

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 January 2018 09:56
To: Data Scanning
Subject: FW: Planning Application Comments 17/01136/OUT - REMINDER
Attachments: Email_Planning_Application_Comments_new.pdf; Objection.docx
Importance: High

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 January 2018 10:20
To: planning applications
Subject: FW: Planning Application Comments 17/01136/OUT - REMINDER
Importance: High

I haven't seen this updated or received a response. Please can someone look at this. Thanks

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 January 2018 08:15
To: 'planning.applications@Rochford.gov.uk'
Subject: FW: Planning Application Comments 17/01136/OUT

Thank you for your response.

However it looks like there has been a problem with the way my text has been transposed.

Please can you use the attached word document to make my text more coherent.

Thanks,

Jonathan

From: planning.applications@Rochford.gov.uk <planning.applications@Rochford.gov.uk>
Sent: Wednesday, January 10, 2018 10:42:57 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Planning Application Comments 17/01136/OUT

Dear Mr Jonathan May.

You have been sent this email because you or somebody else has submitted a comment on a Planning Application to Rochford District Council using your email address.

A copy of your comments are attached

Our Vision at Rochford District Council is to create a better future together.

This email (including any attachments) is intended only for the recipient(s) named above. It may contain confidential or privileged information and should not be read, copied or otherwise used by any other person unless express permission is given. If you are not a named recipient, please contact the sender and delete the email from your system. It is the recipient's responsibility to ensure that appropriate measures are in place to check for software viruses.

This e-mail (including any attachments) is private and confidential, may contain proprietary or privileged information and is intended for the named recipient(s) only. Unintended recipients are strictly prohibited from taking action on the basis of information in this e-mail and must contact the sender immediately, delete this e-mail (and all attachments) and destroy any hard copies. Nomura will not accept responsibility or liability for the accuracy or completeness of, or the presence of any virus or disabling code in, this e-mail. If verification is sought please request a hard copy. Any reference to the terms of executed transactions should be treated as preliminary only and subject to formal written confirmation by Nomura. Nomura reserves the right to retain, monitor and intercept e-mail communications through its networks (subject to and in accordance with applicable laws). No confidentiality or privilege is waived or lost by Nomura by any mistransmission of this e-mail. Any reference to "Nomura" is a reference to any entity in the Nomura Holdings, Inc. group. Please read our Electronic Communications Legal Notice which forms part of this e-mail:

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Comment 17/01136/OUT ID 6965

Application ref. 17/01136/OUT

Contact name Mr Jonathan May

Submission typ O - Objection

Repcode
 NATURE - Areas of Nature
 PRIVAC - Loss of privacy/overlooking
 VIEW - Loss of view
 NOISE - Noise and disturbance
 OVERDE - Over development
 POLICY - Policy objection
 DESIGN - Poor design
 LAYOUT - Poor layout/over-development
 HIGHWA - Traffic generation/access
 OTHER - null

Contact addres Fintry, Barrow Hall Road,
 Barling,
 Essex

Postcode SS3 0WQ

Contact email

Phone number

Objector type CONSUL - Consultee

Timestamp 2018-01-08 09:47:22+00

Id 6965

Comment Thank you for the notification regarding the planning application to build twenty-four three bed houses on the Rosedene Nurseries location.

I have reviewed the plans that have been made available on the Rochford Council website and as a consultee / resident of a neighbouring property I strongly object to this proposal because of the nine reasons that are stated below:

1. Green Belt Protection Rochford Council's Core Strategy document states a key objective is to continue to protect the openness and character of the District's Green Belt (consistent with the NPPF). The proposed development should therefore be viewed as inappropriate development and is harmful to the green belt. The NPPF states that Very special circumstances will not exit unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

Currently no evidence has been provided that supports other considerations outweighing inappropriateness. Furthermore, the proposal does not meet any of the exceptions provided within the NPPF for developing on Green Belt land:

- a. Buildings for agriculture and forestry Not applicable
- b. Provision of outdoor recreation facilities Not applicable
- c. Extension or alteration of an existing building Not applicable
- d. Replacement of existing building Not applicable

e. Limited affordable housing for local community needs – these new proposed properties would not meet the NPPF's definition of affordable housing, such as low cost market housing and may not be considered as affordable housing for planning purposes.

i. NPPF Annex 2 Glossary: Affordable Housing says Eligibility is determined by local incomes and local house prices. The local house prices within this area are above average, with the average UK house price set at £312k and the average property in this area averaging £408k. Examples of this can be seen in today's market whereby a three bedroom bungalows can be purchased within Southend for between £275k-300k, yet in the proposed area are currently valued at £400k-450k.

ii. NPPF Annex 2 Glossary: Affordable Housing says that housing should remain at an affordable price for future eligible households. The local area has consistently seen a greater % value increase than the UK average (SS3 has gone up 46% in the last five years, whereas UK average has gone up by less than 30%).

f. Filling or redevelopment of Brownfield Land – Not applicable

2. Legal Precedent – over the course of the last decade, Rochford Council have set a precedent in this area by consistently refusing planning permission for developments on this site (a) and development on existing neighbouring properties (b and c). All of which have been due to Green Belt Protection, with Rochford Council quoting Inappropriate development contrary to the NPPF. It also needs to be noted that all of these applications were also considerably smaller than the current proposed development. Therefore I would expect the Council to remain consistent with their previous rulings.

a) 06/00287/FUL (2006)

b) 11/00016/FUL (2011)

c) 15/00243/FUL (2015)

3. Commercial Impact – the proposed development will increase the supply of housing within the area and have adverse impacts on the values of existing properties, in an area that has always been much sought after due to its rural location.

4. Highway Safety – the development would adversely affect highway safety or the convenience of road users. Barrow Hall has a 30mph section of road that is sandwiched between national speed limits either side. The road is narrow in places and difficult to navigate to new drivers. Due to this reason there are frequent accidents and the council's efforts to emphasise the speed limit haven't provided the necessary enforcement to reduce dangerous driving. The proposed access road to the site (to the left of Mareng) is being placed on a dangerous bend in the road and the frequency of cars entering/exiting this access road will endanger lives.

5. Visual Impact – the proposed development is over-bearing, out of scale and out of character in terms of its appearance compared with existing development in the vicinity. It will affect the character of the neighbourhood with new build property designs not matching the unique designs of the existing properties. In effect, it will change the natural landscape from semi-rural to semi-urban and the development will have an adverse impact on the character of the landscape. Any development which is permitted should be in scale, design and sitting, such that the appearance of the countryside is not impaired.

6. Noise / Disturbance – the proposed development will almost double the number of houses within this area (25 houses on the periphery of the proposed site) and double the amount of noise, with twenty four new families moving in.

7. Loss of Existing Views – the proposed development will adversely affect the residential amenity of the neighbouring owners through the loss of existing views. The existing properties (Mareng, Fintry, Clenantis and Fowey) will now be surrounded within the new development by new properties and all existing surrounding views will be lost.

8. Loss of Privacy – the four proposed properties to the rear of our property will directly overlook our garden and house. The second storey of each of these properties will be able to look into the majority of our garden where our children play, as well as direct views into our kitchen,

dining area and lounge. Privacy was a key reason for our purchase of our property and this poses a significant concern to us.

9.5 Strained Infrastructure – With new housing developments already being developed within the surrounding areas there is already a significant strain on the local infrastructure, with a lack of doctors and schools to support the growing population. The proposed site would place an added strain on the public infrastructure and facilities which is necessary to enable housing to be provided within an area (Urban Regeneration and Housing Act 2015).

In summary, I strongly object to the proposal and request that Rochford Council acknowledge and review the points that I have raised. Due to the size of the proposal, the significant impact it has on the area and the multiple issues that have been stated above; I work under the assumption that this application will be referred to committee for determination. Please can I receive confirmation of this.

I am available to discuss any of the above points in more detail or provide any further details to support these issues. So in order to help your process, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Mr Jonathan May
Fintry, Barrow Hall Road, Barling, SS3 0QW

Application Number: 17/01136/OUT

Thank you for the notification regarding the planning application to build twenty-four three bed houses on the Rosedene Nurseries location.

I have reviewed the plans that have been made available on the Rochford Council website and as a resident of a neighbouring property I strongly object to this proposal because of the nine reasons that are stated below:

1. **Green Belt Protection** – Rochford Council's Core Strategy document states a key objective is to 'continue to protect the openness and character of the District's Green Belt' (consistent with the NPPF). The proposed development should therefore be viewed as inappropriate development and is harmful to the green belt. The NPPF states that 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations'. Currently no evidence has been provided that supports 'other considerations' outweighing 'inappropriateness'. Furthermore, the proposal does not meet any of the exceptions provided within the NPPF for developing on Green Belt land:
 - a. Buildings for agriculture and forestry – Not applicable
 - b. Provision of outdoor recreation facilities – Not applicable
 - c. Extension or alteration of an existing building – Not applicable
 - d. Replacement of existing building – Not applicable
 - e. Limited affordable housing for local community needs – these new proposed properties would not meet the NPPF's definition of affordable housing, such as 'low cost market' housing and may not be considered as affordable housing for planning purposes.
 - i. NPPF Annex 2 Glossary: 'Affordable Housing' says 'Eligibility is determined by local incomes and local house prices'. The local house prices within this area are above average, with the average UK house price set at £312k and the average property in this area averaging £408k (Zoopla). Examples of this can be seen in today's market whereby a three bedroom bungalows can be purchased within Southend for between £275k-300k, yet in the proposed area are currently on valued at £400k-450k (rightmove).
 - ii. NPPF Annex 2 Glossary: 'Affordable Housing' says that housing should 'remain at an affordable price for future eligible households'. The local area has consistently seen a greater % value increase than the UK average (SS3 has gone up 46% in the last five years, whereas US average has gone up by less than 30%).
 - f. Infilling or redevelopment of Brownfield Land – Not applicable
2. **Legal Precedent** – over the course of the last decade, Rochford Council have set a precedent in this area by consistently refusing planning permission for developments on this site (a) and development on existing neighbouring properties (b & c). All of which have been due to Green Belt Protection, with Rochford Council quoting 'Inappropriate development contrary to the NPPF....'. It also needs to be noted that all of these applications were also considerably smaller than the current proposed development. Therefore I would expect the Council to remain consistent with their previous rulings.
 - a) 06/00287/FUL (2006)
 - b) 11/00016/FUL (2011)
 - c) 15/00243/FUL (2015)
3. **Commercial Impact** – the proposed development will increase the supply of housing within the area and have adverse impacts on the values of existing properties, in an area that has always been much sought after due to its rural location.
4. **Highway Safety** – the development would adversely affect highway safety or the convenience of road users. Barrow Hall has a 30mph section of road that is sandwiched between national speed limits either side. The road is narrow in places and difficult to navigate to new drivers. Due to this reason there are frequent accidents and the council's efforts to emphasis the speed limit haven't provided the necessary enforcement to reduce dangerous driving. The proposed access road to the site (to the left of 'Mareng') is being placed on a dangerous bend in the road and the frequency of cars entering/exiting this access road will endanger lives.
5. **Visual Impact** – the proposed development is over-bearing, out of scale and out of character in terms of its appearance compared with existing development in the vicinity. It will affect the character of the neighbourhood with new build property designs not matching the unique designs of the existing properties. In effect, the natural landscape from semi-rural to semi-urban and the development will have an adverse impact on the character of the landscape. Any development which is permitted should be in scale, design and sitting, such that the appearance of the countryside is not impaired.

6. **Noise / Disturbance** – the proposed development will almost double the number of houses within this area (25 houses on the periphery of the proposed site) and double the amount of noise, with twenty four new families moving in.
7. **Loss of Existing Views** – the proposed development will adversely affect the residential amenity of the neighbouring owners through the loss of existing views. The existing properties (Mareng, Fintry, Cienantis and Foway) will now be surrounded within the new development by new properties and all existing surrounding views will be lost.
8. **Loss of Privacy** – the four proposed properties to the rear of our property will directly overlook our garden and house. The second storey of each of these properties will be able to look into the majority of our garden where our children play, as well as direct views into our kitchen, dining area and lounge. Privacy was a key reason for our purchase of our property and this poses a significant concern to us.
9. **Strained Infrastructure** – with new housing developments already being developed within the surrounding areas there is already a significant strain on the local infrastructure, with a lack of doctors and schools to support the growing population. The proposed site would place an added strain on the public infrastructure and facilities which is necessary to enable housing to be provided within an area (Urban Regeneration and Housing Act 2015).

In summary, I strongly object to the proposal and formerly request that Rochford Council acknowledge and review the points that I have raised. Due to the size of the proposal, the significant impact it has on the area and the multiple issues that have been stated above; I work under the assumption that this application will be referred to committee for determination. Please can I receive confirmation of this.

I am available to discuss any of the above points in more detail or provide any further details to support these issues. So in order to help your process, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Mr Jonathan May
Fintry, Barrow Hall Road, Barling, SS3 0QW