

## **ITEM 7**

### **18/00185/FUL - 126 PLUMBEROW AVENUE, HOCKLEY**

#### **Further Neighbour Representation**

Since the preparation of the report one further letter has been received from the following address:-

Cornhill Avenue: 43

The contents of this are summarised below:-

- There have been instances of the Rochford District Council (RDC) website being down; this has made it difficult to draw up the objections to the planning alterations that have taken place. The situation is also frustrated by previous documents published which can no longer be viewed.
- How can a builder and his agents ignore the terms of conditions laid down in the Notice of Decision to be complied with prior to the building work commencing? This poses future potential risks to the residents affected by this construction work, as a number of conditions were not complied with; in particular, the impact drainage study and water run off. The builder and his agents have materially failed to comply and deviated from the original plans, and as such the buildings now have material differences to that granted on the plan. The elevation drawings also differ to the detailed plans insofar as windows differ in numbers on the buildings.
- At a meeting attended by a senior RDC planning officer residents heard that no resident would be overlooked from the development. This is not the case. Additional windows have been added and all windows have been raised in height from the original plans. The drawings demonstrate that the windows would be placed well below the soffit boards. However, the windows have been elevated so they are now raised to the soffit boards; this issue has been made even worse by the fact the builder has raised the floor level by approximately 300 mm.
- The results of these material alterations to the plans mean that all residents will be overlooked.
- One building that is located one metre from the boundary fence has windows with unobstructed views overlooking gardens and directly into residents living accommodation only a few metres away. These windows are situated to the rear and side elevation and as such are located above the existing two metre fence. We did point out that this was over development and did not comply with the RDC density plan; however, RDC has not commented or held an independent

investigation. Why did the builder or his agents consider it necessary to raise the height of the floor without consulting RDC? This has had a major impact that has caused concern to the residents.

- The water drainage has become a major issue as was pointed out in all communications of objection by the residents. My garden has now become so water logged that I have water sitting on the surface and a stream of water now runs from the garden down the driveway into the public highway after rain fall; this can continue for two/three days. The builder has placed the soak away sumps right up to our boundary fences - why were they not located at another location on the site?
- The site has compacted hard core throughout and will be block paved; no details are shown on the plans concerning the water run off. Failure to provide kerbs and drainage will result in rain fall flowing straight into surrounding properties, along with pollutants from road vehicles. We are aware the builder and his agents were pumping water from the site during construction into the road drains. The down pipes do not appear to be connected to the soak away; when they are the water from the building foot prints is going to be concentrated into a small area and will make the water situation worse for the residents. This is a major developing issue relating to water. The moisture report submitted by the builder appeared unprofessional, was undated, with no dates when the readings were taken and readings did not appear realistic. I have lived here for over thirty years and never had a water problem of this scale before. My property is situated down hill from this development and it is probable that if this development is allowed to continue under the existing plan without adequate measures being taken to stop the water run off, the situation will be intolerable. RDC has a duty of care to protect residents from issues relating to developers.
- I have been advised that the builder is entitled to deviate from the plans, not the terms and conditions. I have also been informed that the builder will erect fencing so that residents are not overlooked. I would be prepared to accept three fence panels two and a half metres in height that will respect my privacy. Fencing on the building located one metre from the boundary fences cannot resolve the issue due to the height of the building. Maybe the residents there may prefer for the side and rear elevation windows to be bricked up. If the builder can deviate from the plan, can the Council not also make alterations? I object to the soak away being placed all along the boundary fences and the issue of water run off from the proposed block paved area. A solution must be found by the developer relating to the surface water that is now flowing from my garden onto the highway. I accept no responsibility for this situation that has arisen from this development.

I expect RDC to protect the residents by ensuring measures are taken to stop the damage to our properties and gardens from the water run offs.

- The builder and his agents failed to adhere to the terms and conditions stipulated in the Notice of Decision and have also deviated from the agreed plans. This has had a major impact on the residents.
- If the builder and his agents cannot resolve this situation of their own making, then this planning application should be rejected. I hope that procedures are put in place and documented to eliminate the issues of water run off and overlooking in respect of this development.