

Item 6	Contents
<p>16/00899/FUL</p> <p>Timber Grove, London Road, Rayleigh</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Correction to Report 2. Natural England Response 3. Sports England Consultation Response 4. Rayleigh Town Council Consultation Response 5. Public Representations <p>1. Correction to Report</p> <p>Members will note that the report indicates that the site is located within the Sweyne Park Ward. Details in this respect were pulled through from an earlier application, which reflects the pre-boundary change information. It is noted that a change in ward boundaries took place between the validation of the previously validated application (reference 15/00593/FUL) and the validation of this application and, as such, where references are made to Sweyne Park ward in the report, these should be read as Downhall and Rawreth ward.</p> <p>2. Natural England Consultation Response</p> <p>Dear Sir or Madam</p> <p>Our reference: 231562 Your reference: 16/00899/FUL</p> <p>Thank you for your consultation.</p> <p>Natural England has previously commented on this proposal under reference 15/00593/FUL and made comments to the authority in our letter dated 16 October 2015.</p> <p>The advice provided in our previous response applies equally to this re-submission although we made no objection to the original proposal.</p> <p>The proposed amendments to the original application are unlikely to have significantly different impacts on the natural environment than the original proposal.</p> <p>Should the proposal be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment then, in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, Natural England should be consulted again. Before</p>

	<p>sending us the amended consultation, please assess whether the changes proposed will materially affect any of the advice we have previously offered. If they are unlikely to do so, please do not re-consult us.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p> <p>Clare Foster Natural England Consultation Service</p> <p>3. Sports England Consultation Response</p> <p>As the proposals in the amended plans do not appear to impact on the adjoining playing field or its supporting facilities, I can advise that Sport England has no comments to make on the amended plans. Our position on the planning application would therefore remain as set out in our formal response dated 14 September 2017.</p> <p>4. Rayleigh Town Council Consultation Response</p> <p>Revised comments have been received from Rayleigh Town Council further to the re-consultation undertaken on 14 November on the basis of the amended scheme details.</p> <p>The response highlighted that Rayleigh Town Council has no objection.</p> <p>(This consultation response was received after the report was completed by the case officer and could therefore not be accounted for in the report).</p> <p>5. Public Representations</p> <p>Public representations have been received from the following persons which are indicated as follows:-</p> <p>R Brady, Claremont Crescent, Rayleigh</p> <p>Please see my previous objections to the plans. However, again, the plans fail to show the neighbouring estate of Kingley Grange.</p> <p>Our home is on the boundary of the proposed site, but is again excluded from the plans. We do exist and will be only a few feet away from the new homes you propose to build. Please submit plans showing ours and our neighbours' homes. It is unfair to make decisions when not all of the full facts are in place.</p>
--	--

	<p>Why is Claremont Crescent not on the plans? Perhaps someone could respond to me.</p> <p>Mr Cripps, 5 Durham Way, Rayleigh</p> <p>I assume the destruction of the badger sett will be covered in your final officer's report and conditions?</p> <p>New Aspect Comment: The summary would appear to an inward looking set of amendments (inside the site box); I can see no reference to considering the impact outside the box.</p> <p>In my view it is obvious that the first impact will be site construction traffic for an extended period (probably 2-3 years) on the existing London Road traffic flows. Apart from competing with the BP/M&S garage, Little Wheatley Road junction and the RTSSC clientele it might well be at odds with both the potential Grange Villa site and elements of the Countryside 'North of London Road' site traffic – already agreed in principle.</p> <p>Apart from interfering with already problematic traffic congestion it might well create a safety issue with large/heavy vehicles turning right into and out of the site across traffic flows – not to mention already low air quality issues.</p> <p>The scale of development in west Rayleigh and Rawreth needs to be considered as a whole large project (rather than piecemeal submissions) and as many conditions (volumes/timings and overlapping durations) imposed in a comprehensive and meaningful overall multi-site traffic plan by RDC and ECC. This is missing within the (as yet) uncompleted Local Plan.</p> <p>Ms S Knight, 15 Little Wenlock Chase, Rayleigh</p> <p>Objects on the grounds of insufficient drainage, loss of trees and vegetation, over-development, parking, poor layout of development and traffic generation.</p> <p>Mr D Eaton (via e mail) (No address provided)</p> <p>Rayleigh town is gridlocked most days at some time and almost impossible in the rush hours, lunchtimes and Saturdays. This would add another 83 houses to the 630 houses already proposed on London Road.</p> <p>Every evening when I drive into Rayleigh between 4.30 and 7.00 London Road is gridlocked. It backs up around the Carpenters</p>
--	--

	<p>roundabout and up and down the A1245. My Fiesta was hit and written-off when stationary on the roundabout in September.</p> <p>Another 700 cars will be added into the local infrastructure with these new developments, and this will compound the whole traffic situation. There are only 3 roads in - A127, single track London Road and Rawreth Lane - and all gridlock at peak times. It is impossible to improve these roads.</p> <p>How can all these new houses and associated cars be justified without new roads?</p> <p>We have one of the lowest forest densities in Europe; I believe around 8% in comparison to the rest of Europe, which is around 30%. More trees should be planted, therefore, rather than being cut down.</p> <p>Mr S Clark, 19 Claremont Crescent, Rayleigh</p> <p>I am deeply disappointed with the allowance of another amended application for Timber Grove. Why has this not gone to a hearing and been rejected? Another day, another poor design by Pannell Developments. Still my house is not on the plans although the new proposed care home will now sit right up against my fence and block all light from my garden and property. I have already mentioned that my house is not on the plan to the Council. The latest plan now proposes a building (care home) on my boundary fence. This is unacceptable and will significantly impact the light entering my garden and property in contradiction of my right to light and would recommend an immediate assessment of the impact. I am shocked that the Council has allowed the development of houses at Claremont Crescent to be built and now wants to build a care home next to them that allows no light to enter them. Why was the Claremont Crescent development given permission, knowing this was the case? This application is totally unacceptable and should be rejected by the Council.</p> <p>The new plans still fail to show my house on the plans, suggesting there is no housing behind the new care home. Please submit new plans that show Claremont Crescent on it. I am concerned by the mention of a car park now proposed to be directly behind my house and next to the care home. I also believe even further trees are to be removed without any consultation. There are no real details on this. I have now had the threat of a care home, car park, bin collection site and playground behind my house on plans submitted.</p>
--	---

	<p>Pannell Developments and Fitzroy Support have little regard for the The environmental impact of the proposed new car park along the gardens of Clarement Crescent on young families is totally unacceptable.</p> <p>Please find my previous objections below.</p> <p>We live adjacent to the proposed development site (Timber Grove) and are writing to ask that Rochford District Council refuse this planning application from Pannell Developments Limited and Fitzroy Support.</p> <p>Herein are our comments and objections relating to this planning application:-</p> <p>The Care Home will directly overlook our back garden; this will lead to a loss of privacy and will certainly impact on the peaceful enjoyment of our home and garden.</p> <p>The location of a care home so close to our boundary and directly overlooking our garden will significantly impact on the market value of our home and the ability to sell our property in the future. The current noise from the care home when the residents are outside would be moved right next to our property and be highly disturbing for our young children and in contravention of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. The care home is currently kept secluded for a reason and I strongly suggest that it stays that way. The building directly behind our garden fence will be visually overbearing. It is an inappropriate design for this location. Such a large building would be totally out of keeping with the neighbouring properties, which are mainly smaller houses. As mentioned, it will also illegally withdraw all light from our property.</p> <p>The removal of existing trees that provide privacy to our property will be completely removed to an even further extent than previously suggested. Parking will be adjacent to our garden and home causing noise, pollution and dust at all times of the day and night. Our garden would become unsafe for our young children to play in. London Road is already a very busy and congested road; this additional concentration of traffic and roadside parking will cause traffic problems and create a safety hazard for other motorists.</p> <p>London Road does not currently provide a safe pathway in which I can walk my children to school (Our Lady Of Ransom) and no safe place to cross the road. Even with the proposed increase in traffic there is no provision for this. The pathway is too narrow and poorly maintained by the County Highways department.</p> <p>I invite you to visit our home to verify that these objections are valid.</p>
--	--

	<p>On the previous application, I asked that Rochford District Council refuse this planning application and encouraged Pannell Developments to re-submit a building design that is smaller, less intrusive on neighbouring properties, and more sensitive to the character of this village. However, the re-submitted plans are worse in impact on my property. Therefore, once again I ask that Rochford District Council rejects these unacceptable, re-submitted plans.</p> <p>Representation from Mr C Clews</p> <p>Thank you for bringing to my attention the revised planning application for the proposed 83 dwellings in place of the residential home. I note that this area of Rayleigh is under consideration for much more than the 83 dwellings proposed here, and there is also a requirement for another 550 houses next to this development. My concern is that the road (London Road) is already congested, and this increase in the population density and use of this road will exacerbate the already difficult problem of traversing within, and out of Rayleigh. Whilst I note that the Rayleigh West site (550 Houses) has not yet been given the go-ahead, the building of Clairemont Crescent (approximately 100 dwellings) and Gunn Close (14 dwellings) recently, then this development on top will provide too many vehicle movements on a road that at weekends and frequently during rush hour, is completely congested. This is not only causing congestion, but increasing the pollution experienced in the town already. I am already having to use Rawreth Lane to get in/out of Rayleigh.</p> <p>Representation from Mr S Clark, 19 Claremont Crescent, Rayleigh dated 6 January 2018</p> <p>I do not feel my comments objecting to Timber Grove have been taken into account in the final officer's report. I would therefore like to share the following information with you regarding the Timber Grove development.</p> <p>Firstly, my main objection is that the plans do not show the location of the care home in relation to my house or any surrounding properties. The plans contradict the rules set out in the Essex Design Guide with the care home sitting right behind my house. On this basis I recommend you delay the hearing on Thursday 11 January until Pannell Developments and Fitzroy Support can provide this to you. Planning Officers, however, state that this is acceptable and legal. How can you possibly make a decision without this information?</p> <p>I have invited the Planning Officer to my house to show me where the care home would sit in relation to my property; this still has not happened.</p>
--	--

	<p>I have requested the exact location of the 'bin site' for the care home (which I suspect will sit next to my house) and it has not been provided.</p> <p>I would also like to add the following objections –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It will have an adverse effect on the residential amenity of my property, by reason of (among other factors) noise from the care home residents and 24-hour operating hours of staff arriving and leaving the car park, which is poorly designed and not in keeping with local surroundings.• The care home and surrounding properties view into my property, causing loss of privacy in my garden to the point of becoming unusable.• Effect of the development on the character of the neighbourhood. A care home 'business' would not be in keeping with local properties.• I would lose existing views of woodland from my property, spoiling the natural enjoyment of my home. <p>I would like to highlight the following points from the final report:-</p> <p>Paragraph 2.5</p> <p>Fitzroy are required by the Essex Care Quality Commissioners to 'split' the single care home into three smaller units for supported living but in the same use (Class C2), the size of which, in combination, would be similar to the previously proposed single home. The occupants of the existing care home would transfer to the three Supported Living units where they would receive the same level of care which they receive at present within the care home. Care would be administered by staff employed on a shift basis, who would provide 24-hour cover at each unit, but who would not live at the properties. The same number of staff would be required to cover the three units as would be required to cover the single care home. It should be noted that none of the occupants can live independently, and they will require this level of care from the start of their occupation of the proposed Supported Living units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• I feel the 24-hour care provided at the care home (if it moves location) would spoil the natural enjoyment of my home due to 24-hour shift changes of staff resulting in increased lighting and car noise arriving and departing the property in the nearby located car park next to my house.
--	--


	<p>Paragraph 7.3</p> <p>No comments were received with regard to the key units and the chalets; therefore, it was deemed acceptable as the design ethos followed the site principles as well as the urban design officer's general comments. Positive feedback was received with regard to the apartments and these were further developed into the units now submitted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• I would like to add that I feel this comment is incorrect. I have clearly expressed concern at the location and design of the care home on multiple occasions. Also, it does not concur with rules set out in the Essex Design Guide. <p>Paragraph 15.4</p> <p>Site boundaries are partly shared with neighbouring residential development to the east of the site and Rawreth Brook, which forms the physical boundary at the northern aspect of the site. The site at its northerly fringes is indicated to be located within Flood Zone 3, which is affiliated with proximity of that vicinity to Rawreth Brook. A ditch runs along the eastern aspect of the site, which it is indicated will be retained as part of the development. The outlook to the north and north east of the site is out onto open countryside, which contrasts with the outlook to the south of the site, which is characterised by residential and commercial built form, which are served off London Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To add to the above comment, it should read that the care home will sit right on top of 5-bed detached houses that new young families moved into 2½ years ago. 'Partly shared' to the east is, quite frankly, slanderous. <p>Paragraph 20.7</p> <p>Planning permission was refused on 30 August 2012 under reference 12/00279/FUL for the demolition of the care home, and the construction of a new care home (Use Class C2) and 43 No. dwellings comprising 1 No. two-bedroomed apartment, 16 No. two-bedroomed houses, 22 No. three-bedroomed houses, 4 No. four-bedroomed houses, with associated parking and the re-construction of the access road from London Road. This application was refused on Green Belt, affordable housing, parking, amenity space, and surface water flooding grounds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In relation to the above refusal, what has changed? If anything, it is all more relevant today.
--	---

	<p>Paragraph 21.7</p> <p>The three proposed supported living units present a scale and over-sized footprint which is not necessarily in keeping with the surrounding proposed development; however, it is considered that given their location within a defined cul-de-sac area of their own and 1.5 storey height, their presence will not be seen as overly intrusive and will be less than the originally proposed care home. Appropriate landscaping to the front and side elevations of these three units will be imperative to ensure a softening of their appearance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Location? Right on top of neighbouring houses in Claremont Crescent. I can regularly hear the residents of the home now. Moving them right next to me will spoil the natural enjoyment of my home. I will also have significant loss of light and increased noise which will be highly disturbing for my very young family. <p>Concern that neighbouring residential development which adjoins the boundary with the site has not been shown on the plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Back to my original point and mentioned by other residents' objections - the plan does not show surrounding properties. Indeed, even the final report does not detail these. <p>Can I also add that the number of objection comments received quoted in the final report "post 3rd amendment" should not be taken into consideration. The last amendment was done just before Christmas. Planning states that all comments are considered for the application, irrespective of when received; however, the report specifies a 'before and after' number of objections vs amendment.</p> <p>In summary, I clearly object to the development on Timber Grove and would be happy for any Members to visit my property so I could share my concerns. I concede some defeat in accepting that properties will be built on the land and would accept a garden of a 'normal' house being behind my boundary, not a care home right on my fence. My garden is only 30ft and I would never have bought my house from Bellway homes 2½ years ago knowing what I know now. The Council should never have approved the Bellway Homes development and then allow a care home to be built on top of it.</p> <p>I will entrust you to make the right decision for local people on the night.</p> <p>I have included a local layout of Kingsley grange.</p>
--	--



Blue x = my house

Green Properties = 3 care homes (inappropriately located)

	 <p>For Reference my house in plot 70.</p> <p>The trees shown will nearly all be removed.</p> <p>The care home will sit on my boundary.</p>
<p>Item 9 (1)</p> <p>15/00244/FUL</p> <p>Halcyon Park, Pooles Lane, Hullbridge.</p>	<p>Letter from Applicant</p> <p>This application has been waiting for determination for over 2.5 years and on 3 November the Council issued a formal apology concerning the failure to deal with it in a timely manner. Since that apology the application has moved to determination.</p> <p>Setting that unfortunate history aside, this proposed access for just the holiday element at Halcyon Park has been carefully conceived and has involved considerable work in satisfying the concerns of the</p>

	<p>Environment Agency.</p> <p>However, only now after 2.5 years there are concerns from the Council at the highway impact of the development.</p> <p>Of course it is possible for the Members to disagree with the advice of the Highway Authority, but the NPPF makes it clear that to reasonably refuse developments on highway grounds the residual impacts must be severe and in this case although Kingsmans Farm Road is relatively narrow with bends, traffic speeds are low and, of course, it is a no through road.</p> <p>There is a strong argument to separate the traffic associated with the residential and holiday elements on Halcyon Park and this objective is supported by the residents.</p> <p>The proposal is the most appropriate way of achieving this and after due consideration and consultation with a highway consultant the Council is asked to determine the application as submitted.</p> <p>On an entirely without prejudice basis, however, the applicants who own the whole frontage on the north side of Kingsmans Farm Lane are willing to consider any reasonable request to improve the highway situation for the benefit of all road users.</p>
--	--