

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Ian Davidge [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 23 July 2019 14:22  
**To:** planning applications  
**Subject:** Revised Comments Development 18/01115/FUL

Dear RDC PLanning Team

Greetings

Yesterday I sent you an email at approx 11.45 a.m. regarding my comments on this Planning Application.

I was surprised that I received NO automatic response from yourselfs to advise that the message had been recieved, because when I have contacted you in the past by email an automatic reply was sent.

So I am now contacting you to request a confirmation from yourselves that you did recieve the message I sent yesterday.

I would also be pleased to receive any further comments you may have about the contents of that message including the enclosure.

I am a bit confused as to why no automatic reply was generated, as it ensures that those like myself who contact you through these channels can be confident that their input has been received.

Otherwise we are left in the dark, not knowing if the message has got through or not.

Looking forward to receiving your reply to this message.

Thank You

Regards

Ian Davidge

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Ian Davidge [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 22 July 2019 11:45  
**To:** planning applications  
**Subject:** Revised Comments Development 18/01115/FUL  
**Attachments:** Dev 1801115FUL (sent - Jul 2019).docx

Dear RDC Planning Team

I refer to the phonecall your Council Receptionist had earlier this morning with one of your staff, during my visit to your Rochford office.

#### **Background**

In my visit I described the background as follows:

At approx 10.45 on Friday 19th July I submitted comments regarding this Application, via your on-line system.

I subsequently realised I had sent a draft version in error, rather than the final version

Your Receptionist advised that you suggested I should email the Final version to you, hence this email.

#### **Revised Version**

So please find enclosed at the end of this message, the revised version of my comments regarding this application, as contained in the attached Word document.

I would be grateful if you could replace my original wording with this new version.

Please note that the other information supplied in last Friday's submission remains unchanged.

#### **Conclusion**

I trust this is satisfactory, but if you do need any further information from me, please do not hesitate to contact me,

I apologise for any inconvenience caused and thank you for your assistance

Regards

Ian Davidge  
64 Alexandra Road  
Great Wakering,  
Essex

**Dear RDC Planning Team**

**Planning Application 18 / 01115 / FUL - Revised**

**Purpose of Letter**

The purpose of this letter is to **OBJECT** to the revised application for this proposed development, for the following reasons.

**Agreement with other Neighbourhood Contributors**

I agree with the points made by other Neighbourhood Contributors about the negative and detrimental impact that this development will have on the existing character, street scene and amenity value for those of us who already live in Alexandra Road.

I also agree with comments submitted by GWPC in their contribution of 19<sup>th</sup> July 2019.

**Intensification and Backlanding - Development Management Framework (DMF) Policy 2.21 - 2.23**

The development introduces a significant Backlanding element into Alexander Road, where presently no such element exists i.e. it represents a change to the character of the residential environment.

Currently Alexandra Road is a residential side street lined, at least as far as the Milton Hall Close development i.e. from the High Street down to numbers 85 / 86, by single dwellings on either side. There are no other dwellings to the rear of any these properties before you get to the Milton Hall Close estate.

The proposed development thus introduces the "Backlanding" issues as described in 2.23 of overlooking and privacy for the existing residents, behind whose properties these new dwellings would be built. It puts directly at risk, the protections for existing residents as described in that part of the DMF.

**Alexandra Road and Traffic Generation**

**Alexandra Road is a Dead-End, a No-Through Road.**

The junction with the High Street is the **only way in and out** of Alexandra Road for all vehicles wishing to access the properties within it. This amounts to some 200 existing properties in Alexandra Road including those in Milton Hall Close.

All **must** use this single point of entry / exit. There is No alternative.

It is a residential side street in regular and intensive use especially at key times during the working day, as pointed out in comments made by other Neighbourhood Contributors.

The proposed feeder road is sited towards the top end of Alexandra Road i.e. The High Street end, where it therefore adds approx a further 10% to the number of properties to the Road. It introduces an attendant "traffic generation" (DMF 2.22) element, increasing the vehicle numbers using this vital traffic artery, while appearing to offer no mitigation to this additional traffic burden.

#### **Can the development area accommodate all development traffic?**

Alexandra Road is totally unsuited to the volume and nature of the development traffic required to support this size of development.

Given that this development has NO alternative means of access, will the development be able to accommodate the types of heavy vehicles likely to be used to deliver the volume of Plant and Supplies needed to sustain a development of this size and / or remove the Waste and Spoil produced by it?

For example where are such vehicles to be parked up or "lay over" when idle and / or awaiting use?

The road is not wide enough to allow it to be partially "blocked off" while still allowing other traffic to get through, especially large vehicles such as the Districts own Refuse Collection vehicles, and also Emergency Vehicles.

#### **Disruption to Current Residents and Services / Impact for Emergency Vehicle Access**

Finally I also wonder about the disruption and loss of amenity to existing residents, for both traffic and the delivery of essential infrastructure services (Gas / Water / Sewers / Electric / RDC Waste Collection), that might arise when building this development and when connecting it to these existing essential services.

#### **Conclusion**

So for the reasons above I believe the District should **REJECT** this development.

I trust this is satisfactory and thank you for providing the opportunity to comment on it.