

ITEM 6

18/01129/REM

Land West of Little Wakering Road and South of Barrow Hall Road, Little Wakering

1. Local Resident Responses

Since the officer recommendation was finalised comments have been received from the following addresses which should be taken into consideration:

Townfield Walk: 8 (7 August), 5 (x2) (7 August), Townfield Walk Residents Association (29 names listed) (7 August)

Southend Road: San Agustin (23 August)

These comments can be summarised as follows:

- Garden to back of property and a 2-storey flat; this will cause invasion of privacy
- Own bedrooms and daughters look to back of my premises, what provisions will be met to secure this privacy
- Large tree in my boundary is not to be touched
- Strongly object as ground is flooded during winter and dry during summer. Disturbance to ground sure to have effects to property and way of life.
- Not an infill but start of a rapid expansion of housing that will make Great Wakering a suburb of Southend.
- Council has not been honest with people concerning amount of land that Cogent owns.
- RDC is going to move Star Lane Industrial Estate so that it can build more houses there.
- The South East Essex Strategic Growth Locations Assessment states that the only suitable area for a large scale development 6-8000 houses for both Southend and Rochford is on Green Belt land west of Great Wakering. This is not a natural "infill" of Green Belt land but the annihilation of Great Wakering, Little Wakering and Barling as villages.
- Flooding concerns to properties in Townfield Walk
- Buffer exists between back gardens of properties in Townfield where vast amounts of wildlife have grown.
- Bats in the breeding season, lighting impacts.
- Townfield Walk Has shortest boundaries but with largest section of rented social housing.

-
- Not the infrastructure here to cope with all this new housing.
 - All assessments and reports are out of date and new ones must be re-done before permission is given.
 - Need a 24 hour traffic survey.
 - I will lose light, peace and beauty. My mental and physical health will be adversely impacted by noise created by people and traffic. Will now be overlooked and have no privacy.
 - Where will be growing our food as all of this Green Belt agricultural land disappears?
 - I am worried that this development will start a process of using green belt land within and around Great Wakering for housing.
 - Once this development of 120 houses is secured other green belt land will follow.
 - I have concerns about the development and its sustainability.
 - We are pleased to see our previous concerns about the safety of the children using the proposed play areas has been considered and they are now moved to safer less hidden areas within the proposed development. We still have worries about the lighting of this area and would like more clarification about this.
 - The failure to consider the impact on infrastructure is neglectful of the Council and no new traffic surveys are indicative of this. The roads here are not built for major traffic changes and influx; they are narrow winding country roads. The increase in traffic movement with no calming effect or new pedestrian crossings is dangerous and irresponsible as the village is already seeing drivers using it as a race circuit.
 - The reports exaggerate the public transport systems here and give false impression of the ease of travel to and from the village for residents without their own vehicles.
 - We are also concerned that the recent soil test results have not been made public. The field proposed for the development regularly floods and this impacts on the 10 houses backing the field where gardens flood in heavy rain. What measures are the Council putting in place for the safety of our properties from flooding and potential subsidence of our properties?
 - The 10 houses overlooking the field will be adversely affected by this development and the ground works to be undertaken should it go ahead with the loss of view and light peace and quiet. The whole estate will be affected by noise and increased traffic, less access to amenities and general change of the village life.
 - The primary school is not built for the increase in population of young families; where will these children be educated? The senior school catchment is limited to one school with the use of buses to take children to Rochford. These added buses on narrow road routes is a further hazard safety concern.
 - The developments at Star Lane, and the southern end of Alexander Road, as well as several smaller developments, have already led to vastly increased traffic, virtually non-stop on the High Street, incredible difficulty in parking anywhere in the village, overuse of doctors' surgery, school.

- Obviously the need for housing, especially affordable housing, in the country as a whole, has become great but I feel Great Wakering has already had enough pressure put on it to solve this problem.

2. Officer Response

Recommendation to remain one of approval subject to conditions.

ITEM 8

19/00493/FUL

Land Adjacent to 14 Hambro Close, Rayleigh

1 Revised section 4 – Relevant Planning History

03/01117/FUL – Recommended for an approved - Erection of Two Storey Building to Accommodate 4 x 1-Bedroom Flats – Subsequently refused at Development Committee on 6 February 2004.

2 Local Resident Responses

Since the officer recommendation was finalised comments have been received from the following addresses which should be taken into consideration:

Hambro Close: unknown address (6 August), 16 (8 August)

These comments can be summarised as follows:

- Green spaces are at a premium and lend themselves to increasing the well-being of the residents living in the vicinity.
- Increases the likelihood of flooding and removing trees only exacerbates this problem.
- Over-development
- Parking issues already
- Waste drainage issue already exists
- No waste allocation for existing residents
- No thought to existing residents
- Sapling is not a replacement
- Loss of green would result in access to houses facing the field by alleyways. Poor lighting and bin obstruction would cause an issue with alleyways.
- Loss of green would change character of the close.
- Construction traffic parking would cause a problem.
- Poor design – property squeezed in middle of green and opposite way to rest of houses. Out of character.

One e-mail has also been received from:

Spokesperson for the Hambro Close Community

And which includes the following objections in response to the officer recommendation:

Due to the report only being made available on Friday 23 August (prior to a Bank Holiday weekend) please find attached our Hambro Close Community Comparison Chart.

The Hambro Close Community recommends that the Committee refuses this planning application based upon:

- 1 Discrimination under the Equality Act 2010 on the basis of Sex, Age & Disability.
- 2 Failure to improve the character and quality of existing community area and the way it functions.
(NPPF development guidelines.)
- 3 Dismissal of known Amenity Value of Established 50 year old sycamore tree (our Cavat assessment is £40-60k.)
- 4 No legal right to destroy healthy, established, 50 year old sycamore tree for purely financial benefits.
- 5 Failure to complete ecological and environmental impact survey
- 6 Failure to complete tree survey - Environmental Officer used Google Maps to make his decision.
- 7 Failure to comply with Forestry Commission procedures
- 8 Failure to complete a flood survey
- 9 Failure to mention any previous planning applications made by RDC on our Community Green Space.

(It was 2003, and it was refused. We have a copy of the local news story should you require it for reference.)

- 10 Failure of the RDC Planning & Environmental Team to align on whether our Hambro Close Community is a built up urban area or a semi-rural, peaceful area overlooking open fields and farmland, private livery with access to a ramblers' walking trail.

(Hint, it's the latter; we can see horses from our kitchen windows every day)

11 Failure to carry out accurate parking amenity assessment.

(Counting to 22 is considered a basic necessity by the Hambro Close Community.)

12 Failure to provide any background papers or Equality Impact Assessment with initial planning application or in a timely manner for the meeting. (I have had to ask for it)

3 Officer Response

Recommendation to remain one of approval, subject to conditions.

ITEM 9(1)

18/01009/FUL

Land Rear of 1 to 8 Stile Lane, Rayleigh

1. Local Resident Response

Since the officer recommendation was finalised comments have been received from the following address which should be taken into consideration:

Stile Lane: 4 (13 August)

These comments are restated; original summarised comments are present within the report.

2 Officer Response

Recommendation to remain one of approval, subject to conditions.

ITEM 9(2)

19/00110/FUL

The Mill Rear Of 8 St Johns Road, Great Wakering

1. Local Resident Response

Since the officer recommendation was finalised comments have been received from the following address which should be taken into consideration:

St Johns Close: 9 (20 August)

These comments can be summarised as follows:

- As far as I could see in the plans, it said no evidence that bats were present. We have lived backing onto this mill for over 16 years now and have watched bats there all the time. Fortunately enough I had the chance to video a few of them last night but wondered how I could submit it to show proof that bats are living there.

2. Officer Response

As noted within the officer report, it is acknowledged that bats may fly over and land on the site; however, it is not considered likely that the site is occupied by a bat roost. Bats are protected species so if any bats do become present during any works the applicant has a legal requirement to stop works and to seek further advice from an ecologist. An informative to this effect is recommended on a decision notice. Recommendation to remain one of approval, subject to conditions and informative.