

21/01132/FUL

7 HILLSIDE AVENUE, HAWKWELL

**DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING AND
DEVELOPMENT OF 2NO. LINK DETACHED HOUSES WITH
ASSOCIATED EXTERNAL WORKS AND AMENITY**

APPLICANT: **C REDDAN**
ZONING: **UNALLOCATED**
PARISH: **HAWKWELL PARISH COUNCIL**
WARD: **HAWKWELL WEST**

1 RECOMMENDATION

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

That planning permission be refused for the following reason:-

1. The proposed development, by virtue of its layout and setting, would create building plots and dwellings which would not successfully reference the prevailing character of the area proving out of keeping with the more spacious established pattern of development and detrimental to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore lack local flavour contrary to policy CP1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy and fail to achieve a positive relationship with nearby dwellings contrary to policies DM1 and DM3 of the Council's adopted Development Management Plan and would fail to add to the overall quality of the area in conflict with paragraph 130 a) to the NPPF.

2 PLANNING APPLICATION DETAILS

- 2.1 Planning permission is being sought to demolish the existing dwelling and erect a pair of link detached, two storey dwellings with associated external works and amenity. New vehicular crossovers would be created onto Hillside Avenue to serve the dwellings. Each dwelling would have an external depth of approximately 15.7m at its deepest point, and width of approximately 7.9m at its widest point. Approximate heights would be 5.1m to eaves, 8.8m to the main ridge and 7.9m to the ridge of the front wing. Materials would be red face brickwork at ground floor with upper walls in white painted render, with grey plain roof tiles.

- 2.2 This application represents a resubmission following refusal of the application reference: 21/00161/FUL. In order to address the previous reasons for refusal around character and parking the applicant has provided a pair of link detached dwellings with hipped roof forms and integral garages.

3 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Site and Context

- 3.1 The application site is located on the eastern side of Hillside Avenue, a crescent shaped road reached via Hawkwell Chase, off Main Road which passes through Hawkwell.
- 3.2 The character and appearance of the street scene is mixed in terms of design, size and scale of buildings. The application site contains a reasonably wide bungalow with a rear dormer. It is located between a detached house to the north (No. 5) and a more modest semi-detached bungalow of similar design to No. 7 Hillside Avenue to the south (No.9). No.7 and No. 9 Hillside Avenue are separated by an access drive and a respective single, pitched roofed garage within the grounds of No. 9. Opposite are detached bungalows. In the wider area the mix of single and two storey dwellings continues. The application site has a frontage width of approximately 18 metres, and depth between approximately 42.2m and 45.6m (the site area is given as 770 sq.m on the application form; 0.077 hectares). The front is mostly laid to hardstanding comprising parking spaces and the rear garden is mostly laid to lawn.

Relevant Planning History

- 3.3 05/01000/FUL – REFUSED - Addition of First Floor to Create 4-Bed House from Existing Bungalow.
- 3.4 06/00478/FUL – REFUSED - Addition of First Floor to Create 4-Bed House from Existing Bungalow.
- 3.5 06/00838/FUL – APPROVED - Addition of First Floor to Create 4-Bed House from Existing Bungalow.
- 3.6 21/00161/FUL – REFUSED - Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of 2No. detached four-bedroomed houses with associated external works and amenity.
- 3.7 The reasons for refusal were as follows:-
1. The proposed development by virtue of its layout and setting would create building plots and dwellings which would not successfully reference the prevailing character of the area proving out of keeping with the more spacious established pattern of development and detrimental to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore lack local flavour contrary to policy CP1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy and fail to achieve a positive relationship

with nearby dwellings contrary to policies DM1 and DM3 of the Council's adopted Development Management Plan and would fail to add to the overall quality of the area in conflict with paragraph 130 a) to the NPPF.

2. The application does not include a mechanism to secure suitable mitigation in the form of a standard contribution towards the Essex Coast Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) or otherwise. This means that the development could potentially have a significant adverse effect on the sensitive interest features of coastal European designated sites, through increased recreational pressure from future occupiers of the development and contrary to Policy ENV1 to the Council's adopted Core Strategy, the NPPF and Natural England Standing Advice relating to The Conservation of Habitat and Species Regulations 2017 (Habitat Regulations).
3. The proposal would not provide the necessary visitor parking space and, as a result, would lead to the potential for unacceptable on street parking due to the site's location away from Hockley town centre and Hockley station. Such lack of parking provision would be contrary to the Council's Parking Standards SPD and policy T8 of the Core Strategy 2011 and DM30 of the Development Management Plan 2014 which seek adherence to the parking requirements within the SPD.

Principle of Development

- 3.8 The proposed development must be assessed against relevant planning policy and with regard to any other material planning considerations. In determining this application regard must be had to section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (TCPA 1990) and paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which requires that planning applications are determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The relevant parts of the adopted Development Plan are the Rochford District Core Strategy (2011), the Allocations Plan (2014) and the Development Management Plan (2014).
- 3.9 Paragraph 71 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) encourages the effective use of land in meeting the need for homes whilst maintaining the desirability of preserving an area's prevailing character and setting (including residential gardens). Additionally, the NPPF sets out the requirement that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption of sustainable development and at paragraph 126 the NPPF asserts good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and is indivisible from good planning and proposals should contribute positively to making places better for people.
- 3.10 The application site is located within the residential envelope of Hawkwell, and more efficient use of land for housing provision is acceptable in principle; however, consideration must be given to whether the proposed infill

development is appropriate in terms of scale, character and other considerations.

- 3.11 Policy H1 of the Core Strategy confirms that the Council will prioritise the reuse of previously developed land. Additionally, in order to protect the character of existing settlements the Council will resist the intensification of smaller sites within residential areas, but that limited infilling will be considered acceptable, and will continue to contribute towards the housing supply. However, this is subject to the requirement that it relates well to the existing street pattern, density and character of the locality.
- 3.12 The NPPF at paragraphs 130 and 134 also advises that planning decisions for proposed housing development should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and requires that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions; this is also emphasised by Core Strategy Policy CP1.
- 3.13 Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM1 of the Development Management Plan both seek to promote high quality design in new developments that would promote the character of the locality. Amongst other criteria, Policy DM3 of the Development Management Plan seeks demonstration that residential intensification positively addresses the existing street pattern and density of the locality, and whether the number and types of dwellings proposed are appropriate having regard to existing character.
- 3.14 In terms of housing need, the Council has an up to date 5-year housing land supply; however, additional windfall sites such as this would add to housing provision in the district.
- 3.15 The development is one that proposes re-development of the site for an intensified residential purpose. National and local policies encourage the effective use of land. Whilst the principle of developing the site for a residential purpose is not objected to at this site, the main issues for consideration relate to the acceptability of the development as an infill development, including issues of scale and impact on character, as well as impacts on residential amenity; these and other issues are explored below.

Impact on Character

- 3.16 Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy and policies DM1 and DM3 of the Development Management Plan are applicable to the consideration of design. These coupled with the NPPF aim to ensure good design, taking into account matters including architectural style, layout, materials, visual impact and height, scale and bulk. The NPPF is clear that good design is indivisible from good planning and development of a poor design should be refused.

- 3.17 The application site is currently occupied by a detached bungalow that has an elongated emphasis fronting Hillside Avenue. This part of Hillside Avenue consists of an eclectic mix of architectural styles. In considering the mixed character and appearance of the surrounding area, with significant variations in height, scale and design, there are no requirements in this location to follow distinctly on design.
- 3.18 The proposed dwellings would follow the existing building line along the northern part of Hillside Avenue. The positioning of the proposed dwellings is not objected to, in principle; the proposed dwellings, by virtue of their siting, would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the street.
- 3.19 The proposed layout would achieve a 1.1m separation distance between plot 1 and No. 5 Hillside Avenue and a 0.9m distance between plot 2 and No. 9 Hillside Avenue. With regard to plot width, plot 1 would provide a distance of 9.1m and plot 2 would provide a distance of 8.9m. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document 2 – Housing Design requires a distance of 9.25m for detached dwellings or 15.25m for semi-detached pairs or for the development to be of such frontage and form compatible with the existing form and character of the area within which they are to be sited. The link detached dwellings are only attached by garage; they are otherwise detached and should be assessed as such when considering SPD2. Therefore changing the dwellings from a detached to a link detached form is not considered to address the issue around plot widths which was a reason for refusal of the previous application as the 9.25m minimum frontage criteria is still considered to apply. All dwellings to the north within Hillside Avenue have plot widths from 10.6m to 15.7m, much greater than the 8.9m and 9.1m proposed here. There is only one dwelling that has a width similar to the application site which is at No.17 Hillside Avenue; however, this predates SPD2, which was adopted in 2007, and the majority of detached dwellings have wide frontages and adhere to the minimum 9.25m frontage criteria. The proposal is not considered to be compatible with the existing form and character of the area, contrary to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 2 – Housing Design.
- 3.20 In terms of scale, the height of the dwellings would be increased from the previously refused scheme from approximately 8.3m to 8.8m but with a hipped roof rather than a gable ended roof form. The depth at first floor has been reduced from 13.2m at its maximum to 12.1m at its maximum and the single storey rear projection has also been reduced from 3.3m to 2.7m.
- 3.21 The scale and bulk of the proposed dwellings would be situated on plots that are tightly knit and are substantially smaller than the adjoining plots within Hillside Avenue. The proposed layout and setting would not have a good relationship with the surrounding area, with the poor plot width resulting in a tightly packed development at odds with the more spacious character of the locality. It is not considered that the amendment to the scheme to create a link detached pair of dwellings, which are also greater in height than the previously refused scheme, has addressed the previous reason for refusal

relating to impact on character. In this context, the development as proposed would result in an incongruous and cramped form of development out of character with and detrimental to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area. The layout of the dwellings proposed would not successfully reference the prevailing character of the area appearing out of keeping, to the detriment of the surrounding street scene, contrary to Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy, policies DM1 and DM3 of the Development Management Plan and the NPPF.

Impact on Residential Amenity

- 3.22 Paragraph 130 (f) of the NPPF seeks to create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. This is reflected in Policy DM1, which seeks to ensure that new developments avoid overlooking, ensuring privacy and promoting visual amenity, and create a positive relationship with existing and nearby buildings. Policy DM3 also requires an assessment of the proposal's impact on residential amenity.
- 3.23 The application site is adjoined by five neighbouring properties. To the north is No. 5 Hillside Avenue, to the east (rear) are Nos. 23, 25 and 27 Bosworth Close and to the south is No. 9 Hillside Avenue.
- 3.24 The main bulk of the dwellings would sit a minimum of 3.2 metres from the neighbouring dwelling to the north (No. 5) and 8.5m from the neighbouring dwelling to the south (No. 9). To the rear, the dwellings would be two storey with a hipped roof form and a single storey flat roofed projection that have been designed to mitigate from having an overbearing impact from the adjacent neighbouring dwellings. Due to the articulated design of the dwellings and the resulting considerable degree of separation with garden depths to the proposed dwellings of some 21-23m and the depth of those gardens to the properties backing onto the site in Bosworth Close exceeding the required distance back to back of at least 25m, it is not considered that the proposed development would cause any significant issues with regard to loss of light or privacy to these neighbouring occupiers or that it would have an overbearing impact.
- 3.25 Windows would exist at first floor level in the northern and southern flank elevations. These windows would serve bathrooms and stairwell/landing areas which are deemed non habitable rooms. It is considered that the internal layout, the siting of windows, and the positions of buildings would ensure that no material loss of privacy would arise for neighbouring residents. A condition requiring these first floor side windows to be obscure glazed and fixed shut below a height of 1.7m should be attached to any approval. There is a window proposed at ground floor to the southern elevation of plot 2 serving an open plan kitchen/dining/family room. As there is a difference in land levels between plot 2 and No. 9 Hillside Avenue there is the potential for overlooking from this window and a similar condition should be imposed.

- 3.26 The Council's 45 degree test is respected in relation to the proposed depth of siting in relation to the neighbouring properties either side and accordingly the development would not give rise to significant overshadowing.
- 3.27 The development would not therefore give rise to material overlooking or overshadowing of neighbouring properties, nor would it over dominate the outlook enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers given the good separation distances maintained between properties. The proposal is compliant with policies DM1 and DM3 of the Development Management Plan.

Garden Sizes

- 3.28 Policy DM3 of the Development Management Plan requires the provision of adequate and usable private amenity space. In addition, the Council's adopted Housing Design SPD advises a suitable garden size for each type of dwelling house. Paragraph 130 criterion (f) of the NPPF seeks the creation of places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.
- 3.29 Supplementary Planning Document 2 requires a minimum 100m² garden area for all new dwellings except one and two-bedroom dwellings where a minimum private garden area of 50 m² would be required. The proposed development would provide two, four-bed dwellings. Both of the properties would be provided with rear private amenity spaces of 202m² and 197m², in excess of the required 100m² which would satisfy the outdoor amenity space requirements, as set out in SPD2.

Impact on Highway Safety

- 3.30 Policies DM1 and DM3 of the Development Management Plan require sufficient car parking and Policy DM30 of the Development Management Plan aims to create and maintain an accessible environment, requiring development proposals to provide sufficient parking facilities having regard to the Council's adopted parking standards.
- 3.31 The Parking Standards Design and Good Practice Guide (2010) states that for dwellings with two bedrooms, two off street car parking spaces are required with dimensions of 5.5m x 2.9m. Garage spaces should measure 7m x 3m to be considered usable spaces.
- 3.32 In accordance with paragraph 111 of the NPPF, it must be noted that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.
- 3.33 The site plan shows two proposed vehicular accesses onto Hillside Avenue. Two car parking spaces measuring to the preferred bay size, as stipulated in the Parking Standards, would be provided per dwelling. In addition to this, the proposal now includes the provision of two integral garages measuring 7m x 3m in accordance with the Parking Standards SPD. This would now provide

both resident and visitor parking bays and would address the previous reason for refusal no.3.

- 3.34 It is not considered that the proposed development would be to the detriment of highway safety or the free flow of traffic and it is therefore considered to comply with the Parking Standards and policies DM1 and DM30 of the Development Management Plan and the NPPF.

Sustainability issues

- 3.35 The Ministerial Statement of 25 March 2015 announced changes to the government's policy relating to technical housing standards. The changes sought to rationalise the many differing existing standards into a simpler, streamlined system and introduced new additional optional Building Regulations on water and access and a new national space standard.
- 3.36 Rochford District Council has existing policies relating to all of the above, namely 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.
- 3.37 Until such time as existing Policy DM4 is revised, this policy must be applied in light of the Ministerial Statement. All new dwellings are therefore required to comply with the new national space standard, as set out in the DCLG Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standard March 2015. As a result of a reduction in size of the dwellings, the plots are now four-bedroom, 6-person dwellings over two storeys which would require a minimum gross internal area of 106 square metres with 3 square metres of built in storage. Each proposed dwelling would have approximately 145 square metres of gross internal area including built in storage. The proposed dwellings would meet Policy DM4 considered in light of the nationally described space standard.
- 3.38 Until such 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. A condition is recommended to ensure compliance with this Building Regulation requirement.
- 3.39 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.

Trees and On Site Ecological Considerations

- 3.40 Policy DM25 of the Development Management Plan seeks to protect existing trees particularly those with high amenity value. There are trees and shrubs situated to the eastern and southern boundaries of the site. Some of the trees and shrubs would have to either be removed or pruned. The trees are not protected and, whilst they offer some visual amenity within the site, are not considered to be of any significance and therefore the works to the trees are considered acceptable.
- 3.41 The application site falls within the 'Zone of Influence' for one or more of the European designated sites scoped into the emerging Essex Coast Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS). This means that residential developments could potentially have a significant effect on the sensitive interest features of these coastal European designated sites, through increased recreational pressures.
- 3.42 The development for an additional dwelling falls below the scale at which bespoke advice is given from Natural England (NE). To accord with NE's requirements and standard advice and Essex Coastal Recreational Disturbance Avoidance, a Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) record has been completed to assess if the development would constitute a 'Likely Significant Effect' (LSE) to a European Site in terms of increased recreational disturbance. The findings from HRA Stage 1: Screening Assessment are listed below:

HRA Stage 1: Screening Assessment – Test 1 – the significant test

Is the development within the zone of influence (Zoi) for the Essex Coast RAMS? - Yes

Does the planning application fall within the following development types? - Yes. The proposal is for two dwellings

Proceed to HRA Stage 2: Appropriate Assessment - Test 2 – the integrity test

Is the proposal for 100 houses + (or equivalent)? - No

Is the proposal within or directly adjacent to one of the above European designated sites? - No

- 3.43 As the answer is no, it is advised that a proportionate financial contribution should be secured in line with the Essex Coast RAMS requirements. Provided this mitigation is secured, it can be concluded that this planning application would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the above European sites from recreational disturbances, when considered 'in combination' with other development. Natural England does not need to be consulted on this Appropriate Assessment.

- 3.44 As competent authority, the Local Planning Authority concludes that the proposal is within the scope of the Essex Coast RAMS as it falls within the 'zone of influence' for likely impacts and is a relevant residential development type. It is anticipated that such development in this area is 'likely to have a significant effect' upon the interest features of the aforementioned designated sites through increased recreational pressure, when considered either alone or in combination. It is considered that mitigation would, in the form of a financial contribution, be necessary in this case. The required financial contribution of £127.30 per dwelling (total £254.60) has been paid to the Local Planning Authority.

4 CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS

Hawkwell Parish Council

- 4.1 My Council continues to object to this application on the grounds set out in its response dated 16 June 2021.

Previous response as follows:-

- 4.2 My Council objects to this application on the grounds that the parking amenity space allocated per plot of two car parking spaces does not comply with the District Council's policy, which is the provision of three car parking spaces for dwellings of this size. As the proposed dwellings are situated on a fairly narrow cul-de-sac where on street parking is limited, there is a genuine concern that these dwellings would each need to have at least three parking spaces; especially as there are no garages proposed in the application. In addition, the lamppost and telegraph poles situated along the frontage of the existing bungalow may restrict the entrances to the proposed dwellings, resulting in the two proposed parking spaces per dwelling not being easily accessible.

ECC Highways

- 4.3 From a highway and transportation perspective the impact of the proposal is acceptable to the Highway Authority, subject to the following conditions:-
1. No development shall take place, including any ground works or demolition, until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The approved plan shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Plan 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

2. Prior to first occupation of the development each vehicular access shall be constructed at right angles to the highway boundary and to the existing carriageway. Each access shall align with the parking area and at its junction with the highway shall not be more than 4.5 metres and shall be provided with an appropriate dropped kerb vehicular crossing of the footway and highway verge. Any redundant parts of the existing access on the frontage shall be suitably and permanently closed incorporating the reinstatement to full height of the highway verge, footway and kerbing immediately the proposed new accesses are brought into first beneficial use.
3. No unbound material shall be used in the surface treatment of the vehicular accesses within 6 metres of the highway boundary.
4. Prior to first occupation of the development, the external vehicle parking areas shall be provided as shown on planning drawing 20.597 201 Rev C; this includes two off street parking spaces for each dwelling. Each parking space shall have dimensions in accordance with current parking standards and shall be retained in the agreed form at all times.
5. Prior to first occupation of the development, the integral garages shall be provided with internal dimensions as shown on planning drawing 20.597 203 Rev C. However, notwithstanding the details on this plan, these garages shall each be fitted with a roller shutter door. Full details to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority.
6. Prior to first occupation, the cycle parking shall be provided in accordance with the EPOA Parking Standards. The approved facility shall be secure, convenient, covered and retained at all times.
7. Prior to first occupation of the proposed development, the developer shall be responsible for the provision, implementation and distribution of a Residential Travel Information Pack for sustainable transport, approved by Essex County Council, to include six one day travel vouchers for use with the relevant local public transport operator. These packs (including tickets) are to be provided by the developer to each dwelling free of charge.

Residents

- 4.4 4 responses have been received from the following addresses:-

Bosworth Close: 25

Hillside Avenue: 5, 9, 11a, unknown

- 4.5 Responses can be summarised as follows:-

- How is this any better than the previous application
- Minor improvements made in latest application

- Only one ground of refusal addressed – addition of parking space for each plot.
- Concerned it will open the way for further developments on similar properties in Hillside Avenue.

Hillside Avenue parking:

- Already experiences regular problems with parking, particularly at the end of the road.
- Residents of, and visitors to, properties on the Main Road regularly park vehicles at the end of the road which needs to be kept clear to allow vehicles to turn around.
- Garden wall hit by delivery lorry due to parking in turning circle.
- Refuse lorries struggle to turn around on collection days.
- Similar issues from regular parcel delivery drivers and supermarket delivery drivers (increased since COVID).
- Development will make a bad situation worse. More vehicles parked on the road during and after development.
- Location of properties away from Hockley high street and the station increases likelihood of car use.
- Additional cars would compromise vehicle access for the rest of the road, emergency access compromised.
- Plot is located close to a very sharp bend, potential hazard.
- Site is on a virtually 90 degree bend and adequate off street parking is essential for safety and emergency services access.
- Parking spaces for both plots impeded by a telegraph pole and street light. Relocation would negatively impact neighbouring properties.

Character:

- Plot still too small for two properties.
- Not in keeping with other properties in Hillside Avenue where dwellings are well spaced.
- Bulk and mass out of keeping.
- The link detached style and dark window frames seem to make no attempt, in the slightest, to blend in with neighbouring properties.
- Site frontage narrower than any other in the road.
- Substance of application unchanged: two oversized properties being squeezed into one undersized plot.
- Too high, too long.
- Link detached now proposed to address parking issue; this is even less in keeping with the surrounding area.
- Design uninspiring and depressing, particularly grey roof tiles. Only one Hillside Avenue property has a grey roof. Design should align with and complement the rest of the road.
- Ridge height is above existing bungalow and existing bungalows next door. Lowering it would bring a greater level of accord.

Parking:

- Query whether it complies with setback standards in Parking Standards SPD.
- Dubious if 3 spaces are usable – lamppost and telegraph pole in front of each of the plots, drop kerb does not span width of plot 2, unlikely to use space in front of garages and will block car in garage in.
- Concern about parking with link detached aspect.
- Garage widths are hardly large enough to accommodate cars, end up being used for storage rather than for cars.
- Two car parking spaces allocated per house is not, going forward, likely to be enough.

Drainage:

- More concrete may affect ground water drainage.
- Not clear from plans where foul drainage is located. Likely to connect to the main sewer which runs through the garden of 11a. Anglian water should confirm capacity; condition should require this.

Development Disruption and Safety:

- Associated with pedestrians passing site, reference to development at nearby site and safety issues.
- Construction vehicles parked outside plot would cause single lane blind bend.
- Noise disruption.

Ecology:

- Feeding regimes for nesting birds, foxes and badgers likely to be disturbed.
- Presence of badgers and foxes in adjacent properties. Bats in close proximity. All will be significantly disturbed.

Local Area:

- Loss of bungalows required for people to downsize later in life.
- Traffic increase.
- Infrastructure impacts – schools, doctors, dentists, social amenities.
- Prohibition on turning these dwellings into individual flats should be a condition.

Residential Amenity:

- Fears of overlooking as show the intention to raise the crowns of the trees on my boundary.
- Need assurance that driveway would be left clear.

- Ruin line of sight.
- Negatively impact light at our property and cause light pollution from new side windows.
- Our property would now be overlooked in a way it has not historically been.
- All possible steps should be taken to minimise overlooking of neighbouring properties.
- Dust and noise during demolition and construction should be minimised and enforced.
- Existing bungalow at 25 Bosworth Close ends around 15m from the rear boundary; proposed distance would reduce that to about 10m. Hugely detrimental impact on privacy.

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 In determining this application regard must be had to section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The proposed development is considered to be detrimental to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area contrary to policies within the Development Management Plan and Core Strategy and the NPPF.



Marcus Hotten

Assistant Director, Place & Environment

Relevant Development Plan Policies and Proposals

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

Core Strategy Adopted Version (December 2011)

Development Management Plan (December 2014)

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

Supplementary Planning Document 2 (January 2007) – Housing Design

The Essex Design Guide (2018)

Background Papers:-

None.

For further information please contact Claire Buckley on:-

Phone: 01702 318127

Email: Claire.buckley@rochford.gov.uk

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

21/01132/FUL



Rochford District Council

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. This copy is believed to be correct.

Nevertheless Rochford District Council can accept no responsibility for any errors or omissions, changes in the details given or for any expense or loss thereby caused.

Rochford District Council, licence No.LA079138

