

18/01129/REM

LAND WEST OF LITTLE WAKERING ROAD AND SOUTH OF BARROW HALL ROAD, LITTLE WAKERING

RESERVED MATTERS PLANNING APPLICATION SEEKING APPROVAL OF APPEARANCE, LANDSCAPING, LAYOUT AND SCALE DETAILS PURSUANT TO OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION REFERENCE 16/00731/OUT FOR 120 DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED OPEN SPACE AND PARKING

APPLICANT: SANCTUARY HOMES AND COGENT LAND LLP

ZONING: ALLOCATED SITE SER9a

PARISH: GREAT WAKERING

WARD: FOULNESS & THE WAKERINGS

1 RECOMMENDATION

1.1 It is proposed that the Committee **RESOLVES**

That planning permission be approved, subject to the following heads of conditions:

- (1) Time Limit
- (2) List of Approved Plans
- (3) Car ports not to have doors
- (4) Visitor bays to be marked out
- (5) Water efficiency details to be agreed
- (6) Increase cycle store size to apartment/maisonettes for visitor spaces
- (7) Maintenance of open space/play spaces
- (8) Parking spaces and garages for parking of vehicles only

- (9) Materials to be agreed
- (10) Roads to be engineered to take refuse truck weight where necessary
- (12) Parking bays at dwellings nos. 31-34, 43-46, 57,58,69,109 and 110 to be moved forward to back edge footway
- (13) Disabled visitor bays outside plot 14 to be changed to visitor

2 PLANNING APPLICATION DETAILS

- 2.1 This application is a reserved matters application seeking approval of the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale details for 120 dwellings with associated open space and parking at land west of Little Wakering Road and south of Barrow Hall Road, Little Wakering.
- 2.2 Outline permission was granted on 10 October 2017 (reference 16/00731/OUT) for 'outline application for residential development of up to 120 homes with public open space and associated parking'. The current application represents a reserved matters application following the decision to agree details of the scheme.
- 2.3 The application includes an area of open space to the west extending from Barrow Hall Road down to Southend Road. This would incorporate soft landscaping, cycle ways, an attenuation pond and two play areas. A pumping station would be located to the south. The main access road would run north/south with some properties having private drives fronting the open space.
- 2.4 The housing mix proposed includes:
 - 10 x 1-bedroom flats
 - 28 x 2-bedroom houses
 - 50 x 3-bedroom houses
 - 32 x 4-bedroom houses
- 2.5 During the course of the application concerns were raised regarding compliance with some policy and guidance requirements. As a result, revised drawings were provided and re-consultation took place on these revisions. The revisions did not amend the overall housing numbers or housing mix.

3 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Planning History

- 3.1 16/00731/OUT - Outline Application for Residential Development of up to 120 Homes With Public Open Space and Associated Parking. APPROVED on 10 October 2017.
- 3.2 17/01104/DOC - Discharge of Condition 44 on approved application 16/00731/OUT. APPROVED on 19 January 2018.
- 3.3 18/01128/DOC - Discharge of outline conditions nos. 5 (Phasing), 6 (Design Code), 7 (Fire Hydrants), 10 (Contamination), 11 (Contamination), 12 (Surface Water Drainage), 14 (Surface Water Drainage), 16 (Foul Water Drainage), 17 (Drainage Maintenance), 22 (Tree Protection), 29 (Low Carbon Strategy), 33 (Lighting), 34 (Waste Management) and 44 (Archaeological) relating to outline planning permission ref: 16/00731/OUT for new residential development of up to 120 homes with public open space and associated parking. PENDING CONSIDERATION
- 3.4 19/00143/DOC - Discharge of condition no. 23 (landscaping) on approved application 16/00731/OUT: Outline application for residential development of up to 120 homes with public open space and associated parking. PENDING CONSIDERATION
- 3.5 19/00261/DOC - Discharge of Condition 35 (Access Design) of Approved Application Reference 16/00731/FUL. PENDING CONSIDERATION

Principle of Residential Development

- 3.6 The Allocations Plan 2014 was adopted on 25 February 2014. The application site is within part of the general location of 'West Great Wakering' referred to in policy H3 of the Core Strategy as one of the general locations in the District post 2021 where land would be released from the Green Belt to meet a rolling up-to-date five year supply of deliverable sites. This general location was identified in policy H3 to accommodate 250 dwellings. The Allocations Plan identified a specific site within this general location known as SER9. The application site falls within the SER9 allocation being part of the site labelled SER9a.
- 3.7 The principle of residential development of this site for up to 250 dwellings has already been accepted through the grant of outline planning permission on site SER9a for 120 dwellings. This current application represents consideration of the detail for this outline approval relating to the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.

- 3.8 The discharge of condition application reference 18/01128/DOC looks to agree a phasing plan for the outline application, which was a requirement of condition 5 of that consent. There are 5 intended phases shown on the submitted plans: P1a, P1b, P2, P3, P4 and P5. The development is intended to commence from the Barrow Hall Road end moving in a southerly direction with the soft landscaped section to the west (including some dwellings fronting this space) to form the final phase. Whilst the residential phasing arrangement would be acceptable it is considered that to have 108 dwellings built and potentially occupied prior to any open space is not acceptable. A degree of open space should be in place approximately half way through the build. However, this can be addressed through the discharge of condition 5 and not through the course of this current application.

Access

- 3.9 This current application does not seek to consider the main access arrangement to the development as this has already been agreed, subject to conditions through the approved outline application. The access would be from Barrow Hall Road with a pedestrian/cycleway link only onto Southend Road.

- 3.10 Condition 35 attached to approved outline application reference 16/00731/OUT stated as follows:

‘No means of access shall be formed between the site and the existing highway until the detailed access design (including but not limited to construction details, drainage and vision splay) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interest of highway safety.’

- 3.11 Condition 45 attached to approved outline application reference 16/00731/OUT stated as follows:

‘Developer to reassess the access to the site and to submit details to the Local Planning Authority of adjustments to be made to deter vehicles from turning left into Barrow Hall Road, which should be approved by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Ward Members.

REASON: In the interest of road safety.’

- 3.12 Concern has been raised with regard to the safety of using Barrow Hall Road as the main access and the need to comply with condition 45 regarding deterring vehicles from turning left. As a result, the applicant instructed highway engineers to explore other options during the course of this application and they submitted a report for consideration. This report has been reviewed by ECC Highways. Barrow Hall Road is still considered by the

applicant's highway engineers and ECC Highways to be the best access point for this development. ECC Highways does not object to this access nor does it seek any works to deter vehicles from turning left.

- 3.13 In light of this conclusion, the applicant has submitted a discharge of condition request for condition 35 showing the intended Barrow Hall Road access arrangement. ECC Highways is yet to formally comment on this discharge of condition request. However, as highlighted previously, this is a matter for discharge of the planning conditions attached to the approved outline application. Access is not for consideration here as part of this reserved matters application.
- 3.14 The roads through the site would include a main type E access in a north/south direction and then from this there would be shared surface type F access roads. The type E road would measure 5.5m wide with a 2m wide footway to each side. The type F roads would measure 6m wide to provide a combined pedestrian/vehicle surface. There would also be 5 areas of private drives each giving access to a maximum of 5 properties. They would mostly have widths of 4m with 3.5m pinch points in places. These measurements are all in accordance with the Essex Design Guide. The cycle way through the open space would measure 3.5m wide.
- 3.15 ECC Highways has no objection, subject to conditions being imposed. The two conditions suggested are already covered through condition 31 of the outline application which requires a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to be provided and therefore it is not necessary to repeat these here. The design, layout and sizing of the proposed roadways through the site are not considered objectionable.

Parking

- 3.16 The Parking Standards: Design and Good Practice Supplementary Planning Document adopted December 2010 requires dwellings with one bedroom to provide a minimum of one off street parking space and dwellings with two bedrooms or more should have a minimum of two off street parking spaces. These spaces would serve the residents of the dwellings.
- 3.17 On the current proposal for 120 dwellings, 110 dwellings would have two bedrooms or more and 10 dwellings would have one bedroom. Therefore, these 10 dwellings would need to provide one space each with the remaining 110 dwellings providing two spaces each. This is adhered to across the development.
- 3.18 The Parking Standards document requires 1 secure covered cycle space per dwelling to be provided for residents. The majority of dwellings proposed have garages or car ports that would be considered to provide secure cycle storage. There are some dwellings that do not have garages; for those

dwellings that either do not have garages or have open car ports a planning condition should require a secure and covered area for cycle storage within the curtilage as part of a planning condition. The apartment block and maisonettes provide a communal cycle store for their 10 residents in accordance with the requirements.

- 3.19 The Parking Standards document requires a minimum of 0.25 visitor parking spaces per dwelling (unallocated). For 120 dwellings, this would equate to the need for a minimum of 30 visitor parking spaces. 30 unallocated spaces are provided across the development. There are 14 dwellings that provide capacity for a degree of additional parking on plot due to driveway lengths; 9 of these 14 meet the bay size criteria within the Parking Standards document beyond the 2 spaces needed per dwelling. ECC Highways has raised concern regarding some plots which have some additional space to their driveways that might encourage discriminate parking over the footway. A condition requiring these spaces to be brought forward to the back edge of the footway has been suggested, along with a condition requiring some disabled visitor bays to be just visitor.
- 3.20 If no garage or secure area is provided within the curtilage of the dwelling then 1 covered and secure cycle space per dwelling in a communal area for residents plus 1 space per 8 dwellings for visitors should be provided. In this instance, the majority of dwellings without a garage in their curtilage could provide a secure area within their gardens for cycle parking required by condition. The apartment block and maisonettes have a shared cycle store. This has a need to provide 10 cycle spaces for residents and 2 for visitors. At the moment it provides 10 spaces; however, there is capacity for this to be amended to provide the additional 2 spaces by condition.
- 3.21 The Parking Standards document requires 1 powered two-wheeler space plus 1 per 20 car spaces (for 1st 100 car spaces). With a requirement for 30 visitor parking spaces, this would result in a need for a total of 3 powered two-wheeler spaces across the development. 3 spaces are shown within the layout.
- 3.22 With regard to disabled bays, the requirement is 200 vehicle bays or less should provide 3 bays plus 6% of total capacity. This is calculated with regard to the 30 visitor parking space requirement; therefore, there is a requirement for 3 spaces. These are provided across the development; two close to the open space area to the west and one to the north.
- 3.23 The quantum of parking provision is considered acceptable at the site with the ability for planning conditions to be applied as outlined above.
- 3.24 The Parking Standards document requires parking spaces to meet preferred bay size criteria of 5.5m x 2.9m per space with a 6.5m length for parallel parking. This criteria is adhered to across the development. Garage spaces

should internally measure 7m x 3m. Single and twin garages are proposed which adhere to this requirement. The disabled bay sizing of 6.5m x 3.9m where such spaces are shown is met across the development. 6m reversing distances are provided within the communal parking areas across the estate.

3.25 Vehicle spaces across the development are considered to be located in usable positions for residents. Most would have parking within their curtilage whilst some would have spaces within parking areas. All units whereby parking would be located within such areas would have access to spaces near to their properties.

3.26 The visitor spaces are spread throughout the development in reasonable locations. In order to make it clear to residents that these are visitor spaces they should be demarcated as such and a requirement for such markings/signage could be controlled by planning condition.

Appearance

3.27 Views are terminated across the development in various locations by predominantly the use of soft landscaping or buildings.

3.28 The layout is not vehicle dominant along the main access with parking predominantly located to the sides of dwellings or within parking areas. There is a greater degree of dominance within the central areas with parking courts to the frontages; however, this is softened with the use of soft landscaping in front of these courts.

3.29 The design of the house types proposed is traditional with some more contemporary design features, particularly with the use and location of fenestration. Design is quite varied within the Great Wakering area; the general design concept is not considered objectionable.

3.30 There are 28 different house types although most are variations of 3 key house types (A, P and S). An apartment block and maisonettes are also proposed. The street scenes would provide variety in the form and style of dwellings within the selected mix.

3.31 The site uses 5 character areas: boulevard, squares, lanes and courts, green fingers and a rural edge. The proposed materials comprise red, "Luton Grey" plum and buff brick work, with through-coloured off white render and dark red plain and grey slate effect tiles. A condition requiring full material details to be agreed should be attached to any approval.

3.32 A dormer is proposed to one of the house types to the front elevation (P3c). The dormer proposed is a modest modern looking flat roofed dormer. Whilst SPD2 requires front/side dormers to have pitched roofs this does not allow for modern style dormers such as that proposed. This affects 9 dwellings within

the scheme. The modern style is not considered objectionable for these 9 dwellings.

- 3.33 It is considered that the design represents good, high quality design in accordance with policy CP1 of the Core Strategy.

Landscaping

- 3.34 Various soft and hard landscaping is proposed across the site. A soft landscaping plan has been provided, along with a Landscape Design Statement, which identifies a variety of landscaping incorporating proposed trees, native hedges, shrubs, perennials, lawn and grassland. New trees would mostly line the roadways with new tree planting also proposed to the open space area. Shrubs and perennials would mostly be focused around the front garden areas and prominent visual areas within the residential area. Swales would be located to the northern side of the three type F roads.
- 3.35 The Council's arboriculturalist does not raise concern with the proposed planting but seeks to ensure that the tree protection and all associated method statements are to be carried out in accordance with the tree protection plan and tree report. This is required by condition attached to the outline application.
- 3.36 A boundary treatment and hard surfacing plan has been provided. This shows the intended use of brick walling to prominent visible locations throughout the development with fencing concentrated to rear and side boundary separations. The hard surfacing shows the intention for tarmac on the main type E roadway with tegula paving and concrete pavements to be used elsewhere. The principle of boundary treatment proposed is not considered objectionable.
- 3.37 Condition 23 of the approved outline application requires full landscaping details to be submitted and agreed. A discharge of condition request has been submitted (reference 19/00143/DOC) and is under consideration. The general principle of the landscaping proposed and shown within the current application is considered acceptable; the full details will be considered and reviewed as part of the discharge of condition request.

Layout

Density

- 3.38 The density would equate to 22.4dph. Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan seeks a minimum of 30dph; however, it is important to consider site context. The proposal incorporates a good level of open space acknowledging the site's location adjacent to the Green Belt boundary and on this basis a lesser density is not objectionable.

Dwelling Mix

- 3.39 Policy H5 of the Core Strategy requires new developments to have a mix of dwelling types. The proposal consists of flats and maisonettes (one-bedroomed) and houses (two, three and four-bedroomed). It is considered that a reasonable mixture of property sizes has been provided at this site in accordance with this policy.

1m Separations

- 3.40 SPD2 requires that 1m separation is provided between the side boundaries of the hereditament and habitable rooms of the dwelling house. Whilst mostly applicable to infill plots within existing residential areas SPD2 also makes clear that this should also be applied to development of new estates. The aim is to achieve a total separation of 2m between the sides of the buildings with reference within SPD2 to such separation being important to the overall appearance of new estates.
- 3.41 There are 21 dwellings within the proposed development that do not meet the 1m separation criteria. However, in all instances visual separation is still provided in the form of green space, access ways or parking areas. Although this does not in a literal sense comply with the 1m criteria, it does adhere to the aspirations of this guidance which seeks to improve the appearance of new estates by providing visual gaps. It is not considered a reason for refusal would be justified on the lack of strict adherence to the 1m separation criteria as the layout and design would still provide visual separations for most house types whilst still seeking to retain a continuity of frontage.

Residential Amenity

- 3.42 The site is surrounded by residential dwellings to its eastern boundary (Little Wakering Road) and southern boundary (Old School Meadow, Townfield Walk and Southend Road).
- 3.43 Due to the distance between the proposed dwellings fronting Barrow Hall Road and the properties that already exist within Barrow Hall Road, it is not considered that the proposed dwellings would be detrimental to the occupiers of those neighbouring properties.
- 3.44 The Essex Design Guide requires a minimum of 25m distance between the backs of houses to provide acceptable privacy distancing. Where the backs of houses are at more than 30 degrees to one another this separation may be reduced to 15m from the nearest corner. This is complied with across the majority of the development (including in relation to existing residential properties surrounding the site) although there are 12 instances whereby such

separation is not provided in relation to the 15m distance. The majority of distances that do not adhere do not reduce below 13m. There is one occurrence whereby the measurement is 8.5m. This is between apartment 50 and No. 6 Old School Meadow. However, there is intended to be a vegetation strip along this boundary and the window at first floor that would look towards No. 6 is a high level window for ventilation serving the kitchen area. On this basis, it is not considered that such relationship would warrant refusal of this application. It is not considered reasonable to refuse the application due to the lack of strict compliance with this criterion The Essex Design Guide, as referred to in policy CP1 of the Core Strategy, should help provide guidance without being overly prescriptive.

- 3.45 Some of the house types use side windows within their design. However, where these are used, the ground floor windows are separated from neighbours by boundary treatment, parking spaces, roads or pathways and are often on corner plot locations to ensure no detrimental impact upon neighbouring properties. The apartment block and maisonettes would not generate unacceptable overlooking between either existing or proposed residential dwellings with regard to their window positionings and uses. Adherence to the separation distances between proposed and existing dwellings for all except two properties in Old School Meadows would ensure that no detrimental overlooking would occur. A dense landscaped zone is proposed as a buffer surrounding proposed and existing dwellings within proposed gardens.

Technical Housing Standards

- 3.46 The Ministerial Statement of 25 March 2015 announced changes to the Government's policy relating to technical housing standards. The changes seek to rationalise the many differing existing standards into a simpler, streamlined system and introduce new additional optional Building Regulations on water and access, and a new national space standard.
- 3.47 Rochford District Council has existing policies relating to access (policy H6 of the Core Strategy), internal space (policy DM4 of the Development Management Plan) and water efficiency (policy ENV9 of the Core Strategy) and can therefore require compliance with the new national technical standards, as advised by the Ministerial Statement (March 2015).

1. Internal Space

- 3.48 Until such a time as existing policy DM4 is revised, this policy must be applied in light of the Ministerial Statement (2015) which introduced a new technical housing standard relating to internal space standards. Consequently all new dwellings are required to comply with the new national space standard as set out in the DCLG Technical housing standards – nationally described space

standard March 2015. An assessment of the proposal against the national criteria is attached at Appendix 1.

- 3.49 The agent has confirmed that all ceiling heights will meet the minimum criteria. Appendix 1 confirms that the Technical Housing Standards are met.

2. Water Efficiency

- 3.50 Until such a time as existing policy ENV9 is revised, this policy must be applied in light of the Ministerial Statement (2015) which introduced a new technical housing standard relating to water efficiency. Consequently all new dwellings are required to comply with the national water efficiency standard as set out in part G of the Building Regulations (2010) as amended. No such condition was attached to the outline application. It is considered appropriate for a condition to be imposed on the current more detailed reserved matters application.

3. Energy

- 3.51 Policy ENV9 requires all new dwellings to achieve Code Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes as a minimum. The Ministerial Statement relating to technical standards has not changed policy in respect of energy performance and this requirement still therefore applies. Condition 29 attached to the outline application required compliance with the low carbon strategy submitted as part of the outline application which is considered to address this.
- 3.52 In light of the Ministerial Statement which advises that planning permissions should not be granted subject to any technical housing standards other than those relating to internal space, water efficiency and access; the requirement in policy ENV9 that a specific Code for Sustainable Homes level be achieved and the requirement in policy H6 that the Lifetime Homes standard be met are now no longer sought.

4. Wheelchair Accessible Units

- 3.53 Paragraph 3.265 to policy SER9 of the Allocations Plan requires a minimum of 7 dwellings across the site to be built to full wheelchair accessibility standards. This includes allocation 9a and 9b. Policy H6 of the Core Strategy requires 3% to be provided which would equate to 4 dwellings within the current reserved matters application. The design and access statement advises that 4 of the flats have been designed to wheelchair accessible standards which is considered acceptable.

Amenity

3.54 SPD2 requires that for three-bedroomed plus detached and semi-detached dwellings 100m² of private amenity is provided. SPD2 requires 3-bedroomed terraced properties to provide a minimum depth of 2 ½ x the width of the house (except where the provision exceeds 100m²) and a minimum garden area of 50m². For 1 and 2-bedroomed dwellings a minimum 50m² garden is required provided that the second bedroom is not of a size that would allow sub-division into two rooms. And for flats there is a requirement for a minimum balcony area of 5m², with the ground floor dwelling having a minimum patio garden of 50m²; or the provision of a useable communal residents' garden on the basis of a minimum area of 25m² per flat. These two methods for flats may also be combined.

3.55 The 1-bedroomed flats are located within a block and as maisonettes provide communal space in accordance with SPD2. The majority of the units are 2, 3 or 4-bedroomed requiring minimum 50 or 100m² gardens. Most provide in excess of the 100m² criteria. There are 4 dwellings that are slightly below:-

Plot 88 (91m²)

Plot 91 (90m²)

Plot 103 (90m²)

Plot 106 (76m²)

3.56 Plots 103 and 106 have sufficient space but just don't meet the 2 ½ times the width of the property in garden length criteria which is not strictly applied. It is therefore only 2 plots that are not considered to comply with SPD2 - plots 88 and 91. These provide 91m² and 90m² respectively therefore the reduction is quite minimal. A high number of garden areas to dwellings across the development are actually over sized. It is considered that these 2 plots provide usable garden areas and the slight reduction in a scheme of 120 dwellings is not considered objectionable. Appendix 2 shows the garden area calculations.

Refuse

3.59 The Design and Access Statement shows how a refuse vehicle would access the development. The Council's Appendix 1 to the Development Management Plan explains that a minimum of 5m width should be provided for a refuse vehicle. This is adhered to across the development. The access roads to be used would need to be engineered to take the weight of a 26 tonne refuse vehicle. A planning condition would need to ensure that this is the case.

3.60 The Council operates a 3 bin system per dwelling consisting of a 240l bin for recycle (1100mm high, 740mm deep and 580mm wide), 140l for green and kitchen waste (1100mm high, 555mm deep and 505mm wide) and 180l for residual waste (1100mm high, 755mm deep and 505mm wide). The refuse

plan provided shows that within the curtilage of each dwelling the bins would be stored within the rear gardens. The apartment block and maisonettes would have dedicated communal bin stores; plots 20, 21, 22, 26 and 27 would also share a communal bin store. The stores would have sufficient capacity for the Council's 3 bin system. Storage arrangements are considered to be acceptable. The proposals would meet the necessary collection and drag distances within Appendix 1 to the Development Management Plan.

- 3.61 All collection points will require hard surfacing; this could be grasscrete to soften the appearance of these areas. The soft landscaping details requiring discharge would look at this in more detail. The applicant should be made aware that there is a cost to supply bins per dwelling. This is better arranged through the developer rather than individual homeowners.

Scale

- 3.62 The approved outline application did not limit overall height of dwellings; however, it did require a design code to be submitted and agreed, required by condition 6. Such details have been submitted and are pending consideration. The building heights proposed are predominantly 2 storey and under 9m. The apartment block would be 9.1m and two house types would be 10.3m (P4e) and 10.4m (P4f).
- 3.63 The house types proposed are considered to provide sufficient variety in height but maintain a predominantly 2 storey presence across the site. The greatest heights, forming the apartment block and 2 house types, would be located at strategic points within the development to form focal points. This is not considered objectionable.

Other Matters

Fibre Optic Cables

- 3.64 The Council's economic development team has submitted comments encouraging the applicant to use BT Open Reach to install free fibre optic cables at the site. There is a planning condition (condition 30) attached to the approved outline application which requires details of open access ducting to be submitted and agreed. This can be considered as part of the necessary discharge of condition request.

Archaeology

- 3.65 ECC Archaeology has confirmed that archaeological work is complete and that no further work is required.

Lighting

- 3.66 Policy DM5 of the Development Management Plan requires proposals to be appropriately designed to minimise the impact of the light pollution on residential and commercial areas, important areas of nature conservation importance, highway safety and/or the night sky. Planning condition 33 of the approved outline application requires such details to be agreed so this would be addressed within this existing condition. An application to discharge this condition has been submitted for consideration.

Noise

- 3.67 There are not considered to be any noise implications from the proposal. Any mitigation, if deemed necessary, would have been required at outline application stage.

Renewable Energy

- 3.68 Policy ENV8 of the Core Strategy requires developments of five or more dwellings to secure at least 10% of their energy from decentralised and renewable or low carbon sources, unless this is not feasible or viable.
- 3.69 Condition 29 of the approved outline application required details to be submitted to confirm compliance with the low carbon strategy provided within the outline application documents. Such details have been provided and are under consideration.

Surface Water Drainage

- 3.70 Condition 12 of the approved outline application required a surface water drainage strategy to be submitted and agreed. Conditions 15 and 17 required details of the management arrangements for such surface water drainage to be submitted and agreed. Such details have been provided and are under consideration. ECC Lead Local Flood Authority does not recommend approval of the reserved matters application as the discharge of condition remains outstanding; however, this is a matter for the discharge of condition attached to the outline application.

Major Gas Pipeline

- 3.71 The site is located within close proximity to a major gas pipeline within Little Wakering. Advice has been sought from the Health & Safety Executive using its planning advice web app as it falls within its consultation distance. The HSE does not advise, on safety grounds, against the granting of planning permission. It advises contacting the pipeline operator, Cadent Gas Ltd., for comment. Such consultation has been undertaken and a response is pending.

Open Space and Play Space

- 3.72 Policy SER9 of the Allocations Plan 2014 identifies the need for open space and play space to be provided.
- 3.73 Within the outline parameters plan an area of green infrastructure was identified measuring 1.9ha. The Allocations Plan sought for a minimum 1.8ha to be provided across the sites incorporating the SER9 allocation. The proposal now seeks to provide 1.307ha of open space. The outline application for the approved SER9a site showed 1.486 of green space. Collectively this would equate to 2.793ha of green space, which would accord with the Allocations Plan as a collective allocation.
- 3.74 The open space is considered to be located in usable and appropriate positions within the development easily accessible to residents.
- 3.75 The Allocations Plan also refers to the need for play space to be provided and seeks a minimum 0.03ha area; this can be in a combination of different areas. The application site shows a Local Area of Play (LAP) and a Local Equipped Area of Play (LEAP). The proposed LAP would measure 0.2ha and the proposed LEAP 0.3ha and they would be located in accessible locations within the open space.

106 Contributions

- 3.76 All the necessary 106 requirements and planning conditions attached to the approved outline application at this site would need to be adhered to and are not required to be repeated within the current application. However, there are slight amendments to the 106 requirement relating to affordable housing unit mix and an additional contribution requirement which is referred to below.

Affordable Housing

- 3.77 Policy H4 of the Core Strategy seeks at least 35% of dwellings on all developments of 15 or more units, or on sites greater than 0.5 hectares, to be affordable. However, such quantity can be relaxed where the developer is able to demonstrate that 35% provision will be economically unviable, rendering the site undeliverable.
- 3.78 As part of the outline planning application 35% affordable housing was agreed to as part of the section 106 agreement (totalling 42 dwellings). The mix was identified within the legal agreement as follows:-

Affordable rented: (32)

1 bed = 2 units
2 bed = 11 units

3 bed = 11 units
4 bed = 8 units

Intermediate: (10)

1 bed = 1 unit
2 beds = 3 units
3 beds = 3 units
4 beds = 3 units

- 3.79 The current proposal seeks a slight amendment to the affordable rented unit mix with the proposal now for 6No. 1-beds (as opposed to 2), 12No. 2-beds (as opposed to 11) and 3No. 4-beds (as opposed to 8). This is in accordance with the Council's Strategic Housing team and the Council's housing needs. It does not alter the overall quantity which remains at 35%.
- 3.80 The section 106 agreement allows for a different mix to be agreed at the submission of a reserved matters application stage. The proposed change is not considered objectionable.

Youth and Community Facilities

- 3.81 Policy SER9 of the Allocations Plan 2014 identifies the various requirements that a new housing allocation such as this should meet. One of these is to contribute towards the provision of local youth and community facilities. Such facilities could either be provided on site or be a form of financial contribution to off site facilities.
- 3.82 In this case, although open space and play areas are provided it is not considered that there is sufficient space remaining to accommodate this on site. A contribution of £25,000 is therefore sought. The same amount was sought towards youth/community facilities for the 116-dwelling scheme at Star Lane Brickworks (12/00252/FUL) and towards open space/play equipment for the 78 dwelling scheme south of High Street, Great Woking (18/00556/FUL). A Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) is proposed at Great Woking Open Space but is awaiting more financial assistance before it can be provided. The £25,000 sought as mitigation through the current development would assist in contributing towards this MUGA.
- 3.83 The outline application referred to the possibility of such mitigation being provided at reserved matters stage. This is not the stage by which any mitigation through contribution should be provided as the principle of development has already been accepted. On this basis, the applicant has agreed, separate to the current application, to enter into a deed of variation of the section 106 agreement approved as part of the outline application. This would enable the £25,000 mitigation to be provided through a separate process to this application.

Ecology

- 3.89 The NPPF, policy ENV1 and policy DM27 require that effects on biodiversity are considered in the determination of planning applications. The NPPF requires that distinctions should be made between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites, so that protection is commensurate with status and that appropriate weight is attached to their importance and the contribution that they make to wider ecological networks.
- 3.90 In addition, in accordance with The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (Habitats Regulations), all competent authorities must undertake a formal assessment known as ‘appropriate assessment’ of the implications of any new plans or projects that may be capable of affecting the designated interest features of European Sites before deciding whether to undertake, permit or authorise such a plan or project; these regulations apply to planning applications determined by Local Authorities.
- 3.91 Local planning authorities have a duty to consult Natural England before granting planning permission on any development that is in proximity to or likely to affect a SSSI. The site is within a Zone of Influence where the scale of development is such that Natural England should be consulted. In response to the consultation, Natural England has highlighted that it considers that the proposed development could generate significant impact on one or more European designated sites scoped into the emerging Essex Coast Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS).
- 3.92 At outline application stage, a Habitat Regulations Assessment was also submitted which was adopted by Rochford District Council to fulfil its duty as a ‘competent authority;’ however, due to the length of time that has passed, officers have conducted a further appropriate assessment, as required by the Habitat Regulations. Natural England has also confirmed in its consultation response that, in its view, a Habitat Regulations Assessment should be undertaken. No new or updated assessment has been submitted with the application. Officers have considered the current proposal in respect of the Habitat Regulations, taking account of advice submitted by Natural England. Officers have followed the advice provided as interim advice by Natural England in August 2018 and have completed the HRA record template.
- 3.93 The conclusion of the HRA is that, subject to securing appropriate mitigation, the proposed 120 dwellings would not likely result in significant adverse effects on the integrity of the European site along the Essex coastline. The mitigation sought includes the open space shown on the layout drawing along with £122.30 per dwelling to contribute towards longer term monitoring and mitigation along the coastline totalling £14,676. This has been accepted by the applicant in principle and such financial contribution shall be provided by variation of deed to the outline application if this reserved matters application

were to be approved.

4 CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS

RDC Waste and Recycling (7 January 2019)

- 4.1 I believe this developer has already taken into account the waste requirements for the district but in any case please refer the developer to the attached planning policy document, page 90 Appendix 1 for waste collection requirements and advise them that there is a charge of £168.00 per household for waste bins which is required in advance of occupancy of the properties. I have some concerns about the layout and bin presentations; who should I take this up with?

RDC Arboricultural (7 January 2019)

- 4.2 The tree protection and all associated method statements are to be carried out in accordance with the tree protection plan reference SJA TPP 17331-01 and tree report reference SJA air 17331-01a supplied by SJ Consultants dated November 2018.

ECC Lead Local Flood Authority (8 January 2019)

- 4.3 We cannot recommend approval of the reserved matters application until condition 12 has been discharged. We advise that the applicant addresses the outstanding information requested by ECC as part of the discharge of conditions application.
- 4.4 In the event that the outstanding information was supplied by the applicant then the County Council may be in a position to recommend discharge of outstanding conditions, once it has considered the additional clarification/details that are required.

RDC Strategic Housing

First Response (31 July 2019)

- 4.5 Following a discussion with Sanctuary Housing, the final break down for the 42 affordable housing units will be:

Affordable rented:

6 x 1-bed
12 x 2-bed
11 x 3-bed
3 x 4-bed

Shared ownership:

- 1 x 1-bedroom
- 3 x 2-bedroom
- 3 x 3-bedrooms
- 3 x 4-bedroom

Second Response (5 August 2019)

I spoke to Sanctuary on 31 July and they agreed the numbers I gave but I'm happy with either breakdown.

ECC Urban Design

First Response (29 April)

- 4.6 The site occupies an area of agricultural land to the west of the ribbon development along Little Wakering Road and, by restricting the development to the accord with the existing western extents of the built form of Little Wakering, allows the site to form a logical infill of the village as opposed to an extension beyond it. The area surrounding the site is largely occupied to the north, east and south by a mix of detached, semi-detached and occasional terrace properties from a range of eras, with most featuring extensive rear gardens. An exception to this is the area of 1970's properties on Townfield Walk and Old School Meadow which are less generous and, along with the utilities easement to the site's western edge, present the largest constraints.
- 4.7 There have been considerable enhancements to the layout and design of the site following pre-application discussions including greater emphasis given to the green fingers running through the site to the POS (public open space) and how these could be better designed to be functional green spaces and assist with softening of the parking spaces in the property forecourts. There have also been improvements to the visual appearance of the properties through adapting a subtle contemporary approach to design which is welcomed. The following points identify the positive elements of the scheme and aspects which it is considered could be enhanced.

Layout

- 4.8 The layout has been improved through revisions to the scheme, and the approach to focal buildings has also been enhanced and is now acceptable. The treatment to boundaries is also acceptable; however, I would ask that the distance from the rear of proposed properties 56-61 is checked against the rear elevations of existing properties on Townfield Walk.
- 4.9 Whilst it is an arrangement which we would aim to avoid wherever possible, the approach to the parking court area on the eastern side of the site is positive and could result in a successful space akin to that at 'The Avenue' in

Saffron Walden. I would like to push on the design team to make this space as high quality as possible.

Landscaping

- 4.10 A large proportion of the site is given over to soft landscaping which is a positive and key design element for the site. The approach to water run off and drainage is also welcomed; however, I would seek clarity on the attenuation feature – is this a basin which will hold standing water for a considerable amount of time? – if so, will it be fenced?
- 4.11 I have concerns on the appearance of the 3.5 cycle/ped lane which runs through the POS, which is identified to be laid to black tarmac. It would be preferable for this to be laid in a bound resin or even a buff coloured tarmac; however, it is understood that there are limited opportunities for materiality on an adopted path.
- 4.12 It is noted that the pumping station has been relocated to a less prominent position within the site, as suggested. It is, however, recommended that the pumping station building is integrated better with the adjacent parking court, e.g., forming a wall to the parking court which could be landscaped with climbing plants, etc. to help screen the structure.
- 4.13 There is shown to be some form of landscaping on the raised table in front of units 34/35. It is unclear from the landscape plans but it would be positive and highly recommended if this could be a raised planter with integrated seating which would allow for the space to be used more as a 'square' by residents than simply a raised table. This could be matched and tied in with the feature entry walls to the green finger streets, as indicated on the landscape plan.
- 4.14 I welcome the use of trees within the swales, as shown; however, I would seek further clarity on how the large spaces of what appears to be 'left over' space (eg. adjacent to plots 8 and 13) will be landscaped. Will they be accessible spaces with benches, etc. or laid to lawn? I would also seek further clarity on whether there will be under planting in tree planted verges.
- 4.15 I have a concern that the path from Southend Road into the development through the POS will not be lit at night and would therefore have a perception of safety given it is not overlooked and is likely to be well used. Could low level bollard lighting or similar, as well as lighting to the village sign, be considered to improve this.
- 4.16 It is unclear as to why a form of natural play has not been provided within the POS? This could be informal 'play along the way' type features which would complement the formal LEAP (local equipped area for play).

Materials

- 4.17 The material palette for the public realm spaces appears to be well considered, with a differing concrete paviour tone and treatment between the boulevard, green fingers and rural edges. This will help to contribute positively to each area of the development having a more distinct sense of place and identity.
- 4.18 I would expect all facing material to be covered by condition with relevant samples provided to RDC.

Parking

- 4.19 There are several examples across the site where on plot parking bays are not overlooked from the side elevation of dwellings. Can it be ensured that there is appropriate ground floor surveillance from side elevations to parking courts and private parking bays from at least one dwelling.
- 4.20 It is also welcomed that block paving will be utilised for the parking areas to the front of properties, as when this tarmac is applied to this arrangement it becomes a large expanse of blacktop which is unattractive. I would, however, seek clarity on how the parking bays would be demarcated? Would this be by markings on the block paving, a different tone of block for the bays in their entirety or around the edges?

Refuse

- 4.21 It appears that bin stores are to be provided on the ends of the swales/landscaped strips, which is not recommended as not only will this ruin the continuous run of soft landscaping but will also appear unsightly in the street scene and will also lead to rubbish blowing into the swales. It is recommended that other options for bin placement are considered, even behind the swales set within the landscaping inside the parking court area.
- 4.22 It is also suggested that the refuse bin storage areas in the front garden of properties are suitably enclosed in a structure which responds to the buildings with which they are associated, e.g., a small brick structure, potentially with the property number on the street facing elevation or similar. There is concern that bins will be left out in these spaces by residents and therefore create a cluttered street scene.

Elevations

- 4.23 The elevational treatments have been improved from those presented at pre-application stage, and generally they are positive examples of simple, contemporary design. Simple details such as double brick soldier courses, brick detail panels and recessed porches all contribute successfully to this. The following changes are recommended to be undertaken by the applicant:

-
- 4.24 - I welcome taller (2.5 storey) buildings on the key gateways to act as focal buildings and these are aligned with the general form and style which we wanted to see at the site and we welcome the use of corner turning windows to address both streets. It is, however, considered that the design of plots 06 and 16 (and others of the same house type) needs some tweaking. I am not convinced that the use of render is appropriate for the site as render tends to age poorly and can stain easily when not maintained properly. I would much rather see a different material, and when considering the materiality of buildings in the surrounding area it would be considered positive to utilise elements such as a modern take on hung tiles (<https://www.ibstockbrick.co.uk/tilebrick/> or <https://en.petersen-tegl.dk/cover/products/>), or alternatively a treatment which has been utilised successfully in other buildings of a similar design is that of wood shales.
- 4.25 The pitch is very steep and this is out of keeping with the surrounding area which generally has flat roofs or shallow hips and it is considered that the gateway building element could be achieved equally as clearly without relying on the vertical emphasis of the pitched gable end. It may be worth the architect firstly considering how a change in materiality could reduce this emphasis before a re-design to reduce the steepness of the pitch.
- 4.26 - H/T 4B6P: Either change render for alternative material (as above) or remove render from the gable and revert to brick treatment.
- 4.27 - Plot 61 should be re-elevated to improve the surveillance onto the street from the side elevation.
- 4.28 - H/T 4B7P – P4d: This house type needs revision or removing. The hipped roof arrangement is awkward and it is considered that, where possible, this building should be slightly taller where it forms a gateway building. Consideration should also be given to removing the render and replacing with an alternative material or be entirely brick.
- 4.29 - H/T 4B7P – P4f / P4e: See above comments on materiality.
- 4.30 - Flats 1B2P – A1a, A1b, A1c & S1: there is the opportunity to increase the pitch height slightly on this building to enhance this gable as a feature. Consideration should be given to replacing the render with wooden shales or tiles, as outlined above. The product type for the cladding around the windows on the north elevation and the canopy to the entrances has been outlined to me by the architect – however, I would like clarity on the final colour/material type decided.
- 4.31 - All buildings that face onto the shared space streets should have a secondary side elevation and, where possible, a secondary entrance from these streets (e.g., units 12, 102, 111 etc).

Second Response (5 August 2019)

- 4.32 There have been a substantial number of revisions to the design following correspondence on 26 April 2019, with the majority of the concerns or areas for enhancement addressed appropriately. I have reviewed the comments from the applicant team referring to the amendments made to the scheme since the last consultation, and have listed these below for reference:
- 4.33 - Issues pertaining to the distance to the rear of properties on Townfield Walk have been appropriately addressed.
- 4.34 - It has been clarified that the drainage attenuation basin will hold standing water and therefore will be fenced. The proposed treatment by way of 1.2m high estate railing is considered appropriate, particularly in the rural edge context of the basin.
- 4.35 - It is welcomed and appreciated that the material to the cycle path/footway through the POS has been amended to a buff coloured asphalt which is more in keeping with the green space.
- 4.36 - The issues raised relating to the prominence of the pumping station have been addressed through both the use of parking and vertical planting around the structure itself.
- 4.37 - I recognise the applicant's reluctance to provide seating around the central junction space and the preference for locating seating within the POS. Whilst I believe that this would have helped activate and 'traffic calm' the junction, creating more of a space than simply a raised junction, I am happy to accept this provided a positive approach is taken to landscaping around the space. Following a review of the proposed planting scheme, as outlined by Richard Morris Architects, I am confident that the planting scheme proposed will be of sufficient quality, not only at the junction spaces, but across the development as a whole.
- 4.38 - I welcome and appreciate the applicant proposing to include low level bollard lighting to the footway/cycle path which would encourage its use during the evening.
- 4.39 - I have not seen the proposals for the LAP/LEAP at the site; however, this could be an oversight on my part and I would be happy to review this if provided prior to the case officer completing their Committee report.
- 4.40 - It is noted that many of the house types have been amended to include windows facing onto parking areas on side elevations as requested. This is positive and will help enhance informal surveillance over vehicles.

- 4.41 - I agree with the applicant that the use of soldier course sett detailing to demarcate parking bays without communal parking areas is appropriate and a subtle way of defining these spaces.
- 4.42 - The refuse strategy has been improved and is now considered acceptable from a design perspective. I would, however, question what methods are in place, if any, to restrict residents leaving their bins at the bin collection points throughout the week as opposed to just on bin collection day
- 4.43 - The material palette has been amended to reflect earlier comments, particularly in relation to the feature buildings with strong vertical pitched gables onto the street. The use of Ibstock Tilebrick is welcomed, as is the removal of rende, and I am happy with the material composition of the units as shown on elevations and street scenes.
- 4.44 - The replacement of P4d with P4f house type is positive and removes the awkward shape and arrangement of the earlier house type.
- 4.45 - Secondary elevations have been provided to house types that front onto public spaces as recommended – this will help to ensure that buildings turn corners successfully and provide sufficient surveillance onto side streets.
- 4.46 In summary, the design has been through multiple iterations to address urban design comments which has resulted in an attractive, contemporary scheme which will create its own strong sense of identity and place. The design is modern with interesting elements and architectural features, with a strong landscape emphasis which will help to soften the largely brick buildings. I have no reservations in recommending this scheme for approval.

ECC Highways

First Response (08/02/19)

- 4.47 I have reviewed the additional information related to the access arrangements at Land of Barrow Hall Road undertaken by David Tucker Associates. The report considers a number of options for access to the development site and investigates condition 45 that was added at the request of Members.
- 4.48 A restricted movements junction will raise a number of safety concerns, with vehicles trying to turn left, a movement that would encroach into oncoming flow of traffic. The introduction of physical measures would also be to the detriment of existing local residents' vehicle accesses. A banned movement would also introduce considerable signage and street clutter with further implications to servicing/waste collection and deliveries. A restriction would also be subject to a Traffic Regulation Order, which is separate to the planning process.

- 4.49 Alternative access points to the development are not considered acceptable to the Highway Authority on technical grounds (Star Lane) and ownership (Old School Meadows).
- 4.50 The majority of vehicle movements from the site will travel east along Barrow Hall Road and head in a southerly direction towards Southend. There is no highway reason (policy or technical) to restrict left turn movements from the site. Therefore, the position of the Highway Authority remains the same and that the proposed junction of the development shall be provided to permit all turning movements and the Highway Authority agrees with the findings of the report.

Second Response (6 August 2019)

- 4.51 The applicant's attention should be drawn to the parking bays at dwellings nos. 31-34, 43-46, 57, 58, 69, 109 and 110 with the potential of cars parking across the footway (where relevant) into the carriageway. This could be addressed by moving spaces forward to the back edge footway. The disabled visitor bays in front of plot 14 need only be standard bays.
- 4.52 From a highway and transportation perspective the impact of the proposal is acceptable to the Highway Authority.
- 4.53 Conditions:
- 4.54 Prior to commencement of the development, the areas within the curtilage of the site for the purpose of loading/unloading/reception and storage of building materials and manoeuvring of all vehicles, including construction traffic, shall be provided clear of the highway.
- 4.55 No development shall take place, including any ground works or demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for:
- i. the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
 - ii. loading and unloading of plant and materials
 - iii. storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
 - iv. wheel and underbody washing facilities

ECC Archaeology (16/01/19)

- 4.56 An archaeological evaluation has already been carried out on this site and no further archaeological work is required.

RDC Economic Development

- 4.57 BT Open Reach will install Fibre to the Premises (FTTP) for free for developments over 30 dwellings so there will be no cost to the developers and it will just make their houses more marketable as every purchaser wants good broadband speeds. If it is too late please can you pass Sanctuary this information anyway so they can hopefully arrange an initial site visit to consider it? If you can pass details below to the developers it will be appreciated:-
- 4.58 Open Reach's offer to provide fibre free of charge to developers still stands, in fact in a lot of cases they will also include developments of less than 30 dwellings. The developers must register the site as soon as possible, because it can take up to 9 months for Open Reach to plan and deploy the network.

<https://www.ournetwork.openreach.co.uk/property-development.aspx>

Health & Safety Executive (29 July 2019)

- 4.59 HSE does not advise, on safety grounds, against the granting of planning permission in this case.

Sport England (7 January 2019)

- 4.60 If the proposal involves the provision of additional housing then it will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then new and/or improved sports facilities should be secured and delivered in accordance with any approved local policy for social infrastructure and priorities set out in any Playing Pitch Strategy or Built Sports Facility Strategy that the local authority has in place.
- 4.61 In line with the Government's NPPF (including Section 8) and PPG (Health and wellbeing section), consideration should also be given to how any new development, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities.

Essex Police (24 July 2019)

- 4.62 We note the developers' desire to apply the principles of Secured by Design. As such, we would like to invite the developers to contact us with a view to discussing the Secured By Design principles further.

Natural England**First Response (14 January 2019)**

- 4.63 It has been identified that this development site falls within the 'Zone of Influence' (Zoi) of one or more of the European designated sites scoped into

the Essex Coast Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS).

- 4.64 In the context of your duty as competent authority under the provisions of the Habitats Regulations, it is therefore anticipated that, without mitigation, new residential development in this location is 'likely to have a significant effect' on one or more European designated sites, through increased recreational pressure, either when considered 'alone' or 'in combination' with other plans and projects.
- 4.65 We therefore advise that you consider whether this proposal falls within the scope of the Essex Coast RAMS. Where it does, you must undertake a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) (Stage 2: Appropriate Assessment) to secure any necessary recreational disturbance mitigation and record this decision within your planning documentation.
- 4.66 Having reviewed the planning documents for this application, it appears that you have not yet undertaken an HRA (Stage 2: Appropriate Assessment) to consider this issue. We therefore advise that you do so now using our suggested template and that you should not grant permission until such time as the HRA has been carried out and the conclusions confirmed in line with our guidance.

Second Response (8 July 2019)

- 4.67 We are satisfied that the mitigation described in your Appropriate Assessment is in line with our strategic-level advice (our reference 244199, dated 16 August 2018 and summarised at Annex 1). The mitigation should rule out an 'adverse effect on the integrity' (AEOI) of the European designated sites that are included within the Essex Coast RAMS from increased recreational disturbance.
- 4.68 We advise that an appropriate planning condition or obligation is attached to any planning permission to secure the on-site mitigation measures. The financial contribution should be secured through an appropriate and legally binding agreement, in order to ensure no adverse effect on integrity.

Anglian Water (31 July 2019)

- 4.69 Please be advised that we have been unable to comment on this occasion as there are no foul drainage documents available on your website.

Local Residents

FIRST CONSULTATION RESPONSE

- 4.70 5 comments received from the following addresses:

Barrow Hall Road: The Paddock (12 January 2019), The Gables (12 January 2019), Foxgloves (15 January 2019),
Kimberley Road: 43 (12 January 2019)
Townfield Walk: 5 (8 January 2019)

The comments can be summarised as follows:

- Complaint about consultation time frame
- Querying if plans are same as for the outline application
- Noise pollution
- Views
- Road safety issues using Barrow Hall Road
- One way system should be considered entering from Barrow Hall Road, exiting onto Star Lane mini roundabout with sufficient width for emergency and refuse vehicles
- Not enough parking spaces; cars will park on Barrow Hall Road and Little Waking Road
- Advertisement saying village is near a main line rail station is short sighted
- Not 10 minutes walk to local supermarket; people will drive to Co-op
- Infrastructure at saturation point
- Condition regarding no exit to travel west onto Barrow Hall Road from development; this has been ignored
- Child safety issues due to children's play area directly adjacent to attenuation area
- Road layouts not designed to reduce speeds to 20mph
- Current road surfaces are at life expectancy looking at pot holes and surface defects
- The road is not 11m wide for its width and is unsuitable as an access/egress for the development under current safety standards
- Does the Council know about and adopt the Sustainable Safety approach to achieve better road safety as adopted in Holland?
- Means of reducing speed such as road humps on Barrow Hall Road
- Problem of amount of traffic entering junction at Little Waking Road

SECOND CONSULTATION RESPONSE:

4 comments received from the following addresses:

Old School Meadow: 7 (24 July 2019)
Havenside: 36 (24 July 2019)
Little Waking Road: 33 (31 July 2019)
Southend Road: San Agustin (1 August 2019)

These can be summarised as follows:

- Extra traffic and road impact

- School capacity
- Access onto Barrow Hall Road is a safety issue
- Road for construction traffic was going to be put from the tip road to the site just for the duration of the build. Why is this no longer happening?
- Little Wakering Road is pretty much a slalom course already, especially at school times, and this is just going to make it worse
- Impact on infrastructure and shops – doctors, Co-op, secondary school, bus service
- Houses on Star Lane not sold and being rented so why build more?
- Concern around surface water and sewerage
- Ecology impact – shrews, newts, bats, owls present
- What is the big mound in the field, of historic importance?
- Do know there is a need for more housing, although plenty of properties above shops lying empty
- Would affect value, own homes not Council tenants
- Once rural village community has had more than its share of large developments over the last few years, leading to a totally different character, inferior, living experience.
- Increased traffic already from other developments; difficult to park in village
- Need for housing, especially affordable housing, in the country as a whole, has become great, but Great Wakering has already had enough pressure put on it to solve this problem
- Quality of life in village has reduced over last 5/10 years, this development will reduce it further

Shoeburyness Residents Association (7 January 2019)

- 4.71 We accept that many more homes are needed in this part of South East Essex but are getting more and more concerned about the effect additional homes will have on our already overloaded roads in the east of Southend which of course also includes many Wakering and South East Essex residents.
- 4.72 We would therefore ask that you contact Southend Borough Council Planning to help put together a solution to this worsening road congestion problem which could become dire for many Rochford and Shoeburyness residents if the above and the new football stadium and other planning requests are agreed before serious attention is given to an inner or outer ring road.

5 EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 An Equality Impact Assessment has been completed and found there to be no impacts (either positive or negative) on protected groups as defined under the Equality Act 2010.

6 CONCLUSION

- 6.1 The proposal is considered not to cause undue demonstrable harm to any development plan interests, other material considerations or to the character and appearance of the area such as to justify refusing the application.



Marcus Hotten

Assistant Director, Place & Environment

Relevant Development Plan Policies and Proposals

Allocations Plan (2014) – SER9a

Core Strategy (2011) - policies H1, H3, H4, H5, CP1, ENV1, ENV3, ENV4, ENV5, ENV8, ENV9, CLT1, CLT2, CLT3, CLT4, CLT5, CLT6, CLT7, CLT8, T1, T2, T3, T5, T6, T8

Development Management Plan (2014) - policies DM1, DM2, DM4, DM5, DM25, DM26, DM27, DM28, DM29, DM30 and DM31.

Parking Standards: Design and Good Practice Supplementary Planning Document (2010)

Supplementary Planning Document 2 Housing Design (2007)

Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard. Adopted March 2015.

Background Papers

None.

For further information please contact Claire Buckley on:-

Phone: 01702 318127

01702 318127

Email: Claire.buckley@rochford.gov.uk

Claire.buckley@rochford.gov.uk

If you would like this report in large print, Braille or another language please contact 01702 318111.

Appendix 1

National Technical Housing Standard Assessment					
House Type	Gross Internal Floor Area (m ²)	Storage (m ²)	Single bed size (m ²) & width (m)	Double bed size (m ²) and width (m)	Ceiling Height (m)
A1a (plot 51)	1b2p 50 (50 required and met) ✓	0.84 - plus store in corridor to share between 2 flats at 0.64 per flat (1.5 required and met) ✓	N/A	✓	Agent confirms minimum achieved for all house types
A1b (plot 52)	1b2p 50 (50 required and met) ✓	0.84 - plus store in corridor to share between 2 flats at 0.64 per flat (1.5 required and met) ✓	N/A	✓	
A1a (plot 53)	1b2p 50 (50 required and met) ✓	1.5 (1.5 required and met)	N/A	✓	
A1b (plot 55)	1b2p 50 (50 required and met) ✓	1.5 (1.5 required and met)	N/A	✓	
A1c (plot 54)	1b2p 50 (50 required and met) ✓	1.6 (1.5 required and met)	N/A	✓	
A2b	2b4p 79 (79 required and met) ✓	2.9 (2 required and met) ✓	N/A	✓	
A2c	2b4p 79 (79 required and met) ✓	3.3 (2 required and met) ✓	N/A	✓	
S1	1b2p 50 (50 required and met) ✓	1.6 (1.5 required and met) ✓	N/A	✓	
A2a	2b4p	6 (2 required and met) ✓	✓	✓	

National Technical Housing Standard Assessment					
House Type	Gross Internal Floor Area (m ²)	Storage (m ²)	Single bed size (m ²) & width (m)	Double bed size (m ²) and width (m)	Ceiling Height (m)
	79 (79 required and met) ✓				
A3	3b5p 94 (93 required and met)	5 (2.5 required and met)	✓	✓	
A4a	4b5p 110 (97 required and met)	3.6 (3 required and met)	✓	✓	
A4b	4b5p 106 (97 required and met)	3.3 (3 required and met)	✓	✓	
P1a	1b2p 51 (50 required and met) ✓	2 (1.5 required and met) ✓	N/A	✓	
P1b	1b2p 57 (50 required and met) ✓	2 (1.5 required and met) ✓	N/A	✓	
P2a	2b4p 79 (79 required and met) ✓	6.6 (2 required and met) ✓	N/A	✓	
P2b	2b4p 79 (79 required and met) ✓	2.1 (2 required and met) ✓	N/A	✓	
P2c	2b4p 79 (79 required and met) ✓	3.2 (2 required and met) ✓	N/A	✓	
P3a	3b4p 93 (84 required and met)	3.4 & 4 (2.5 required and met)	✓	✓	
P3b	3b4p 92 (84 required and met)	2.6 (2.5 required and met)	✓	✓	

National Technical Housing Standard Assessment					
House Type	Gross Internal Floor Area (m ²)	Storage (m ²)	Single bed size (m ²) & width (m)	Double bed size (m ²) and width (m)	Ceiling Height (m)
P3c	3b5p 100 (93 required and met)	6.4 (2.5 required for 3b5p)	✓	✓	
P3d	3b4p 93 (84 required and met)	2.7 (2.5 required and met)	✓	✓	
P4a	4b5p 107 (97 required and met)	3.5 (3 required and met)	✓	✓	
P4b	4b6p 115 (106 required and met)	4.2 (3 required)	✓	✓	
P4c	4b5p 114 (97 required and met)	4.9 (3 required and met)	✓	✓	
P4e	4b7p 121 (121 required and met)	5.3 (3 required and met)	✓	✓	
P4f	4b7p 121 (121 required and met) ✓	5.1 (3 required and met)	✓	✓	
S2	2b4p 79 (79 required and met) ✓	6.4 (2 required and met) ✓	✓	✓	
S3	3b4p 93 (84 required and met)	3.5 (2.5 required and met)	✓	✓	
S4a	4b5p 110 (97 required and met)	3.5 (3 required and met)	✓	✓	

National Technical Housing Standard Assessment					
House Type	Gross Internal Floor Area (m ²)	Storage (m ²)	Single bed size (m ²) & width (m)	Double bed size (m ²) and width (m)	Ceiling Height (m)
S4b	4b5p 107 (97 required and met)	3.5 (3 required and met)	✓	✓	

Appendix 2

Plot Number	Garden size required	Garden size
1	100	100
2	100	124
3	100	100
4	100	157
5	100	100
6	100	100
7	100	127
8	100	101
9	50 (terrace)	122
10	50 (terrace)	81
11	50 (terrace)	81
12	50 (terrace)	76
13	100	100
14	100	143
15	100	120
16	100	100
17	100	105
18	100	131
19	100	154
20	100	199
21	50	74
22	50	74
23	100	101
24	100	100
25	50	65
26	50	96
27	50	51
28	100	113
29	100	119
30	50	88
31	50	126
32	100	116
33	100	126
34	100	133
35	100	131
36	100	117
37	100	115
38	100	114
39	100	113
40	100	114
41	100	114
42	100	143
43	100	136

Plot Number	Garden size required	Garden size
44	100	115
45	100	120
46	5m2 or 25m2	190/4 = 48
47	5m2 or 25m2	190/4 = 48
48	5m2 or 25m2	190/4 = 48
49	5m2 or 25m2	190/4 = 48
50	5m2 or 25m2	50
51	5m2 or 25m2	337/5 = 67
52	5m2 or 25m2	337/5 = 67
53	5m2 or 25m2	337/5 = 67
54	5m2 or 25m2	337/5 = 67
55	5m2 or 25m2	337/5 = 67
56	50	100
57	50	81
58	50	130
59	50	128
60	50	128
61	50	110
62	100	100
63	50	93
64	50	90
65	50	98
66	50	62
67	50	64
68	50	72
69	100	156
70	50	78
71	50	60
72	50	114
73	50	64
74	50	59
75	50	62
76	50	63
77	50	72
78	100	116
79	100	120
80	100	118
81	100 (terrace)	116
82	50 (terrace)	77
83	50 (terrace)	93
84	50 (terrace)	78
85	50 (terrace)	82
86	50 (terrace)	97
87	100	100
88	100	91
89	100	100

Plot Number	Garden size required	Garden size
90	100	100
91	100	90
92	100	100
93	50 (terrace)	80
94	50 (terrace)	82
95	50 (terrace)	101
96	50 (terrace)	93
97	50 (terrace)	77
98	50 (terrace)	100
99	100	117
100	100	100
101	100	100
102	100	107
103	50 (terrace)	90
104	50 (terrace)	77
105	50 (terrace)	77
106	50 (terrace)	76
107	100	116
108	100	130
109	100	103
110	50	55
111	100	125
112	50 (terrace)	70
113	50 (terrace)	82
114	50 (terrace)	94
115	50 (terrace)	73
116	50 (terrace)	78
117	50 (terrace)	98
118	100	102
119	100	145
120	100	100

18/01129/REM

