide Internal Alterations and
New External Door.
Applicant : Mr Ben Fordham

Application No : 09/00541/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 36 Helena Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Roof Alterations including Changing Hipped Roof to Gable
End. Insert Pitched Roofed Front Dormers and Flat Roofed
Rear Dormer. Single Storey Extension with Part Pitched
Roof and Part Flat Roof, Infill under Front Canopy with
Single Storey Extension. Erect Detached Outbuilding in
Rear Garden.
Applicant : Mr And Mrs B Howard



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

Application No : 09/00534/COU Decision : **Grant Planning
Permission (COU)**
Location : 8 Star Lane Industrial Estate Star Lane Great Wakering
Proposal : Change Of Use From Waste Transfer Site With Ancillary
Office Area (Sui Generis) to Car Storage and Associated
Car Maintenance With Ancillary Office (Sui Generis)
Applicant : Mr Peter Reeve (Incarnation Limited)

Application No : 09/00535/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 1 Beauchamps Cottages Shopland Road Sutton
Proposal : First Floor Side Extension (Revised Application)
Applicant : Mr Richard Wiggins

Application No : 09/00538/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**
Location : Ballards Gore Golf Club Ballards Gore Stambridge
Proposal : Two Storey Front Extension
Applicant : Mr Julian Innell

- 1 The Replacement Rochford Local Plan (2006) shows the site to be within the Metropolitan 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 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 proposal for the extension to this building does not fall into any of the categories defined in PPG 2 as appropriate development within the Green Belt and it is the opinion of the Local Planning Authority that no evidence has been presented to sufficiently justify overriding the strong presumptions against inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The development by virtue of the bulky front extension in design and form is considered to be inappropriate and harmful to the openness and character of the Metropolitan Green Belt. The development is considered to be contrary to PPG 2 and as such constitutes inappropriate development within the Green Belt.

Application No : 09/00540/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 2 Hawkwell Park Drive Hawkwell
Proposal : Variation of Condition No. 4 of Planning Approval
ROC/797/86, to Allow Opening of the Doctors Surgery
Between 07.00-21:00 Monday to Saturday.
Applicant : South East Essex Primary Care Trust



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

Application No : 09/00539/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 67 Havenside Little Wakering Southend-on-Sea
Proposal : Remove Existing Canopy Roof to Front and Construct
Pitched Roofed Porch.
Applicant : Mr Steven Bull

Application No : 09/00543/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 2 Elm Drive Rayleigh
Proposal : Construct Flat Roofed Single Storey Side and Rear
Extension.
Applicant : Susan Alligan

Application No : 09/00544/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 46 Langdon Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Demolish Kitchen and Chimney Stack and Construct Single
Storey Pitched Roofed Rear Extension and Alterations.
Applicant : Miss Amanda Dunn

Application No : 09/00545/ADV Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 59 High Street Rayleigh
Proposal : Remove Existing Fascia Sign and Install 1 No. Non
Illuminated Fascia Sign and 1 No. Non Illuminated
Projecting Sign.
Applicant : New Look

Application No : 09/00546/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 11 Connaught Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Construct Single Storey Pitched Roofed Rear Extension.
Applicant : Mr John Myers

Application No : 09/00547/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 206 London Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Demolish Existing Dwelling and Construct Residential
Development Comprising Ten x Three Bedroomed and
Four x Four Bedroomed Houses in Two and Three Storey
Houses (14 Units in Total), Form New Access, Estate
Road, Garaging and Parking Areas.
Applicant : Mr S. Hatton



Application No : 09/00548/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning Permission**

Location : 6 Malvern Road Hockley
Proposal : Demolish Existing Rear Conservatory and Construct Two Storey Pitched Roofed Rear Extension. Extend Existing Detached Garage to Form Utility Room and Replace Flat Roof to Garage With Pitched Roof.
Applicant : Mr & Mrs R Coulon

- 1 The proposed two storey rear extension by reason of its depth forms a horizontal angle greater than 45° with the neighbouring ground floor window at no.4 Malvern Road. If allowed the resultant height and depth of the extension would give rise to an unacceptable loss of light, outlook and dominance to the rear rooms of no. 4, detrimentally affecting the amenities the occupiers of no. 4 ought reasonably expect to enjoy. The application is considered contrary to Policy HP6 part (ix) of the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006).

Application No : 09/00550/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning Permission**

Location : Treetops Bullwood Approach Hockley
Proposal : Single Storey Pitched Roofed Front Extension to Form Double Garage and Revision to Vehicular Access.
Applicant : Mr Peter Hall

- 1 The proposed development, if allowed, would be visually intrusive to the street scene of the Bullwood Approach/Hillside Road area introducing a bulky built form forward of the established building line occupying almost the whole space between it and the road creating an incongruous feature in an area which otherwise has relatively open frontages.

Application No : 09/00552/LBC Decision : **Grant Listed Building Consent**

Location : 62 - 64 High Street Great Wakering Southend-on-Sea
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 : 09/00554/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 22 Broadlands Avenue Rayleigh
Proposal : Roof Alterations Incorporating Form Gable End Pitched Roofed Front and Rear Dormers and Rooflights to Create Rooms within Roofspace.
Applicant : Miss Marina Van-Roon



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

Application No : 09/00555/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 39 Falcon Close Rayleigh
Proposal : Convert Garage into Habitable Room and Increase
Driveway/Hardstanding.
Applicant : Darren Cossons

Application No : 09/00558/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 75 Glebe Drive Rayleigh
Proposal : Single Storey Pitched Roofed Rear Conservatory and
Construct Decking to Rear
Applicant : Mr And Mrs Macleod

Application No : 09/00562/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**
Location : Greenfields Rosilian Drive Hullbridge
Proposal : Change use of Garage and Make Alterations to Convert to
Residential Dwelling
Applicant : Mr G V Lucy

- 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 R9 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 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 no evidence has been presented to sufficiently justify overriding the strong presumptions against the construction of new dwellings in the Green Belt.

The proposal would fail part (vi) to policy R9 in that the resultant annex type dwelling would further establish an additional household and residential activity on the site that has not been justified in agricultural terms and would give rise to and intensification of the residential use of the site, further urbanising that part of the Green Belt in which the site is situated.



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

The proposal would fail part (vii) to policy R9 in that the applicant has failed to demonstrate a reasonable attempt to secure an alternative business re - use of the building during the last two years prior to the current application.

The proposal would therefore result in the further piecemeal urbanisation of the site detrimental to the open character and appearance of that part of the Metropolitan Green Belt in which the site is situated.

Application No : 09/00563/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 37 Kingswood Crescent Rayleigh
Proposal : Convert Existing Integral Garage to Habitable Room With Bow Window.
Applicant : Mr Michael Hynson

Application No : 09/00565/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : The Anchor 284 Ferry Road Hullbridge
Proposal : Construct Decking Areas and Patio Terracing, New Entrance Porch, Two x Jumbrellas, New Disabled WC, Binstore and Yard, New Windows and Doors, Pitched Roofed Barbeque Structure.
Applicant : C K Property Investments

Application No : 09/00566/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning Permission**
Location : 1 Clifton Road Ashingdon Rochford
Proposal : Demolish Existing Bungalow and Construct 2 No. Detached Four Bedroomed Houses With Integral Garages. Form New Vehicular Crossovers.
Applicant : Mr P Hills

- 1 The proposal by way of the inadequate plot width to the dwelling proposed to plot 'B' and the inadequate space between the 12 buildings would fail to provide a satisfactory frontage width and space between the dwellings proposed. If allowed the development would lack sufficient space about the building to give a satisfactory setting compatible with the modest scale and spacious surroundings to that part of the street in which the site is situated. As such the development would provide a poor relationship to nearby dwellings and cramped appearance in the street contrary to part (ix) to Policy HP 6 to the Council's adopted Local Plan (2006).



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

Application No : 09/00570/PD Decision : **Permitted Development**
Location : London Southend Airport Co Ltd Southend Airport Rochford
Proposal : New Control Tower Building

Applicant : London Southend Airport

Application No : 09/00573/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 75 Richmond Drive Rayleigh
Proposal : Single Storey Pitched Roofed Rear Conservatory
Applicant : Mr Gibbs

Application No : 09/00580/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 203 Eastwood Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Construct Conservatory to Rear
Applicant : Mr And Mrs Dray



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE