

**18/00135/REM**

**LAND BETWEEN WINDERMERE AVENUE, MALYONS  
LANE AND LOWER ROAD, HULLBRIDGE.**

**Contents**

1. Hullbridge Parish Council
2. Hullbridge Residents Association
3. British Horse Society.
4. Rawreth Flood Action Group
5. Further Neighbour Representations

**1. Hullbridge Parish Council**

Confirm that Members are supportive of the proposed design and layout of the development and are pleased that the issues that we have raised at our meetings have been taken on board and incorporated in the revised and enhanced designs. We are pleased to note that the recreation space is of a size that can site a full size Muga court and other associated facilities which will be part of the Section 106 youth facility.

The only observation which hasn't been included and that we have raised previously is for an outer footpath in the top left hand corner of the development so this open space is fully utilised, even if this is a more rustic footpath i.e. made from cockle shell.

This development provides housing for all needs with three main type housing areas (Parkland Quarter, Village Core and Northern Quarter) and we understand meets the space standards criteria also has a number of green spaces, buffers.

In the future to promote cohesion of this development with the existing village we feel a boundary review would need to be done to include the whole site within Hullbridge as currently this is split with Rawreth Parish.

**2. Hullbridge Residents Association**

**Three further letters have been received from the Hullbridge Residents Association and which make the following comments and objections.**

**First Letter dated 30 December 2018**

Concern regarding division of development between parishes

We can understand the reasons why you preferred to ignore the boundary line. This would have been a hindrance to building the requisite 500 homes. If you care to look at our correspondence which you actually commended us for (our mathematics) that the land is divided by 30.5% and 69.5% for Rawreth and Hullbridge respectively, and the distribution for housing (on a 2-storey basis) meant that there was only sufficient land to build 332 homes overall. Given this line of thought we now know that the boundary line was ignored to allow a congested 500 home development.

**Second Letter dated 30 December 2018**

Objections also include issues relating to (A) Non compliance to NDSS. (B) Lack of strong identifiable character areas and other “design concerns”.

We are surprisingly concerned that hardly any changes had taken place from the previous submission.

We are of the opinion that there are some hasty decisions being made for the sake of approving the plans to allow commencement of the development, but without considering the consequences later.

If the houses are now larger to satisfy national space standards, the external space is smaller, thus not complying with the amenity space requirements.

The garden space allocation for houses should meet the minimum requirements and especially the minimum 25m<sup>2</sup> for each flat, but HRA study indicates that between 12 m<sup>2</sup> to 20 m<sup>2</sup> only have been shown. We do not understand why there is no change, perhaps overlooked in haste.

BDW plans show 3 and 2.5 storey buildings will be built. HRA have always said that more than 2-storey buildings would be out of keeping with existing village standards. Why has this issue been ignored?

HRA state that the present density for development per hectare is approximately 15 No. 2 storey homes.

HRA analysis shows that 39% of the development land has been allocated to 2.5 to 3.0 storey buildings, therefore to achieve a development of 500 homes RDC has allowed increased density.

Our opinion of the ultimate outlook for this development is ‘over development’ and ‘congestion,’ as stated in our previous submissions to you.

---

**Balconies.** HRA scrutiny advises RDC and BDW to review the flat plans with balconies as some overlook other dwellings. No change has been submitted.

**Roads.** HRA observed that the road widths do not comply with the highway standards. If not changed beware future consequences in traffic movements. No changes have been submitted

**15 Bungalows.** HRA submit that the Core Strategy and Land development Framework insistent on 15 bungalows with disability access has not been provided so why have standards been reduced? No change introduced.

HRA believe the over-use of standard house types is not acceptable. These designs have been used by Barratts in many developments across the country. A 'distinct', identifiable character, especially across the 3 identifiable areas, should be treated specially and offer the opportunity for an array of built forms and materials.

**Third Letter dated 7 January 2019**

We protest that our last letter dated 30 December 2018 raising important issues such as Non compliance to NDSS, Lack of strong identifiable character areas and compliance with amenity areas are not being observed.

The garden space allocation for some houses do not meet the minimum requirements, especially the 25m<sup>2</sup> for each flat.

Erection of 3 and 2.5 storey buildings are "out of keeping with existing standards" are being ignored, forcing a congested and over-developed village, in direct opposition to the CS and LDDF guidance.

Other issues ignored are: Existing Telecom Masts, Balcony overlooking issues. Road widths (which will have future consequences in traffic movements). 5 Bungalows instead of 15 Bungalows. Boundary Line ignored. Over-use of Standard House Types (designs have been used by Barratts in many developments). The developer stated in his latest "Design and Access Statement" that "at first glance it may appear that there is no difference to the site layout, because the overall layout still conforms to the Outline Master Plan, which is one of the reasons the original REM was recommended for refusal. . The contravening 45-degree rule in several cases has not been mentioned in your report. Some of the amenity areas are still below standard and ignored

We are of the opinion that that there are some hasty decisions being made for the sake of a swift approval of these plans and ignoring the consequences mentioned above.

---

**Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)**

Concerns over lack of consultation and lack of weight given to Hullbridge Residents Association views - just 17 letters give a poor reflection of the feelings of the village whereas some 43 neighbour contributions have each given several objections, including HRA who represent 98% of the community have been submitted but ignored. Please rectify this to show a true reflection of our concerns, because the officer's report gives the impression of only a small percentage of respondents.

We regret that we have not had any further consultation with Barratts, nor with BDW.

**3. British Horse society**

If Members are minded to approve the application to remove the condition to provide a bridleway, we ask that consideration is given to provide on-road access through the new estate linking Lower Road with Windermere Avenue and/or the other adjoining local roads.

We therefore request that, if application 18/00124/FUL is approved, access for equestrians is enabled at Malyons Lane, Harrison Gardens and Windermere Avenue as part of any permission granted to this application. We feel that this will be an acceptable compromise if no dedicated route for equestrians is provided and will go some way to ensuring that vulnerable road users can access the public rights of way network rather than using Lower Road.

The removal of the bridleway condition was, in our opinion, a great loss, and the 'safety' reasons given at the Committee meeting where it was determined were irrelevant and yet again equestrians have been discriminated against despite they are probably the most vulnerable road users of all. .

As the bridleway has been removed, that access is enabled at the northernmost point of the estate (currently showing foot access only at present) so that all users can benefit. No doubt you are aware that there is a very large 'horse population' in the surrounding area and safe links are of the utmost importance to equestrians, despite the routes now being urbanised they will most definitely be well used - and the Council would be wise to ensure that these links are available for all to use.

**4. Rawreth Flood Action Group**

Concern at the intolerable threat of more localised surface water flooding. Have met with the applicants to discuss common law flooding issues. Hullbridge and Rawreth have no surface water management plan and under the Surface Water Management Act this does not comply with the legal requirements. It is a legal requirement and no such document exists.

The SUDs drainage systems will cease to operate under flood conditions and both Hullbridge and Rawreth will be affected by Tidal Locking requiring all flood waters to be held back until the ebbing tide levels allow discharge. The excessive inclement weather of August 2013 proved this. Rochford District Council is in breach of their

---

terms and conditions and ignoring legislation approved by the Government and common law and case law from the High Courts.

The Committee should consider the serious consequences of this inappropriate development.

## **5. Further Neighbour Representations**

23 further letters have been received from the following addresses:

Ambleside Gardens: 23.  
Burnham Road: 113 (2 letters).  
Creek View Avenue: 8.  
Crouch View Grove: 17.  
Elm Grove :7, 20.  
Ferry Road: 164  
Grasmere Avenue: 17, 106 (2 letters).  
Harrison Gardens: 5, 18.  
Lower Road: 105.  
Monksford Drive:10.  
Sunshine Close: 5.  
The Priors; 7 (2 letters).  
The Promenade: "Ambleside"  
Windermere Avenue: 51, 56.

and two unaddressed letters

and which in the main make the following comments and objections in addition to those set out in the report and above:

- Concerns over lack of consultation and lack of weight given to Hullbridge Residents Association views.
- Little material change to the revised Design Access Statement.
- 5 bungalows are still only indicated which does not conform to your own LDDF and Core Strategy, which calls for a minimum of 15 bungalows with full wheelchair accessibility standards, together with a Lifetime Homes housing statement.
- Several matters that were brought up at the previous Council planning meeting have not been resolved, which are the incorporation of youth facilities into the retained farm house and out buildings as the majority of these has now been demolished by the developer, the acceptability of three storey buildings in Hullbridge with flat roof dormer designs, clarification of how the flood management will work, the lack of amenity areas/drying areas for the proposed flats.

- 
- It has also been rumoured that the developers have stated that they propose to commence the construction of the proposed roundabout at the junction with Rawreth Lane earlier than originally anticipated only if this revised Reserved Matter Application is approved.
  - Understand that portions of the development have been sold /given over to other developers/Councils. In particular, Lewisham Council and that they are allocating a large number of properties to residents /homeless of Lewisham. Is this true? And what if the residents of Rochford District Council and local Councils. Are they not being given priority? How is this right?
  - The blocks of flats in the north/core village section need to be moved. They stand out and are not in keeping with surrounding properties. I understand that they have balconies and this will mean that the residents will be able to look in both neighbouring gardens and those of existing properties. They are on the highest ground in Hullbridge and are three storeys high. Both the blocks numbered 369-377 and 396-404 need to be moved to the far western side of the Core Village. Why are these blocks being built here? They are very unusual for this area and this will set a precedent. Visitors to the village will see these buildings as they enter Hullbridge. They will be a blight on the landscape and will block the views of both existing residents and new residents across this valley type area.
  - High density housing will create excess flooding. Ponds and ditches will breed mosquitoes.
  - Furthermore, these blocks surround a park area. What steps are being made to ensure that this will be only used as pedestrian access only? What will stop motor vehicles and particularly mopeds/motor cycles cutting through this park?
  - At the junction of Elm Grove and Malyons Lane, what measures are being made to stop this being a rat run? Will bollards be placed to stop prevent this at various locations on the site?
  - There seems to be a number of large soak away drainage ponds. How safe are these? How effective are they? There are huge problems with flooding at times of heavy rain and I can only see that these will exacerbate this problem. What happened to the Super Tank drainage that was initially proposed? Was this too expensive?
  - Am objecting to the planning application despite amendments on the following counts: loss of privacy/overlooking, loss of view, over development, poor design, protection of wildlife, parking, traffic generation/access.
  - Objection to footpath leading to Harrison Gardens as this would inevitably lead to parking along this small road which has a number of elderly residents including those with dementia. It would also lead to potential noise and disturbance along this quiet street which is undesirable.

- 
- Parking issues: although there have been a few revisions to parking, there is still insufficient available and it is untenable for current residents to have car parked along their roads. It is still contravening visual impact as required by Essex Design Guide.
  - There also needs to be sufficient room for emergency vehicles to access roads.
  - Flat roof dormers: these should not be part of the planned development especially as BDW stated there would be none.
  - Overdevelopment - already in a very built-up area which has no infrastructure.
  - Devastating effect of 'traffic lights' and inclement weather on traffic through Watery Lane, Lower Road and centre of Hullbridge during the construction period. Loss of earnings to self employed people in particular who cannot get to their destinations. Additional traffic on already saturated roads together with proposed developments at Rayleigh will caused huge problems.
  - How will residents' properties be safeguarded over the next 5/6 years as there are a significant number directly affected and whole village indirectly affected by construction?
  - 4.5 m entrance to Malyons Farm not fit for access to new site as any feeder road needs to be at least 5.5m wide.
  - Hullbridge has very few amenities and will not be able to cope with 500 new homes – over development again.
  - Outcome of a drainage/flood assessment?
  - Object to the latest changes on the plans as they are minimal to requirements that led to referral.
  - The proposed style of windows are not to the required size to provide means to escape fire.
  - Existing foul water sewer size is not big enough should be 6m wide easement.
  - Garages are not required size.
  - Let's hope the people you have employed know what they are doing regarding the land as its all clay and to build on that would affect the land around it. Having spoken to a Senior QS he has told me that land will not be able to hold what you have planned. Just the water drainage alone.
  - The re-submission has not resolved any of the issues presented to the planning meeting by our HRA or Council officials, when planning was not approved.



- 
- There is insufficient parking and road access. The impact on 40% of residents without surface water drainage has not been addressed.
  - The overlooking/lights from bedroom windows will make people plant tall bushes etc. for the sake of privacy/ noise/headlights of cars/lights from neighbouring homes.
  - 999 vehicles will find the "maze" leads to annoying "dead ends" - when time is vital, especially at night. All street furniture will make access for mobility scooter users a problem (as there will be a need to light/sign all the dark areas, including alley ways.) How will the traffic be controlled to avoid "right of way" problems as small roadways filter into one main exit, especially at rush hours?
  - Malyons Lane has restricted access and should not be considered a main access to and from the site, the main point of access if any should be from Lower Road / Watery Lane.
  - Using attenuators appears to be a cheap and unsatisfactory alternative for the disposal of vast quantities of surface water exacerbated by a high water table.
  - No mention of the specification of boundary partitions and dimensions between existing properties and building site.
  - Most importantly of all safety, as these ditches have pathways and open spaces nearby. Water is a great attraction for the young and appear not to be fenced.
  - I would like to raise my concerns regarding: - the Twelve(12) Swale's surrounding the proposed 500 Unit Development, Groundwork Construction, Design Details and Dimensions relating to: - Child safety aspects and the linkage or otherwise of the twelve(12) Swales to each other and/or their separate routes either to each other and final distribution into the main watercourse and drainage systems, which are not apparent on their current overall plan.
  - In particular to their relationship with Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs). That they not only meet the immediate developments drainage needs for this particular project in relation to flooding and surface water drainage, but will also deliver benefits for amenity, biodiversity, air and water quality to the community. For example: - The addition of 'Arborflow SuDs tree pit systems'. And taking into account Climate Change/Adaptation and Sustainable Water Management in general, without adversely impacting on the existing village infrastructure systems. On this point, I am aware certain information has been presented and approved by Anglia Water in relation to this development. However, I believe any prior concerns are better addressed now, rather than a need for them to be retro-fitted at a later date. Therefore my need to comment and I would like to refer Barrett David Wilson Homes(BDWH) to compliance with Sponge2020 recommendations.
  - 2.5 storey housing has been proposed within the 'low' density approved areas not in compliance with the outline planning consent. Although the applicant has made adjustments to the plot arrangements within this area, there has been no



---

consideration to the massing of the buildings and their direct outlook into the rear of 16/18 Harrison Gardens.

- As noted previously almost all boundaries to the development are provided with a landscape buffer area. Plots 477, 478, 479, 480 and 480 are placed against the boundary of the properties with the smallest depth gardens and lowest pitched roofs. As indicated on the plan above, facing elevations are over 50 metres apart to nearly all boundaries with green space and landscaping between. Plot 386 on the plan above has 54 meters and a landscaped buffer between 90' angled buildings. This has not been applied through the site. When looking at the development as a whole large landscaped buffer zones have been provided to the entrance and southern proportion of the development which abut the existing dwellings. Little care and consideration has been given to the existing houses at the rear (northern) proportion of the development. It could be considered as these properties are away from the highway less care is given as they could be considered out of site and less important. When in fact these properties are most affected by the development due to their smaller garden depths and lower ridge heights. This particular proportion of the development has little to no landscaping and buffer zones when compared to all other boundaries.
- Plot 479 gives rise to overlooking and unreasonable loss of privacy to 18 and 20 Harrison Gardens. This property needs to have the second floor habitable room removed to mitigate against this intrusion and comply with adopted policy.