

<p>Item 1 09/00326/FUL Land Rear Of 85 – 93 The Drive, Hullbridge</p>	<p>Essex County Council Environment Sustainability and Highways</p> <p>No objection to raise subject to the following heads of conditions to any approval that might be given;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">(1) Provision within the site of an area for the parking of operatives' vehicles and for storage of materials.(2) Driveway/access to be constructed in bound materials.(3) All works within the highway to be laid out and constructed to the satisfaction of the area manager south.(4) Access to be splayed to a suitable dropped kerb crossing. <p>Buildings/Technical Support (Engineers)</p> <p>No objections. Advise that The Drive is a private street with no public surface water sewers in the area.</p> <p>77 further letters have been received in response to public notification and which raise the following comments and objections in addition to those set out in the report;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Will reduce area available for surface rainwater and add to problems where residents have filled in the ditches and gardens and roads are flooded.• Increased traffic from construction and development when occupied causing obstruction and delays.• Construction nuisance.• Inadequate private single track roads overburdened serving the site with no proper vehicle passing places that were provide by the residents years ago and never adopted by the Council.• No change in circumstance to previous application other than road has deteriorated further.• No need for this development given the number of infill and other developments and accommodation available.• Backland development of gardens is totally inappropriate.• Adverse affect on wildlife and habitat available in garden areas.• This type of application is wrong, immoral and goes against the grain of everyday living cashing in on the good fortune of a lengthy garden.• Already turned down by a previous inspector.• Private right of way at the rear of site for residents of Grasmere Avenue may be used for construction vehicles that will destroy the greenery.• Why proposing bungalows when they are supposed to be
---	---

	<p>building 450 houses in Watery Lane?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Are applicants prepared to repair any damage caused to The Drive? Frontagers have to currently foot the bill. All know that developers will not actually make these repairs.• Would expect fields to be developed but not back gardens.• Suggest traffic count for The Drive to demonstrate traffic flow problems.• Small garden areas for future residents.• Area already tightly compacted with dwellings only three feet apart.• Village has been ruined by constant building of inappropriate flats etc.• Anticipate destruction of trees and hedgerows even those outside the site if permission is granted.• Obstructed views.• Nuisance and increased noise in quiet area.• Quote Yvette Cooper MP: "...it isn't enough to build more homes, they need to be in high quality neighbourhoods with proper infrastructure which is crucial to be in place to create prosperous and sustainable communities. Council's and communities need to do their bit to improve the area for families and for the future...This means that Council's should be allowing new homes in good quality areas to enhance the existing community ,not ruin it." Consideration should be given to these statements.• Increasingly important for new buildings and public spaces to be sympathetic to the environment. Proposal does not have safety, modernity, aesthetic appeal, and energy efficiency in mind.• Proposal spoils existing and would compromise the amenities of existing residents which is a material planning consideration.• Plans seem to extend across piped ditch.• Loss of oak tree and other trees lessening quality of life for residents.• Plans not readily available for viewing at Parish Council offices and RDC Internet is not available for all and the Council offices are not always open.• This type of construction will end the village status of Hullbridge.• New builds will not integrate with the community.• Concern regarding land levels and affect on the drainage of the site and surrounding gardens.• Concealed entrance to proposed access.• Filling of swimming pool at No. 85 will affect ground movements.• Possibility of future chalet conversion of the proposed
--	--

	<p>bungalows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Inadequate parking, particularly in view of visitor parking needs.• Disturbance from lights from vehicles associated with future residents to the scheme.• Application is not about bungalows but being able to sell the properties with Planning permission.• Cramming such development is against planning guidelines and the Council's core strategy.• Hullbridge is a village where residents have chosen to live away from cramped town life with green spaces and this will be spoiled.• Applicants statements regarding available services such as shops and employment and inability for their children to buy homes are misleading.• Increased density.• Previous garages to properties in The Drive refused permission because no access over the Green Lane.• Not "Nimby" as the proposal is literally right in their back yard.• Question rights of neighbours. When purchasing our property would never have considered this sort of thing would happen.• Some properties run businesses from their home which adds to the traffic and nuisance.• Plenty of Green Belt available to provide the development.• Occupier of No. 91 is a car dealer who has numerous vehicles parked at his home so would like to know what additional parking provision the owner will make for his vehicles.• Problem of parked cars on The Drive is a nuisance and danger for traffic and pedestrians alike.• Inadequate visibility for the junction proposed which should be 2.4m x 45m in both directions. If allowed on the current basis would only achieve 2.4m x 20m to the left and 2.4m x 30m to the right due to parked vehicles either side of the point of access.• Questions if the Council and officers are prepared to take responsibility for the inadequacy of the visibility in the scheme if an accident occurs?• Loss of lovely gardens which attract wildlife.• Hullbridge becoming overcrowded at the same time as losing shops, Police station and no Bank and no plans to improve our roads, pathways or street lighting.• Will over shadow rear gardens.• Nothing less than a full width carriageway is required to serve the development and which would require
--	---

	<p>demolishing one of the properties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because Backland development are approved against neighbours wishes, who have to bear the real costs and have no choice, such development is an antisocial device. • Do not want view/outlook to change. • Would like to keep Hullbridge as the small friendly village environment I moved into rather than the concrete jungle like the London Borough I moved away from. • Site is within a Flood Risk Area. • Pollution. • Back gardens should be retained for enjoyment not development. • Will add to strain on local services and school. • Overpopulating the village will demoralise the existing residents. • The Road does not have suitable wheel chair access. • Do not consider the drawing so to be accurate showing the true scale of the development. • Lack of infrastructure in the area. <p>One letter has been received from Mark Francois MP who considers the proposal would represent overdevelopment of the site and that there are still access issues which have not been fully addressed and therefore objects to the application.</p>
<p>Item R2 09/00235/FUL</p> <p>80 West Street Rochford</p> <p>Item R3 09/00223/FUL</p> <p>80 West Street Rochford</p> <p>Item R4 09/00236/FUL</p> <p>80 West Street Rochford</p>	<p>In view of concerns raised Officers explain the circumstances regarding the recent Tree Preservation Order and the acceptance now of the loss of the Lime tree.</p> <p>Woodlands Section Arboriculture explanation:</p> <p>Tree Preservation Order 21/08 was served dated 6th June 2008 in response to a planning application that showed the preserved tree to be removed. Planning app No. 07/01010/FUL.</p> <p>At that time access was restricted to the site; an amenity assessment was carried out but no condition survey could be completed.</p> <p>Since planning application 07/01010/FUL a further planning application has been submitted No. 09/00223/FUL. Part of the planning application process requires a tree impact assessment to be carried out in accordance with British Standard 5837. Part of this assessment requires a fairly detailed inspection of tree condition (physiological and structural). During this inspection the arboricultural consultant, DF Clark, found the tree to have fungal colonization of <i>Ustulina deusta</i>. This is a dangerous fungus when</p>

	<p>found in the urban environment where a frequent target exists and risk of failure is high. The tree usually does not display visual symptoms until at a very advanced and usually dangerous state of decay; the fungus is very small and difficult to see, the fungus can attack roots and go undetected until fracture occurs.</p> <p>The type of decay is a white and soft rot occurring at the base of the stem or in the roots. The fungus attacks the cell walls in particular the cellulose (flexibility) leaving the harder but more brittle lignin to remain. This type of decay leaves the tree susceptible to brittle fracture at the stem or root plate. Often the fracture can occur without warning. Recently in Hockley Woods a large mature Oak broke from the root plate, following inspection it was found that this tree only had 2 structural roots holding the stem and branch structure, the tree broke across a path in still, calm, sunny conditions. The tree was infected with <i>Ustulina deusta</i> found on the roots of the tree</p> <p>There is no known cure for the infected host, the fungus will continue to degrade the cell walls within the tree and cause problems with the physiology and structural integrity of the tree.</p> <p>In this instance the tree should be removed and replanted with a suitable replacement tree, as per the TPO legislation. The fungus can persist in the soil and via root contact. It is therefore recommended that soil management be completed before any planting is carried out.</p> <p>Officer update With regard to the issues raised concerning the adjoining conflict with activities on licensed premises officers recommend the following informative to be included on each approval that might be given;</p> <p>Informative: The applicant is advised to draw to future occupiers' attention that the licensed premises adjoining the site has existing licences to play outside and inside music and provide entertainment. Future occupiers of the development to which this application relates should bear in mind this existing situation before occupying the premises.</p>
--	--