

PLANNING DECISIONS January 2011

Application No : 10/00341/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 9 Weir Gardens Rayleigh
Proposal : Hip to Gable Roof Extension to Form Rooms in Roofspace
With Pitched Roofed Front Dormer and Flat Roofed Rear
Dormer.
Applicant : Mr Christopher White

Application No : 10/00436/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 109 Rectory Road Hawkwell
Proposal : Demolish Existing Buildings and Construct Development of
21 Houses and Associated Access, Car Parking, Amenity
Space and Landscaping.
Applicant : Fairview New Homes

Application No : 10/00594/FUL Decision : **Application Withdrawn**
Location : Alp Court Fairfield Great Wakering
Proposal : Replace Existing Aluminium Windows With Double Glazed
PVCu Windows to Flats No. 1 - 25
Applicant : Mr Henry Reeves

Application No : 10/00442/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**
Location : 62 London Hill Rayleigh
Proposal : Conversion Of Existing Bungalow To A Three Storey
House, Incorporating Loft Space, With 5no Velux
Rooflights, and Juliet Balcony to First Floor Rear Elevation.
Applicant : Mr And Mrs Wakeling

Reason(s) for Refusal

- 1 The proposal by way of its height, scale, mass, design and appearance is considered to be detrimental to setting of the semi detached listed buildings at no. 64 and 66 London Hill, contrary to advice contained within PPS5: Planning for the historic environment and to the street scene appearance contrary to parts (vi), (ix) and (x) of Policy HP6 of the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006).

- 2 The proposal by way of its significant depth, height, size and proximity to the shared boundary with no.64 London Hill, taken together with the higher land level of the application site, would result in an overbearing and oppressive development, giving rise to a poor relationship with the adjacent property no. 64 London Hill. In addition it is considered that the resultant property would breach the 45° rule, giving rise to unreasonable over shadowing to the rear garden and rear windows of no. 64 London Hill, detrimental to the amenity of its occupiers. The development is considered contrary to parts (viii) to (x) of Policy HP6 of the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006).

Application No : 10/00624/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 27 Louis Drive East Rayleigh
Proposal : Single Storey Rear Extension
Applicant : Mr L Hook

Application No : 10/00663/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning Permission**
Location : 101 Folly Lane Hockley Essex
Proposal : Demolish Existing Dwelling and Erect 5-bed House With Attached Garage
Applicant : Mr And Mrs Guiver

Reason(s) for Refusal

- 1 The proposal would result in an unacceptable relationship between the proposed dwelling and the neighbouring site of No. 99 Folly Lane by virtue of the height and depth of the proposed dwelling close to the eastern boundary and extending the full depth of the rear garden boundary with No. 99 Folly Lane which would form an overly dominant blank flank wall to this neighbouring property causing harm to the level of amenity that should reasonably be expected by the occupiers of this neighbouring property contrary to part (ix) of Policy HP6 of the Rochford District Replacement Plan (2006).
- 2 The proposal by virtue of the proximity of the proposed rear wall to neighbouring properties in particular No. 6a Silverthorn Close and given the amount of glazing provided by patio doors, some with Juliet balconies at both first and second floor levels in the rear elevation would give rise to an unreasonable degree of potential for overlooking to neighbouring properties which would have a harmful effect on the level of privacy that ought to be reasonably expected by the occupiers of neighbouring properties contrary to parts (viii) and (ix) of Policy HP6 of the Rochford District Replacement Plan (2006).
- 3 The proposal by virtue of the bulk, design and appearance of the proposed dwelling would result in a building which would be overly dominant and appear in stark contrast to surrounding properties in the street to the detriment of the character and appearance of the street scene and harmful to visual amenity contrary to parts (viii),(ix) and (x) of Policy HP6 of the Rochford District Replacement Plan (2006).

Application No : 10/00668/FUL

Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**

Location : 1 Woodlands Road Hockley

Proposal : Demolish Existing Dwelling and Construct Three Storey
Building Containing 8 Flats with Associated Access,
Parking and Amenity Areas

Applicant : Holme Property Maintenance And Development Ltd

Reason(s) for Refusal

- 1 Policy HP 6 of the Local Plan (2006) requires new housing to be of a high standard of design and layout. The proposal is considered to amount to an overdevelopment of the site which does not demonstrate a high standard of design and layout as it fails to provide an adequate level of useable amenity space and car parking provision to meet the required standards, proposes to remove all the existing established trees, particularly to the front of the site which have amenity value and could help integrate the development into the street scene and proposes to site the cycle store in a position which would not be easily accessible, contrary to Policy HP6 of the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006) and the adopted parking standard (2009).
- 2 The proposed building form would include a flat-topped roof section to a predominantly pitched roofed building which would appear incongruent to the overall building form harmful to visual amenity and contrary to part (x) of Policy HP6 of the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006).
- 3 The proposed balcony to the rear elevation of the building would give rise to the potential for direct overlooking of the rear garden of the adjoining residential property which would be harmful to the level of amenity that ought to be reasonably expected by the occupiers of this neighbouring property contrary to part (viii) of Policy HP6 of the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006).
- 4 The proposal does not provide sufficient parking within the site for the proposed development. Two parking spaces are required for dwellings with at least two bedrooms to meet current parking standards plus visitors spaces (0.25 spaces per dwelling). Furthermore the parking spaces are too small to meet the standards contained in the Parking Standards document issued by Essex County Council. The lack of parking spaces together with the size of the spaces may well lead to vehicles being displaced onto the highway to the detriment of other road users and general highway safety.
- 5 The layout of the parking area as shown on planTP-01 will not allow all the spaces to be used individually if the spaces are full. Parking space 4 will be impossible to use if a vehicle is parked in spaces 3 and 5. This may lead to indiscriminate parking taking place within the site and vehicles being displaced onto the highway to the detriment of other road users and general highway safety.

Application No : 10/00676/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : Site Of 8 And 10 Weir Gardens Rayleigh
Proposal : Variation of Condition 10 of 07/00976/FUL to achieve the re-siting of the bin store, involving change to parking layout, position of cycle store and amenity areas. Altered condition to read; "The building shall not be occupied until the car parking area has been constructed and laid out in accordance with drawing reference 09.548 PC.01A, including marked out parking bays. The car park shall be retained thereafter in this form and not used for any purpose other than the parking and turning of vehicles."
Applicant : Sovereign Country Homes

Application No : 10/00679/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 180 Ashingdon Road Rochford
Proposal : Porch to Front
Applicant : Mr A Cording

Application No : 10/00682/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning Permission**
Location : 314 Eastwood Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Demolish Existing Bungalow and Construct Detached Four Bedroomed House With Integral Garage
Applicant : Hilton Homes Ltd

Reason(s) for Refusal

- 1 The proposal, by virtue of the scale, form and siting of the proposed dwelling, would result in a building that would be overly dominant and appear in stark contrast to the neighbouring properties in the street scene, in particular to No. 316 Eastwood Road, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the street scene and harmful to visual amenity, contrary to parts (viii) and (x) of Policy HP6 of the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006).
- 2 The proposal, by virtue of the scale, form and siting of the proposed dwelling would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the occupiers of No. 316 Eastwood Road by way of being overbearing and causing an unacceptable degree of overshadowing, which would be harmful to the level of amenity that ought reasonably be expected by the occupiers of this neighbouring property, contrary to parts (ix) and (x) of Policy HP6 and the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006).

Application No : 10/00690/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 43 Daws Heath Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Single Storey Rear Extension
Applicant : Mr & Mrs R Fautley

Application No : 10/00692/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning Permission**
Location : Nine Acres Farm Flemings Farm Road Eastwood
Proposal : Construct Fishing Lake to Rear of Property.
Applicant : Mrs Janice Francis

Reason(s) for Refusal

- 1 The proposal, by way of the size of the fishing lake proposed and the nature of the availability for anglers at any time, would give rise to noise and disturbance arising from unloading and loading of fishing equipment and traffic arriving and departing, particularly during the late night and early morning proving detrimental to the amenity of occupiers of nearby residential properties that ought reasonably be expected to be enjoyed by those residents and contrary to Policy LT 21 to the Council's saved Local Plan (2006).
- 2 In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority insufficient information has been provided with regard to the nature of the construction of the lake, the formation of raised banking in relation to natural ground level, the source of the water fill and management of water overflow and as such may give rise to environmental effects upon the drainage of surrounding land arising from such a large lake being constructed on sloping ground that already experiences water saturation. Furthermore, the proposal, by way of the height of the mounding and banking proposed, would amount to inappropriate development detrimental to the open character and appearance of the Metropolitan Green Belt.

Application No : 10/00693/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 34 Bull Lane Rayleigh
Proposal : Demolish Existing Bungalow and Detached Garage and Erect 4-bed House With Attached Garage
Applicant : Mr And Mrs H Lockhart

Application No : 10/00696/ADV Decision : **Refuse Advertisement Consent**
Location : Flank Wall At 1 West Street Back Lane Rochford
Proposal : One Non-illuminated Sign Board 610mm x 500mm Fixed to Wall
Applicant : Mr B Uddin

Reason(s) for Refusal

- 1 The proposed advertisement is considered detrimental to the amenity, character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the listed building to which it attaches. The sign neither enhances nor preserves the character and appearance of the listed building or the Conservation Area presenting a distinctly non traditional and incongruous appearance. The advertisement is considered to be unnecessary clutter and to have a poor relationship with the listed building to which it attaches, resulting in an inappropriate and intrusive signage to this building and the surrounding Conservation Area. The advertisement is considered contrary to Policy SAT9, SAT10 and SAT11 of the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006).

Application No : 10/00699/LDC

Decision : **Refuse Lawful
Development
Certificate**

Location : Holly Lodge Hall Road Rochford

Proposal : Application for Certificate Of Lawfulness for Construction of
Two Storey Rear Extension

Applicant : Mr Maurice Drage

Reason(s) for Refusal

- 1 The proposed development would NOT be permitted development under Class A, B, C, D or E, or under any other Class within Part 1 to Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended) by virtue of the proposed first floor extension would have a depth in excess of 3m contrary to part (e)(i) and an eaves height in excess of 3m within 2m of the boundary contrary to part (f).

Application No : 10/00701/FUL

Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 11 Central Avenue Rochford

Proposal : Single Storey Rear Extension

Applicant : Mr Clive Wells

Application No : 10/00703/ADV

Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 1 Spa Road Hockley

Proposal : Non-Illuminated Canopy Sign

Applicant : Mrs Roseanne Strong (Strong Bakery Ltd)

Application No : 10/00705/FUL

Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 27 Tillingham Way Rayleigh

Proposal : Replace Existing Glass Porch With a Brick Construction.
Creat Bay Window by Extending Porch Roof Along the
Width of the Property

Applicant : Mr Mark Catmore

Application No : 10/00709/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 20 Eastview Drive Rayleigh
Proposal : Erect Two Storey Side Extension
Applicant : Mr Matthew Lyon

Application No : 10/00713/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning Permission**
Location : Car Park At Junction Of Old Ship Lane East Street Rochford
Proposal : Demolish Existing Garage and Construct Two Storey Building Comprising Five One Bedroomed Flats With Associated Parking Spaces
Applicant : Bryce Meadows - Mr I Bryce

Reason(s) for Refusal

- 1 The proposal would fail to provide any private amenity space for the future users of the development contrary to part (v) of Policy HP 6 to the Council's saved Local Plan (2006). As such, there would be no space available to residents of the development for limited outside storage, recreation and gardening and this would prove detrimental to the reasonable amenity that ought to be expected by future occupiers of the development.
- 2 The development would fail to provide satisfactory off street car parking in accordance with the Council's recently adopted standards and preferred car parking space size of 5.5m in depth and 2.9 in width. The layout would achieve 6 spaces of a width of only 2.6m and as such would not equate to at least one space per flat being provided with adequate visitor space and would thus result in on street parking to the detriment of the free flow of traffic and the visual amenity of the area more generally.
- 3 The proposal, by way of developing the car park to the existing public house, would cause the loss of available car parking to the residential flat above the pub and car parking for customers of the premises and would thus result in increased on street car parking to the detriment of the free flow of traffic and the visual amenity of the area more generally.
- 4 The proposal, by way of the close proximity of the development to adjoining residential dwellings at No.11 East Street and Kings Hill Cottage, Old Ship Lane, would give rise to unreasonable overlooking and consequent loss of privacy to occupiers of those properties detrimental to the amenity that those occupiers enjoy.
- 5 The proposal, by way of its overall scale and form of development occupying almost the full extent of the site, would result in a loss of the existing open area of the site, which is a valuable open space within the fabric of Rochford town centre. The loss of such open spaces in the town centre is out of keeping with and detrimental to the composition of the spaces, form and buildings that go to make up the fabric of the town centre, its character and appearance.

- 6 The proposal, by way of the two storey height, bulk and mass occupying almost the full extent of the site, would cause the loss of direct sunlight and increased overshadowing to residential dwellings at No.11 East Street and Kings Hill Cottage, Old Ship Lane detrimental to the amenity that those occupiers ought reasonably expect to enjoy.
- 7 The proposal, by way of the extent of site coverage of the building and courtyard contained within the application site, does not demonstrate that disabled access to the adjoining public house would be maintained, which, if this proves to be the case, would be detrimental to the disabled access to the public house building adjoining the site.
- 8 The proposal, by way of the appearance, extensive site coverage and overall form of the building, would look out of place and out of character with the area detrimental to visual amenity, given the modest domestic scale that otherwise predominates on the northern side of East Street and the openness of the site.

Application No : 10/00717/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
 Location : 62 London Hill Rayleigh
 Proposal : Construction of Summer House in Rear Garden
 (Retrospective).
 Applicant : Mr And Mrs Wakeling

Application No : 10/00719/FUL Decision : **Application Withdrawn**
 Location : Land North Of 36 High Road Rayleigh
 Proposal : Demolish Existing Garage And Construct 2 No. Semi
 Detached Two Bedroomed Houses With Access From
 Between 19 - 17 Ridgeway.
 Applicant : Autosecond Ltd

Application No : 10/00720/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
 Location : 21 Rawreth Lane Rayleigh
 Proposal : Construct Vehicular Crossover and Block Paved Area to
 Front
 Applicant : Mr H. R. Croucher

Application No : 10/00726/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
 Location : 77 The Drive Hullbridge
 Proposal : Re-roof to Provide Rooms in Roof With Velux Windows to
 Front and Rear and Construct Single Storey Rear
 Extension with Roof Lantern and Two Storey Front
 extension and single storey Side Extensions
 Applicant : Mr And Mrs Kelynack

Application No : 10/00727/ADV Decision : **Grant Advertisement Consent**

Location : Retail Unit 74 - 78 West Street Rochford
Proposal : Two Externally Illuminated Hanging Signs and Three Externally Illuminated Fascia Signs
Applicant : Sainsbury's Supermarkets Limited

Application No : 10/00729/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning Permission**

Location : 6 Mount Avenue Hockley
Proposal : Demolish Existing Dwelling and Erect Two Detached 4-bed Dwellings with Integral Garages (Amended Design)
Applicant : S P Cottrell Ltd

Reason(s) for Refusal

- 1 The proposal by way of the design, bulk, mass and depth of the proposed properties is considered to result in an unattractive, poorly designed form, detrimentally affecting the visual amenity afforded to the street scene, contrary to parts (ix) & (x) of Policy HP6 of the Local Plan. If allowed the development would result in a scheme of undesirable appearance, which is overly dominant and intrusive within the context of the street, to the detriment of visual amenity, character and appearance of the street.

Application No : 10/00707/LBC Decision : **Application Withdrawn**
Location : Gardiners Farm Gardiners Lane Canewdon
Proposal : Provide Feather Edge Cladding, New Windows, Substitute Doors For Windows And Alterations To Annex Building
Applicant : Mr And Mrs Churn

Application No : 10/00731/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 50 Kimberley Road Little Wakering Southend-on-Sea
Proposal : Timber Framed Pitched Roofed Games Room in Rear Garden (Retrospective)
Applicant : Mr And Mrs Parks

Application No : 10/00732/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 76 Warwick Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Two Storey Side Extension and First Floor Rear Extension
Applicant : Miss K Levy

Application No : 10/00733/LDC Decision : **Refuse Lawful Development Certificate**

Location : 3 Tudor Mews Eastwood

Proposal : Lawful Development Certificate Application for Proposed Single Storey Rear Extension

Applicant : Mr And Mrs C Parker

Reason(s) for Refusal

- 1 The proposal would fall contrary to parts (e)(ii) and (i)(i) of Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (GPDO), as amended by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (England) Order 2008 as the proposed extension would have a height which would exceed the maximum height permitted of 4 metres and as the proposal would include a ramp which would exceed a maximum height of 300mm.

Application No : 10/00734/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 3 Uplands Park Road Rayleigh

Proposal : Rear And Side Extension To Bungalow, Attached Garage, Change Hip End To Existing Roof To Gable Ends And Provide Rooms In Roof With Dormer To Rear Elevation

Applicant : Mr And Mrs D J Sperring (J R Reid Construction)

Application No : 10/00736/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 23 Temple Way Rayleigh

Proposal : Single Storey Mono-pitch Rear Extension with Two Rooflights

Applicant : Mr Neil Maynard

Application No : 10/00738/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**

Location : 24 South View Close Rayleigh

Proposal : Two Storey Side Extension (Rebuild Existing Attached Garage)

Applicant : Mr Steve Chase

Application No : 10/00739/LDC Decision : **Grant Lawful Development Certificate**

Location : Ashingdon Ward Rochford Hospital Union Lane

Proposal : Application for a Certificate of Lawfulness For Use Of Ashingdon Ward As Mental Health Administration Office Space

Applicant : South Essex Partnership NHS Trust

Application No : 10/00742/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 44 Stambridge Road Rochford
Proposal : Construct Vehicular Crossover
Applicant :

Application No : 10/00743/FUL Decision : **Application Withdrawn**
Location : 47 High Road Hockley
Proposal : Construct Vehicular Crossover to 47 And 47A High Road
Applicant : Mr Russell Clark-Smith

Application No : 10/00744/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 13 Sir Walter Raleigh Drive Rayleigh
Proposal : Construct Single Storey Flat Roofed Side Extension With
Paved Area to Front
Applicant : Chelmsford Diocesan Board Of Finance

Application No : 10/00745/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : Ashingdon Ward Rochford Hospital Union Lane
Proposal : Install "Windcatcher" Passive Air Ventilation and Cooling
Ducts to Roof Slopes of Existing Building
Applicant : South Essex Partnership NHS Trust

Application No : 10/00746/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**
Location : 23 Albany Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Construct Two Storey Part Pitched Roofed, Part Flat
Roofed Side/Rear Extension and Pitched Roofed Front
Dormer
Applicant : Mrs Sally Benjamin

Reason(s) for Refusal

- 1 The proposed flat roofed rear dormer would by reason of its size and design result in an intrusive and disproportionate addition which would be out of character and scale with the existing dwelling to the detriment of the character and appearance of the dwelling and harmful to visual amenity, contrary to Policy HP6 of the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006).

Application No : 10/00748/COU Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**
Location : 239 - 243 Eastwood Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Part Change of Use From Car Showroom (Including
Ancillary Retail Space) to A1 Use Including the Provision
for 8 no. Customer Car Parking Spaces
Applicant : Geoff Bray (Rayleigh) Ltd

Reason(s) for Refusal

- 1 The proposal cannot accommodate the required number of parking spaces at the preferred bay size for the development as recommended in the parking standards document issued by Essex County Council as Supplementary Planning Guidance in September 2009, Parking Standards, Design and Good Practice. The lack of adequate parking provision may lead to short term parking taking place within Eastwood Road on the footway or in The Chase to the detriment of pedestrian and general highway safety.

Application No : 10/00749/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 18 Gayleighs Rayleigh
Proposal : Demolish Existing Rear Extension. Construct Two Storey and Single Storey Rear Extensions, Convert Integral Garage to Living Accommodation, Construct Decking and Balustrade to Rear and Realign Front Steps to Accommodate New Drive
Applicant : Mr Gary Parsons

Application No : 10/00750/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 41 Hullbridge Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Construct Rear Conservatory Extension
Applicant : Mr And Mrs Bishop

Application No : 10/00751/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 20 Willow Walk Hockley
Proposal : Construct Rear Conservatory Extension
Applicant : Mr And Mrs Boston

Application No : 10/00752/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : Land Rear Of 148 And 150 Eastwood Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Construction of Two Storey Dwellinghouse To Rear Of 148 And 150 Eastwood Road
Applicant : Mr M Withrington

Application No : 10/00754/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 30 Lee Lotts Great Wakering
Proposal : Construct Single Storey Front Extension
Applicant : Mrs Christine Giles

Application No : 10/00755/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 63 Sutton Court Drive Rochford
Proposal : Demolish Existing Single Storey Rear Extension and Construct Single Storey Rear Extension
Applicant : Mr And Mrs Searles

Application No : 10/00756/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 56 Cheapside West Rayleigh
Proposal : Construct One and Two Storey Rear and Side Extension
Incorporating First Floor Element Over Existing Garage
Applicant : Mr And Mrs S And L Rich

Application No : 10/00757/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 90 Daws Heath Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Demolish Existing Detached Garage and Construct Single
Storey Rear Extension and Two Storey Side Extension
Incorporating Garage. Construct Room in Roof With
Pitched Roof Rear Dormer and Velux Windows to Front
Applicant : Mr T Wagstaff

Application No : 10/00758/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 162 Grove Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Single Storey Front Extension and Form Disabled Ramped
Access to Front of Property
Applicant : Mr M Wellard

Application No : 10/00759/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 8 Victor Gardens Hockley
Proposal : Demolition of Existing Bungalow and Construction of 2 no.
Detached Houses
Applicant : Mr Gibbs-Jones

Application No : 10/00760/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 109 Burnham Road Hullbridge
Proposal : Single Storey Pitched Roofed Side Extension to Provide
Garage, Loft Conversion Incorporating Flat Roofed
Dormers to Front and Rear.
Applicant : Ms M Caten

Application No : 10/00741/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**
Location : 7 Orchard Avenue Rayleigh
Proposal : Side Extension To Existing Detached Dwelling
Applicant : Mr And Mrs S Thompson

Reason(s) for Refusal

- 1 The proposed development fails to provide a satisfactory side isolation space between the resultant building and the site boundary at first floor level. The proposal conflicts with policy HP6 of the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006) and the Council's supplementary Planning Guidance (2007) which seek to provide a minimum sidespace of 1m between the outside face of the resultant dwelling and the plot boundary at first floor level to prevent the coalescence, or future coalescence of dwellings at first floor level. If permitted the proposal would erode the space about the building extending the built form to the full extent of the width of the site, visually detrimental to the character and appearance of the site and the street scene more generally and creating an unacceptable relationship with No 2 Elizabeth Avenue.

Application No : 10/00762/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 86 Eastwood Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Revised Application to Demolish Existing Garage and Erect Two Storey Side Extension With Pitched Roofed Front Dormer and Pitched Roofed Side Dormer in Existing Roof facing no.84 Eastwood Road.
Applicant : Mr T Regan

Application No : 10/00764/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 43 Hullbridge Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Demolish Existing Bungalow and Construct Detached Four Bedroomed Chalet Bungalow
Applicant : Mrs Sam Foreman

Application No : 10/00767/LDC Decision : **Refuse Lawful Development Certificate**
Location : 17 Grove Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Application For A Lawful Development Certificate for Proposed Single Storey Rear Extension
Applicant : Mr And Mrs Peralta

Reason(s) for Refusal

- 1 The proposed development would NOT be permitted development under Class A or under any other Class within Part 1 to Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended) by virtue of the height of the proposed extension being in excess of 4 metres

Application No : 10/00769/NMA Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 553 Ashingdon Road Ashingdon Rochford
Proposal : Application for a Non-Material Amendment to Existing
Permission for Detached Pitched Roofed Garage to Front,
Granted on 12th August 2009 Under Application Reference
09/00339/FUL and to Change Roof Pitch to 40 Degrees
and Increase Overall Height of Walls to 2.6m High and
Height of Roof Ridge to 5.1m High.
Applicant : Mr Stuart Rolph

Application No : 10/00770/FUL Decision : **Refuse Planning
Permission**
Location : Junatison Barrow Hall Road Little Wakering
Proposal : Contruction of Stable Block Comprising of 3 Stables,
Store/Tack Room and Fenced Yard
Applicant : Mrs S Dickenson

Reason(s) for Refusal

- 1 The proposed stable block would fall contrary to parts i) and iii) of policy LT14 of the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan 2006. This is because insufficient land is available within the curtilage of the site to allow for the proper care of three horses in accordance with the British Horse Society Standards and the proposal is also not well related to existing bridleways and therefore may have an adverse effect upon the highway safety of the area. Allowing such a proposal could lead to the proliferation of stable blocks within residential gardens across the district to be constructed with similarly insufficient land available and not well related to existing bridleways which could collectively have an even greater adverse effect upon highway safety.

Application No : 10/00771/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 28 Western Road Rayleigh
Proposal : Extend Front Porch and Construct Link Extension Between
28 and 28A
Applicant : Miss Johanna Stephens

Application No : 10/00775/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 34 Great Eastern Road Hockley
Proposal : Single Storey Pitched Roof Side Extension and Flat Roofed
Single Storey Side Extension
Applicant : Mr G Rayment

Application No : 10/00773/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 3 Magna Mead Barling Road Barling Magna
Proposal : Convert Existing Detached Double Garage Into One
Bedroomed Annexe
Applicant : Miss K McKillop

Application No : 10/00777/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 79 Weir Gardens Rayleigh
Proposal : Construct Pitched Roofed Front Dormer
Applicant : Mr And Mrs Fitzgerald

Application No : 10/00780/LDC Decision : **Grant Lawful
Development
Certificate**
Location : Brook Lodge Church Road Rawreth
Proposal : Application for a Certificate of Lawfulness for Proposed
Single Storey Side Extension
Applicant : Mr D Ley

Application No : 10/00781/LDC Decision : **Grant Lawful
Development
Certificate**
Location : Brook Lodge Church Road Rawreth
Proposal : Application for a Certificate of Lawfulness for Proposed
Roof Alterations to Comprise Formation of Gable End and
Flat Roofed Rear Dormer
Applicant : Mr D Ley

Application No : 10/00782/FUL Decision : **Application Permitted**
Location : 6 Humber Close Rayleigh
Proposal : Proposed Access For The Disabled - Concrete Ramp With
Steel Handrails
Applicant : Mrs Norman