

APPLICATION REFERRED FROM THE WEEKLY LIST

WEEKLY LIST NO. 1448 – 2 November 2018

17/01190/FUL

LAND REAR OF 145 TO 149 FERRY ROAD, HULLBRIDGE

**CONSTRUCT TWO ONE-BEDROOMED BUNGALOWS WITH
ASSOCIATED PARKING**

1 DETAILS OF REFERRAL

- 1.1 This item was referred from Weekly List No. 1448 requiring notification to the Managing Director by 1.00 pm on Wednesday, 7 November 2018 with any applications being referred to this meeting of the Committee.
- 1.2 Cllr M Hoy referred this item on the grounds of amenity space and inappropriate development within the Green Belt.
- 1.3 The item that was referred is attached at appendix 1 as it appeared in the Weekly List.
- 1.4 A plan showing the application site is attached at appendix 2.

2 RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 It is proposed that the Committee **RESOLVES**

To determine the application, having considered all the evidence.

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

Appendix 1

Application No: 17/01190/FUL Zoning: Residential

Case Officer: Mr Mike Stranks

Parish: Hullbridge Parish Council

Ward: Hullbridge

Location: Land Rear of 145 to 149 Ferry Road, Hullbridge

Proposal: Construct two one-bedroomed bungalows with associated parking

SITE AND PROPOSAL

The site and location

1. This application is to a site on the eastern side of Ferry Road 80m south of the junction made with Ambleside Gardens. On the site is a former shop converted to four one bedroomed and three two bedroomed flats. Planning Permission (Ref: 15/00313/FUL) for a further one bedroomed flat is currently being implemented on the site that will result in 8 No. flats in total existing on the site.
2. The application concerns land at the rear of the existing building that is given over to parking and amenity area partly serving the existing flats.
3. The site also includes the back part of the rear garden area to the neighbouring property No. 147 Ferry Road.
4. A group of various trees exist to the rear and northern side boundaries and through the rear garden of No.147 Ferry Road on the site of the current application.
5. The site is accessed by way of a 2.8m wide sideways alongside the northern side of the flatted building.
6. A pedestrian crossing exists to Ferry Road in front of the flatted building close to the existing vehicular access.

The Proposal

7. Planning permission is sought to provide 2 No. one bedroomed bungalows on the wider part of the site behind the existing buildings. The two bungalows would have a hipped roofed design to be covered in roof tiles and with rendered external walls above a brick plinth. The windows would have upvc framing. The more precise details of the material are unspecified.

8. The layout would site both proposed bungalows to the north west and south west corners of an 8m x 8m turning area either side of which would be parking bays.
9. Between the two bungalows would be provided amenity areas for each bungalow and disabled parking bays.
10. To the north of the site would be provided communal amenity area for the existing flats.
11. Revised parking for the existing flats would also be provided together with cycle and bin storage.
12. The existing trees within the main part of the site where the bungalows and parking areas are proposed would be removed.
13. The layout of the development was revised on 28th February 2018 reducing the number of car parking spaces proposed from eighteen on the site down to eleven and grouping the cycle store away from the northern site boundary with No. 149 Ferry Road to behind the flatted scheme.
14. The private amenity space to the proposed bungalows was also revised to be distinct from that for the existing flats.
15. The bungalow to the north (plot 2) was re-sited slightly 0.2m to the south. The Bungalow to plot 1 was re- sited 0.6m south but maintaining a 1m side space to the boundary of the site with Nos. 139 – 143 Ferry Road.
16. The internal layout of the bungalows was also revised at the same time. The bungalows retain the same external size and height. However, the internal arrangement now faces onto the private amenity space provided for each bungalow.
17. As the revisions were of a minor nature no further consultations have been carried out with adjoining occupiers. The reply to consultation from the County Highway Authority reflects the revised layout in highway terms.
18. The application follows pre – application advice that found the general layout and principles acceptable.
19. A members site visit took place on 10th February 2018.

Relevant planning history

20. Application No. 316/60 - Erection of DIY shop and house. Approved 25th July 1960.

21. Application No. 335/64 - Alterations and additions to shop and living accommodation. Approved 7th July 1964.
22. Application No. 925/80 - Erect garage for two cars. Approved 7th November 1980.
23. Application No. 03/00789/COU - Change Of Use of Shop and First Floor Flat to Dwellinghouse Together with Single Storey Front Extension.
Approved 04.11.2003
24. Application No. 07/00708/FUL - Demolish Existing Buildings at 145 and 147 Ferry Road and Construct 2 No. Three Storey Buildings Containing 3 No. One Bedroomed and 21 No. Two Bedroomed Flats With Access and Parking Area.
Refused 19.12.2007 and Appeal Dismissed.
25. Application No. 08/00114/FUL - Demolish Existing Buildings and Construct Part Two Storey, Part Three Storey Building Containing 18 No. Two Bedroomed and 6 No. One Bedroomed Flats With Access, Parking to Rear and Amenity Areas. Site of 145-147 Ferry Road, Hullbridge.
Refused 14.05.2008
26. Application No. 08/00732/FUL - Refurbish and Convert Existing Building Into 4 No. Two Bedroomed and 1 No. One Bedroomed Flats, Make External Alterations to Include New Windows and Doors and Replacement of External Staircase, Windows to Gable Ends and Rooflights to Serve Rooms in Roof. Demolish Outbuildings to Rear and Provide Car Parking and Refuse/Cycle Store.
Approved 05.12.2008
27. Application No. 08/00836/FUL - Single Storey Pitched Roofed Extension to Provide 2 No. One Bedroomed Flats with Pitched Roofed Building to Provide Cycle and Refuse Store and Parking at Rear.
Approved 18.12.2008
28. Application No. 15/00038/FUL - Construct first floor pitched roof rear extension to form one bedroom flat.
Refused 26.03.2015
29. Application No. 15/00313/FUL - Construct First Floor pitched roofed Rear Extension To Form One Bedroom Flat.
Approved 22.07.2015

Material Considerations

Principle of the development

30. 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 but advises that there are likely to be circumstances where development of residential gardens will be inappropriate and should be resisted (para.70). Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, making places better for people to live and to make development acceptable to communities (para.124).

31. The NPPF also advises that planning decisions for proposed housing development should ensure that developments do not undermine quality of life and are visually attractive with appropriate landscaping. 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 (para. 130).
32. Policy H1 of the Core Strategy states that in order to protect the character of existing settlements the Council will resist the intensification of smaller sites within residential areas. Although limited infill will be considered acceptable, it will have to relate well to the street pattern, density and character of the locality. The SPD (SPD2) for housing design states that for infill development, detached plots should ordinarily be a minimum 9.25 metres wide, and that there should be a minimum distance of 1 metre between habitable rooms and the plot boundary. The proposed bungalows would be to plots 12.5m (plot 1) and 11.6m (plot 2) in width respectively and at or in excess of 1m distance from the site boundaries.
33. 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 and enhance the local identity of the area.
34. Policy DM3 of the Development Management Plan seeks demonstration that infill and backland development positively addresses the existing street pattern and density of locality and whether the number and types of dwellings are appropriate to the locality.
35. The site is currently somewhat uninviting and secluded behind frontage development with a mixture of amenity space, storage and parking. Larger outbuildings to the former shop that previously secluded the area even more have been removed.
36. The siting of the proposed bungalows close to the rear boundary of the site would place those proposed bungalows some 20m or so away between rear walls with the homes fronting Elm Grove. Although sited close to the rear site boundary (losing those residents backing onto the site in Elm Grove the benefit of the space beyond their fence line) the modest size and mass of the proposed bungalows would result in an acceptable relationship between the

larger built form of the flatted building and the homes fronting Elm Grove beyond. The siting of the proposed bungalows would also buffer the parking and circulation areas behind the flats to the quieter garden areas of neighbouring homes.

37. The total site has an area of 0.126ha. The two bungalows proposed and the eight flats would equate to an overall density of 79.3 dph for the whole site. However, the actual developable area that relates to the provision of the two bungalows has an area of 0.0716ha. The two bungalows to that part of the site would equate to a density of 27.9dph.
38. The locality in which the site is situated has an existing actual density of 40dph as checked against a measured area of one hectare centred on the site. The development proposed would make best use of the area which has an uninviting appearance at present and in this context is suited to a more intense development. The actual part of the site to which the development relates would be to a density at less than accepted by Policy DM2, however given the site circumstances the two bungalows would relate well to the wider actual density and context of the area between commercial and domestic development. The proposed bungalows would further diversify the dwelling mix without harm to the character of the area. There would be no material overlooking with occupiers in Elm Grove because of the low rise nature of the bungalows. However it would be necessary to remove Permitted Development rights for roof alterations to safeguard privacy and for further extensions because of concerns at the impact of future massing.

Design

39. The Proposed bungalows would have a hipped roofed design to an overall ridge height of 5.4m with a height of walling to eaves of 2.85m. The bungalows would have a modest design domestic in scale proposed to be finished in a predominant render above a brick plinth. The domestic nature of the two bungalows would transition between the larger commercial and flatted buildings that front Ferry Road and the housing fronting Elm Grove backing onto the site. The hipped roofed design would have the least bulk in terms of any imposition upon the occupiers of housing that back onto the site fronting Elm Grove. The setting for the development proposed would be intimate and although backland in nature and intervening between existing frontage development and homes in Elm Grove would not be out of place given the intensity around the existing flatted development present nearby without harming the pattern of adjoining development or local mixed character of built form. The proposal would provide diversity in the housing stock by providing two one bedroomed bungalows complementing the nearby flats and larger homes.

Space standards

- 40. The proposed bungalows would be of identical design but handed to each other with their front doors facing to the intervening parking spaces.
- 41. The bungalow design would have a gross floor area of 55 square metres and a double bedroom in excess of the 50 square metres gross required.
- 42. The layout would provide for a cupboard storage of 1.9 square metres in area and in excess of the 1.5 square metres required.
- 43. The internal ceiling height of each bungalow would be to 2.8m for the whole habitable floor area and in excess of the minimum 2.3m ceiling height required.

Garden areas

- 44. The sidespace to Plot 1 measures 1.15m to southern boundary of the site decreasing to 1m at pinch point to rear widening to 2.1m to the remaining rear boundary.
- 45. The sidespace to Plot 2 measures 1.9m widening to 2.3m at rear.
- 46. Both proposed bungalows would be located in excess of 1m between the finished wall of the dwelling and the site boundaries as required by the Council's guidance.
- 47. The first floor flat under construction provides for a balcony of some 10 square metres in area. The existing seven flats are reliant on the amenity space of some 175 square metres to the rear forming part of the site that would be displaced by the development proposed.
- 48. The proposed layout would provide a new shared amenity space of 208 square metres in area to the northern part of the site and some 33 square metres in excess of that required to serve the flats. Although remote to the flats, it has been preferable that car parking and garaging be located adjoining the existing flatted building and around the proposed turning head as would be the case in the layout proposed.
- 49. The proposed one bedroomed bungalow to plot 1 would have an amenity space of 35 square metres and that to plot 2 would have an amenity space of 41 square metres and both short of the 50 square metres required. The shortfall of 24 square metres between the two bungalows would be met from the surplus 33 square metres communal space adjoining the proposed bungalows. The shared nature of this arrangement would integrate the communal space between the flatted and bungalow dwellers. If this were found to be unacceptable, it would be possible to revise the siting of the bungalows merely to attain compliance, whereas although the layout

proposed is short in private amenity area for the two bungalows as shown, the space provided would be useable and access would be available to the adjoining communal space giving those bungalow occupiers access to a larger shared amenity space in addition to the modest private amenity space shown. The proposed layout arrangement would also be the best way of developing this site effectively, by placing the communal garden alongside existing garden areas to the north. On balance, officers consider that as the amenity space would be usable and convenient that no material objection can be raised at the amenity space provision.

Technical Standards

50. The Ministerial Statement of the 25th 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. From the date the Deregulation Bill 2015 was given royal ascent, 26th March 2015 to the 30th September 2015, the government's policy is that planning permissions should not be granted requiring, or subject to conditions requiring, compliance with any technical housing standards other than for those areas where authorities have existing policies on access, internal space, or water efficiency.
51. 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. A condition is recommended to require compliance with this Building Regulation requirement, were permission to be granted.
52. 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; a condition is recommended to require that the energy standard as set out in part L of the Building Regulations (2010) as amended, were permission to be granted.
53. 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.

Ecology

54. The application is accompanied by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment that has considered the numerous trees on the site and the impact upon them of the development proposed. The general findings are that these trees are too closely grouped such that as they grow they will continue to suppress each other such that they will never hold any landscape or amenity value.
55. The Horse Chestnut tree at the edge of the proposed turning head has bacterial wet wood indicating internal decay. The large poplar tree to the south east corner has a structural fail and ought be removed for safety reasons.
56. Many of the trees on the site would need to be removed to allow the development. None of these trees are worthy of preservation. The report considers that replacement species more suited to the urban environment and giving seasonal interest ought feature as part of landscaping to the site. The revised layout reduces the extent of the car parking area to the rear of No. 147 Ferry Road improving the relationship of the development to the group of trees on the northern part of the site.
57. The Council's Arboriculturalist has viewed the site and notes the general poor condition of the trees making them not worthy of retention. The applicant could remove the existing trees and there would be no grounds to require their protection.

Highways and Parking

58. The existing development on the site comprises four two bedroomed and three one bedroomed flats with a further one bedroomed flat under construction. However, nine car parking spaces were approved in total to serve the approved development based upon a reduction to the standard given proximity of the site to local services and a regular bus service.
59. The proposed layout would provide a total of 14 No. car parking spaces laid out to the minimum size requirements of 2.4m wide and 4.8m in depth consistent with the existing provision and the minimum size required by the Council's adopted standards. The proposed layout would provide one car parking space to the frontage of the flatted building adjoining Ferry Road with a further five spaces to the rear of the flatted building. The remaining 8 No. spaces (including two disabled spaces) would be grouped off the proposed 8m x8m turning head.
60. The applicants would also provide five secure cycle lockers adjoining the refuse bin enclosure to serve the flats and a cycle locker to the garden area to each bungalow proposed.

61. The proposed one bedroomed bungalows would require one car parking space each.
62. Taking account of the nine spaces for the flats sharing the site, a further 3 spaces would remain for visitors to serve the ten dwellings that would result overall.
63. The total development that would result on the site comprising the four one bedroomed and four two bedroomed flats, together with the two proposed one bedroomed bungalows would require 17 No. car parking spaces including that for visitors if the standard were applied without taking into account that allocation approved and the reasonable reduction accounting for the sustainability of the site. It would be unreasonable for the Council to now require full compliance with the parking standard across the site as a whole for the flats.
64. Apart from the nine spaces serving the existing flats, the development to provide the two proposed bungalows would effectively over provide by two additional spaces.
65. No objection is raised against the proposal by the County Highway Authority.

Consultations and Representations:

Hullbridge Parish Council:

66. Object on the following grounds:
 - 1) Back land development which is contrary to policy.
 - 2) Restricted access for emergency vehicles.
 - 3) Additional movement's provides increased hazards for residents and with it, close proximity to the footpath is hazardous to pedestrians.
 - 4) It removes amenity space to the existing residents of 145 Ferry Road
67. We also like to comment that there are flooding issues at the rear and mature trees will have to be removed.

Essex County Council Highways (On revised plans)

68. Advise that from a highway and transportation perspective the impact of the proposal is acceptable to the Highway Authority subject to the following conditions:
 1. The provision of one on-site vehicle parking space per dwelling and an associated turning area as shown in principle on planning drawing 0-400 Revision 1. Each parking space shall have dimensions in accordance with current parking standards. The vehicle parking area

and associated turning area shall be retained in the agreed form at all times.

2. There shall be no discharge of surface water from the development onto the Highway.
3. No unbound material shall be used in the surface treatment of the vehicular access within 6 metres of the highway boundary.
4. 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.

Rochford District Council Arboricultural and Conservation officer:

First round reply to consultation:

69. Advise that the site has several trees of varying age ranges, sizes, etc. to the rear and within the adjacent gardens. At present no detail regarding the trees has been submitted with the planning application. It is therefore not possible to determine the impact of the proposal on the health of the trees and the visual amenity they provide. It is recommended an arboricultural impact assessment be carried out in accordance with British Standard 5837 2012.

Ecology

70. No objection
71. Condition should be added regarding nesting birds and timing of development.

Second round reply to consultation:

72. Have visited the site with the applicants Arboricultural Consultant some time ago to go over his findings. The most prominent trees at the site are T1, T2, T7, T8 and T9, however all have structural and biological defects that reduce their BS retention categorisation, we noted clear wing hornet moth exit holes found on one of the poplars and shear stress/crack on another, the ash had compression fork (crushed fork – non shape optimised) and bacterial wet wood found on the horse chestnut. I can confirm that the categorisation used is correct – all lower grade C, where these can be retained they should in the short term until new planting can be achieved, however category C trees should not unduly constrain the development and are recommended to be removed and replace where necessary.
73. It would be prudent in this instance to condition a suitable tree planting scheme of occasional trees planted in locations where the future nuisance is

reduced using species with; low water demand, upright form and low root penetration strength.

Rochford District Council Principal Street Scene Officer

74. 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.

Neighbour Representations:

75. Eleven letters have been received from the following addresses;

Ambleside Gardens: 1.
Elm Grove: 7 (3 letters) 9 (2 letters), 11, 19.
Ferry Road: 149 (2 letters).
Windermere Avenue: 45.

and which in the main make the following comments and objections;

- Areas of Nature
- Insufficient drainage
- Loss of light
- Loss of privacy/overlooking
- Loss of trees and vegetation
- Loss of view
- Noise and disturbance
- Over development
- Parking
- Policy objection
- Poor design
- Poor layout/over-development
- Protection of Wildlife
- No objection as such, however I would object if the mature trees at the back of these properties were to be removed.
- This backland proposed development will be accessed by a concealed entrance which appears to be against planning guidance taking into account the seven flats there would be nine residencies sharing a single driveway which is not safe or practical for the residents, passing pedestrians or traffic.
- There appear to be very limited amenity space.
- Also mature trees may have to be removed which could cause problems, ground water problems.
- We were very disappointed to receive your letter as we have previously opposed Cantor Properties earlier proposal (07/00708/FUL) to build flats on the very same location. Obviously we are once again totally opposed to this proposed new development not only for the aforementioned reasons but

also for the reasons below. We would also like to point out that the acquired residential garden is that of 147 Ferry Road and not 145 to 149 as stipulated on the planning document and with that in mind are the site measurements correct or do they need to be revisited.

- We would also like clarification as to why 2 One Bedroomed Bungalows require an additional 8 car parking spaces, to us it would seem to indicate that this proposal is just the first phase of the development and should it go ahead then we will see the sale of 147 Ferry Road and yet another development proposal in order to make use of the 17 car parking spaces
- The proposal states that there will be 17 car parking spaces, 9 of which are already in situation for the flats that will share the site if given the go ahead to develop. The proposed car parking spaces appear to be sited in very close proximity to our dwelling in Elm Grove that will back directly onto the site and the activities arising from the number of vehicles and households arising from the development would have effects in total contrast to the relative peace and quiet and seclusion we currently enjoy. We believe the resulting intensity would be sufficient to cause unreasonable harm to the amenity, currently enjoyed by ourselves and fellow residents that back onto the site and contrary to part (i) to policy HP11 to the Councils adopted local plan (2006)
- With the above taken into consideration we strongly believe that the plans are totally unacceptable and would seriously impact the relative peace and quiet and seclusion we currently enjoy and also the quality of life as there will be no buffer between the bungalows, car parking and our garden apart from our existing fence panels.
- We are also very concerned about light pollution as currently the mature trees in the residential garden of 147 Ferry Road offers protection from Ferry Road and should they be removed we will not only have lights from Ferry Road but also from the proposed development.
- Also, with regards to health matters my Wife suffers from Asthma and the increased pollution from car fumes etc. will stop her from enjoying time in our garden which we have enjoyed for the past 30 years.
- The only access to the development will be by the side of the existing flats (145 Ferry Road) and a question remains whether there is sufficient room for emergency vehicles such as Fire Engines and Ambulances to gain access to the proposed new development let alone construction traffic carrying necessary building materials as it appears to be restricted access.
- As far as can be determined from the plans the applicant does not appear to control sufficient land to provide the required traffic visibility splays. The lack of visibility and increased volume of traffic using the restricted access could result in an unacceptable hazard to pedestrians and road users and to the detriment of highway safety, especially, in light of the close proximity of the existing pedestrian crossing near to 145 Ferry Road.
- The proposal document also states that there is no flooding on the proposed site or adjacent land as it not close to any water course, stream or beck. We strongly believe that there is a form of watercourse in existence as the bottom of our garden and that of our Neighbours can flood

as a result of heavy rainfall. This is likely to be made worse as a result of the proposed development and the removal of the mature trees.

- The proposal document also states that there are no trees or hedges that could influence the development and that the development site cannot be seen. We would once again question the validity of those statements as the acquired land is full of mature trees which as mentioned before currently affords us privacy from the properties in Ferry Road and as a result of the trees being removed it will obviously remove the seclusion and privacy we have enjoyed for the past 30 years. If our memory serves us correctly the previous proposal was subject to a tree survey and therefore another survey should be conducted as part of this new proposal.
- The proposal document also states that it is unknown whether the new development will be connecting to the existing drains / sewerage infrastructure, again this needs urgently addressing before any final decision is made as it could have a detrimental affect on all surrounding properties.
- We totally oppose the proposed development not only for the reasons stated above but also given that the village of Hullbridge is soon to have a new housing estate of 500 homes why are plans for further back land developments being even considered. In our opinion there is no immediate need to build in back gardens in detriment of local residents.
- We objected to the last planning application made by this same Company without success as it went ahead.
- This will make things even worse. Flooding is an issue, noise and pollution, and certainly our privacy and security.
- What provisions if any is this man making as far as fencing to respect our privacy? I hope the Council think this through and reject the application, Hullbridge is slowly being ruined by property developers who have no consideration over the people they impact only the money they are looking to make.
- The proposal is over development of the site with the back land development going against Parish Council Policy. The building of the proposed bungalows will lead the present occupants of the flats situated at 145 Ferry Rd to lose their communal area and so the tenants will have nowhere to dry washing, sit outside in the summer or for children to play, having a major impact on the families that live there. I say this as I understand that the developer is also their landlord and so there may be a conflict of interest.
- The proposed buildings overlooking our property are too close to our boundary leading to loss of privacy and increased noise level, light pollution and disturbance due to the positioning of the properties and car park especially as we spend most of the summer in the garden.
- There will be a significant loss of trees and vegetation impacting on local wildlife often seen in the area.
- As we look out of our property at present we have a pleasant view of trees surrounding the properties but this will be lost should the development be passed.

- I also highlight that the only entrance to the site is very narrow, the access being located very close to a zebra crossing. The vehicles also have to cross the pavement to gain access to the site and the increase in traffic with the proposed development increases the risks of accidents. The restricted width would also be problematic should there be a need for the emergency services to attend. I also understand that some of the doors of the flats there at present open out onto the access way that can only be highly dangerous and inappropriate.
- There appears to be no buffer zone between the bungalows, car parking and our garden apart from our existing fence panels. We are also concerned about the light pollution once the mature trees are removed and drainage as our garden is subject to flooding after heavy rainfall and the development will only compound the issue.
- Why does the proposed development of 2 one bedroom bungalows require 8 additional car parking spaces? This will again only serve to increase exhaust pollution together with associated activity and noise. By changing the previous proposal from flats to bungalows appears to be an underhand way of getting the planning application approved and we are not convinced that further applications for 147 Ferry Road will not be made in the future.
- Whilst realising that the development will only affect those neighbours in close proximity to the development you cannot underestimate the huge impact it will have on the quality of our lives.
- Finally, why are back land developments even being considered as there seems no direct need to build in mature residential gardens when a new estate comprising of 500 dwellings in Hullbridge has been approved in principle by Rochford District Council.
- There appears to be a fault with the Council's website and the ability to access the planning application - each time the planning application number is entered and "search" clicked on, the website doesn't process thus presenting a difficulty to those that may not be fully computer literate in being able to raise objections. The only way, which not everyone may realise, to access the planning application is to do an advanced search and pull them all up and then go through the list to select the correct application.
- The application covers land rear of 145 to 149 Ferry Road, Hullbridge. We own and occupy 149 Ferry Road and have had no communication whatsoever with the applicant regarding building on our property and have no intention of supporting this scheme. We consider this anomaly in title to be sufficient to reject the entire proposal.
- The applicant states that there are no trees and hedges on adjacent land affecting the proposed development site that could influence the development or that might be important as part of the local landscape character. This simply isn't true. As Ferry Road and close environs form the main road/s of Hullbridge since it became a habitable village, many trees and hedges have been erected in all back gardens in the affected location. Most are long established trees of 40 years or more. As said by other parties raising objections, these afford total privacy to those living in the affected properties, whether on each owner's own land or those of his/her

neighbours. For example, our trees would therefore create a light issue to the proposed dwellings as sited so close to boundary edges. In respect of privacy, the trees that would need removing from 147 Ferry Road also provide privacy to both 147 and 149 Ferry Road. Both of these properties have swimming pools and benefit from not being overlooked when in use. There is also a noise consideration when in use as currently the use of the pools do not affect other neighbours due to the shelter and privacy afforded to the immediate area around both pools.

- As a separate point to the applicant's view that the trees/hedges are not important as part of the local landscape character, we would say that the proposed development site is located in the exact centre point of Ferry Road / Hullbridge and the main area where all residents and the wider community make use of the local facilities such as the local shops, garden association, library, optician and dentist for example. There is a historical significance to preserving this area of Hullbridge. Firstly, the land on which 149 and surrounding properties are built used to be an orchard (hence property name of The Orchard to no 149) so gardens are large, contains trees pertaining to the land's use as an orchard and contain a significant number of trees which we believe should be preserved for its historical value to the village. Our property was also the first original doctor's surgery in Hullbridge. Residents often refer to the doctors and indeed, a road in the village and the nature reserve, were both named after the doctors' and still exist today as a tribute to them. We believe the local landscape surrounding these significant events should be altered as little as possible to preserve the "community spirit" and Hullbridge heritage that residents often enjoy speaking about. Especially when taking into account that Hullbridge has an ageing community that remember the past well, and the tendency of Hullbridge residents to live here all their lives or once they have moved in not to leave again because they value their community and village lifestyle.
- We specifically purchased our property for its' privacy and the fact that trees around all the rear garden prevent the property from being overlooked and likewise we enjoy not being able to see our neighbours' properties. We can provide further details privately should the Council wish to hear why we value our privacy so highly and above that of most people.
- Our swimming pool is currently surrounded by trees that would be removed if the proposal went ahead. The pool is situated next to the boundary with 147 Ferry Road. Aside from the privacy issue, the locating of bins, bike stores etc. the other side of the boundary fence to the pool raises with us concerns of vermin and other pests being attracted to the area which would present hygiene issues and/or dangers of disease to humans with our pool.
- We have lived in our property for over 4 years now and during our time as residents of the Hullbridge, we have noticed an increase in the amount of anti-social behaviour, crime and groups of teenagers hanging around late at night etc. The community centre car park would be one example, but we have noticed a tendency on occasion for groups to congregate in the bus shelter opposite our property. Another concern we have with these

"pockets" of car parking hidden away from main roads is that it would be another area affording the opportunity for anti social behaviour; somewhere to hang out at night undetected by police or authorities but causing a disturbance to the surrounding occupants who previously have suffered no sort of behaviour of this kind.

- We would like to raise a general concern for the current residents of the flats owned by the applicant who may feel unable to voice their objections to the proposal for fear of losing their home.
- We would wish to raise a boundary issue that only recently came to light during building work to erect our new side extension adjacent to 147 Ferry Road. It has been brought to our attention that the boundary between 147 and 149 is not in the correct place according to the plans drawn by our architect and the title copies of entries on the land register. It would appear that a significant chunk running the entire length of the boundary between the properties has been taken from no 149 with no transfer of land to no 147 as far as we have been currently able to determine.
- Planning permission was granted to our single storey extension project and the project completed at considerable expense in January 2018. One of the main considerations for applying for planning permission to add a single storey extension on that area of our land was that it was completely private and sheltered by trees and thus we could make use of the new space without feeling overlooked. With views of bungalows, car parks and a lack of greenery/privacy, we may never have gone ahead with our build and improvements to our own home as the landscape to the left of our home would be significantly changed. To keep privacy and to also be considerate to our neighbours, we did not apply for permission to erect a two storey extension.
- We cannot provide much information on this, but have been told during our time living in the village that there is/was a ditch in the area where the dwellings would be built and that previous natural use of the land may affect proposals to build on it. We're not able to comment further but would wish to raise this as a point to be aware of.
- I have family living in the flats already there and it's just not big enough, it seems they will be taking away there only bit of communal area where they can enjoy being outside.
- It has come to my attention that there has been an amendment to the proposed layout, yet we as residents/neighbours have yet to be advised of this. It was only by chance that I had perused the documents on your website. I understand that in addition to the proposal, there is a previous application that has already been passed of a further first floor dwelling on the site that can only add further to the impact upon others caused by the over development of the site.
- I consider that all relevant parties should be notified in writing of the amendments to the development and made aware also of the previous proposal that should be mentioned alongside this application.
- I consider this to be an over development of the site with a poor layout, will be harmful to the local wildlife, is too close to the respective boundaries,

- and will cause difficulty for traffic in respect of access, the exit of the site leading onto a zebra crossing .
- With the additional flat there will be insufficient parking for the residents who will undoubtedly park in the surrounding roads, again impacting on the local area.
 - Please could you confirm with me that all interested parties have been notified of the changes to the proposal and have been advised that this application is in addition to the previous plan for the flat that has already been passed?
 - It has come to our notice that there has been amendments submitted to the previous plans however as impacted residents / neighbours we have received no formal notification of such from RDC and only found out by perusing the planning application website.
 - The new plans also make reference to an additional one bedroom unit that was previously approved and once again we received no formal notification prior to this being approved. Irrespective of the amended plans our previous objections to the proposed development remain exactly the same as the issues of over development, restricted access, flooding (photographic evidence available) together with the loss of privacy and seclusion and security that the mature trees and garden currently provides not only to our own property but also the neighbouring properties. The plans would indicate that not only are the bungalows too close to the boundary but will also have windows to the lounge area which will have direct viewing into our property and the proposed screening in the amended plan is totally inadequate and unacceptable and will bring with it privacy, noise, light pollution and security issues. We still do not understand how two one bedroom bungalows can warrant the amount of additional parking proposed.
 - We are also led to believe that "backland" development is totally opposed by Hullbridge Parish Council.

APPROVE

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
2. The development shall be undertaken in strict accordance with the plans Drawing Numbers 0-400 Rev. I, 1-400 Rev. C, 1-401.
3. Details of all external facing and roofing materials for use in the construction of the dwellings hereby approved shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to first use of the materials. Such materials as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority shall be those used in the development hereby permitted.
4. Part G (water efficiency) of the Building Regulations (2010) shall be met for the dwellings hereby approved and be permanently retained thereafter.

5. Part L of the Building Regulations 2010 in respect of energy performance shall be met for the dwellings hereby approved.
6. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B and/or Class C, of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (including any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order, with or without modification) no additions or openings shall be inserted, or otherwise erected, within the roof area (including roof void) of the dwellings hereby permitted.
7. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (including any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order, with or without modification) no extensions or additions shall be erected on any elevations of the dwelling hereby permitted.
8. No development shall commence, before plans and particulars showing precise details of the hard and soft landscaping which shall form part of the development hereby permitted, have been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any scheme of landscaping details as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, which shall show the retention of existing trees, shrubs and hedgerows on the site and include details of:
 - schedules of species, size, density and spacing of all trees, shrubs and hedgerows to be planted;
 - existing trees to be retained;
 - areas to be grass seeded or turfed, including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment;
 - paved or otherwise hard surfaced areas;
 - existing and finished levels shown as contours with cross-sections if appropriate;
 - means of enclosure and other boundary treatments;
 - car parking layouts and other vehicular access and circulation areas;
 - minor artifacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting etc;
 - existing and proposed functional services above and below ground level (e.g. drainage, power and communication cables, pipelines, together with positions of lines, supports, manholes etc.);

shall be implemented in its entirety during the first planting season (October to March inclusive) following commencement of the development, or in any other such phased arrangement as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any tree, shrub or hedge plant (including replacement plants) removed, uprooted, destroyed, or be caused to die, or become seriously damaged or defective, within five years of planting, shall be replaced by the developer(s) or their successors in title, with species of the same type, size and in the same location as those removed, in the first available planting season following removal.

9. Prior to the first occupation of the development one on-site vehicle parking space per dwelling and an associated turning area as shown in principle on planning drawing 0-400 Revision 1 shall be provided. The vehicle parking area and associated turning area shall be retained in the agreed form at all times.
10. There shall be no discharge of surface water from the development onto the Highway.
11. No unbound material shall be used in the surface treatment of the vehicular access within 6 metres of the highway boundary.
12. 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.



Rochford District Council, licence No.LA079138



NTS