

ITEM 6 – 18/00126/FUL – LAND BETWEEN WINDERMERE AVENUE, MALYONS LANE AND LOWER ROAD, HULLBRIDGE (Roundabout)

1. Informal Comments from the Essex County Highway Authority

The proposed junction arrangements have been modelled, designed and safety audited to meet industry standards. The HA is satisfied with the layout and its proximity to Zebra crossing (over 200m to the west) and its operation on the highway network. The provision of the right turn lane at Watery Lane will also assist with the movement of vehicles previously blocked on the network. The access arrangements to adjacent properties are not altered.

The provision of the bus layby and associated infrastructure will assist with the promotion of sustainable transport from the site and existing residential areas. The layby will also facilitate the free flow of vehicles on lower road and those utilising the Watery Lane junction travelling in an eastbound direction.

The proposed bus stop could not be moved to the east of the roundabout, due to existing facilities being available to the east of the Ferry Road mini roundabout and therefore placing the stops too close together.

2. Further Neighbour Representations

68 further letters have been received since the preparation of the report and from the following addresses:-

Abbey Close: 6.

Abbey Road: 30, 42, 60, 65.

Ambleside Gardens: 23.

Burnham Road: 27, 66, 81, 91, 112, 113.

Cedar Drive: 21 (2 letters).

Central Avenue: 22 (3 letters).

Creak View Avenue: 29.

Crouch Avenue: 79.

The Drive: 67.

Elm Grove: 7, 18 (2 letters).

The Esplanade: unaddressed.

Ferry Road: 39, 167, 235 (4 letters).

Grasmere Avenue: 43.

High Elms Road: 12.

Hillcrest Road: 52, 62.

Lower Road: unaddressed, 28, 31, 124, 160.

Malyons Lane: unaddressed.

Padgetts Way: 1, 21, 27.

South Avenue: 17.

Waxwell Road: 54, 67.

West Avenue: 10.

Windermere Avenue: 10, 26, 29 (2 letters), 51, 52, 54, 56, 66, unaddressed.

And 11 signed but unaddressed electronic submissions.

And which in the main make the following material comments and objections in addition to those set out in the report:-

- The location of the roundabout so close to Watery Lane and another roundabout at the top of Ferry Road will undoubtedly bring local roads to a complete standstill. Not having an alternative entrance into this planned development at the north of the site seems extremely short sighted. Ultimately I cannot think of a more unsuitable location for this development to be built as the entire local infrastructure (roads, electricity supply, sewerage system, public transport, etc.) will simply not be able to cope with another 500 households.
- The drawings show outdated 1985 designs. A lot of articulated vehicles today are much longer than in 1985 plus drawbar vehicles at 60 ft in this rural area plus farm tractors and trailers are much larger now.
- Also extra large low loaders delivering diggers and plant machinery to the site.
- This roundabout has been moved nearer to existing housing and nearer to the zebra crossing and mini roundabout by Budgens and is liable to cause congestion.
- Object as the roundabout has been moved closer to existing housing impacting negatively on the flow of traffic causing congestion as well as air and noise pollution to actual properties. Should be re-sited to accommodate those needs.
- This is a very sharp bend coming into Hullbridge and the roundabout will be too close to it. People come round the corner with speed and may not see backed up. This is very dangerous and could cause serious collisions.
- I strongly oppose the application that moves the roundabout closer to existing housing, the bus stop that has no layby, and a bus every 15 minutes, plus

zebra crossing, a mini roundabout which services Ferry Road and Lower Road. This will cause a considerable amount of congestion.

- A change to the road layout should be at the junction with Lower Road, Hullbridge Road and Watery Lane. Construction of a conventional roundabout as against a mini roundabout that are always abused and would be more suitable for the traffic flow.
- The village memorial has not been sited well for such times as remembrance day and should be a public space and relocated to allow space for a proper roundabout.
- Insufficient thought has gone into this application. Traffic congestion is high and putting in a site roundabout to ease your construction access and then probable new housing residents will only slow traffic down and cause more congestion and travel chaos for residents already living here. Hullbridge is not able to cope with more houses or traffic. It is already used as a cut through for people commuting from Hockley, Ashingdon and Canewdon, etc.
- The roundabout has been moved on this application nearer to existing housing and closer to the zebra crossing/Budgens roundabout and will add further to congestion.
- It would seem a far better proposal to extend the new bus stop 'slip road' to include access to the site from the Watery Lane direction and making a 'traffic light' sequence for access and egress both to and from the development, in conjunction with the proposed roundabout, to give some sense of movement for all road users.
- The construction of the roundabout will disrupt the bus service, which will in turn disrupt the children who use the service to get to/from school, and the commuters who travel to/from the station.
- The roundabout proposed is going to cause a pile up of traffic back up Ferry Road and Coventry Hill in the mornings and Lower Road to Rawreth Lane in the evenings with traffic from the proposed housing having right of way. This will cause rat running through the development causing more jams and potential danger.
- This roundabout will only slow traffic down. It will make the surrounding roads more congested than they already are. It will be chaos. Removing the bridleway is a disgrace. It will force more horses and riders onto the very busy roads which will be very dangerous for them.
- What will the impact be on the local area when the 2 new roundabouts are built; how will these be managed to reduce/prevent travel delays?
- The plan for the development of the Rawreth Lane roundabout is January 2019 which is also when Watery Lane can be closed due to flooding. This could cause severe traffic delays for commuters travelling via Hullbridge. Will consideration be given on timing of road works so that no other local works are being completed that would push further traffic via Hullbridge (e.g. works on Hockley High Road, A1245, A129) or allowing for emergency works such as the Cadent work on Lower Road that left traffic lights but no one working

over a bank holiday weekend and caused utter chaos and travel delays across the region in combination with other planned works. (I know this is nothing to do with the Council but other planned works were still in place over the weekend which added to the problem overall)

ITEM 7 - 18/00124/FUL - LAND BETWEEN WINDERMERE AVENUE, MALYONS LANE AND LOWER ROAD, HULLBRIDGE (Bridleway)

1. Response to Consultation: Essex County Council Highways

From a highway and transportation perspective the impact of the proposal is acceptable to the Highway Authority.

The removal of the condition is acceptable to ECC.

ECC cannot support the creation of an adopted bridleway as a public right of way at this location. Our policy from a maintenance and inspection perspective is to not accept any new urban bridleways, i.e. bridleways within medium/large development sites.

Moreover, the most crucial issues here at this location are the safety aspect and the lack of real connectivity improvements within the proposal. The suggested creation would not connect to any equestrian accessible public right of way (PROW). We would not therefore expect to see any new bridleways created at this site.

2. Further Neighbour Representations

Eight further letters have been received since the preparation of the report from the following addresses:-

Elm Grove: 18 (2 letters)

High Elms: 12

Lower Road: 31

Waxwell Road: 67

West Avenue: 10.

Windermere Avenue: 98

And one unaddressed.

And which in the main make the following relevant comments and objections in addition to those set out in the report:-

- The local countryside which will be decimated by this development is regularly used by riders when exercising their horses in the local fields and bridlepaths. Unfortunately when they are forced to use the roads to get from field to field this can be very dangerous to the riders (some are young children) and can also result in traffic congestion. It is therefore essential that all existing Bridle paths which already pass through this site are maintained for the use of future generations.
- Understand that ECC are against the idea due to maintenance. I assume the cycle route and skateboard park that were in the original plans with the bridleway are not being removed and as stated in the original application that the developer would be liable for the upkeep. I see no reason to remove the bridleway which will be a very useful route to get riders through Hullbridge without having to use Ferry Road. The advantage of the bridleway is that it can be used by all groups, walkers, cyclists, and riders. Please do not remove this valuable link and put riders in danger on the road. The requirements were stated in the approval so the developer was obviously happy with the maintenance clause. I do not see why ECC are so against it.
- I object to the removal on the premise that it would seem the developer has put this in the original application to make the plan more inviting to a rural community and once planning approval has been given has gone back on their promise. We have a sad lack of bridleways at present considering we are a rural community with many horses around which means they do have to use the roads leading to the inevitable traffic hold ups. This is a resource that would be beneficial to the locality.
- I do not believe that the bridleway should be excluded.

One letter has also been received from the Rt. Honourable Mark Francois MP and which makes the following comments:-

- I understand that the developers had originally agreed to install a new replacement bridleway on the site on land between Windermere Avenue, Malyons Lane and Lower Road. However, according to recent reports in the local press, it would seem that this provision has now been deleted. I think this would be a retrograde step and I would like to see the bridleway reinstated as part of the development plan.

3. Revised Officer Recommendation

Officer comment:

At the time of assessing the current application the advice of the County Highway Authority was not known and weight was given to the assumptions made in the consideration of the outline application that were based upon the requirements of the allocation plan and that as the application was in outline form, a condition

requiring the provision of the bridle path met the requirements of the development plan.

Members will see within the comments from the County Highway Authority concerns relating to future maintenance but also concerns at the safety of riders and other highway traffic as a result of being brought into conflict in large development sites.

The legal agreement to the outline planning permission makes provision for future maintenance of open spaces, footpaths and any bridlepath.

Of significance, however, are the concerns raised by the County Highway Authority with respect to the safety aspects that would bring horse riders, pedestrians and particularly vehicular traffic into conflict. Horse riders would journey to the facility on the road either by transport or more likely by riding and would have to pass through the roundabout junction entering the site. Whilst the footpath and landscaped areas around the site could be improved (widened) to make the bridlepath provision, horse riders would be using a facility in close proximity with suburban traffic within the development and the associated noise and disturbance typical to a suburban environment not suited to horse riding. For this reason, District officers understand that the County Highway Authority favours bridleway provision away from developed areas.

The site does not connect with any equestrian accessible public right of way. There would be a risk that horse riders would make use of the public footpath network leading away from the site which would be illegal. After using the bridlepath required by the condition, riders would then re-enter the road network. As such the site does not present any opportunity to provide real connectivity to the bridleway network and the provision required by condition 38 should be discouraged.

Weight needs to be given to the advice now received from the Highway Authority. The position taken is also consistent with a similar view expressed upon the development to the west of Rayleigh under Policy SER 1 to land south of Rawreth Lane and north of London Road.

In view of the recommendation now received from the County Highway Authority District officers **REVISE THE RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION DELETING CONDITION 38 AND THE REQUIREMENTS FOR A BRIDLE PATH TO BE PROVIDED IN THE DEVELOPMENT** and that a revised outline permission be issued without condition 38 and that being incorporated into the existing legal agreement to the outline permission.