

## QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

### TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE ON 18<sup>th</sup> April 2023

#### Item 6

##### 1) Question from Mr M

*Thank you Chair. My name is xxxx from Savills, and I am the Planning Agent for the application at land north of South Woodham Ferrers.*

The application before you covers the last part of the Strategic Growth Site 10 to come forward, with Countryside's larger application having been approved by this committee earlier this year.

The principle of development is established by the allocation of the site within the Local Plan, and the approval of the site wide masterplan in 2021. Over the last three years Bellway Homes and their consultant team has worked together with your officers, officers at the County Council, and other key stakeholders to ensure that they design a scheme that will deliver the vision for the site.

In accordance with both the allocation and the masterplan, the scheme includes a significant quantum of green infrastructure that respects the existing landscape context. This includes green corridors, public open space, children's play space and allotments, all of which will deliver a net increase in trees and a Biodiversity Net Gain of at least 10%.

Of the new homes, 35% will be affordable with a mix of affordable rent, shared ownership and first homes. All new homes, irrespective of tenure, will be of a high quality and will be built to Future Homes Standards, meaning that there will be no gas boilers on the site. The scheme also includes an element of self and custom build homes, and a financial contribution towards specialist accommodation. Financial contributions towards education and health have also been secured to meet the demands of the new homes.

Together with Countryside's application, Bellway's application completes the vision for the Strategic Growth Site, and will ensure the delivery of much needed new homes, the necessary infrastructure, and a significant quantum of new public open space.

The scheme has been thoroughly tested, and we are pleased that officers at both the City Council and the County Council have endorsed our assessments, leading to a very positive officer report with a recommendation for approval. This includes the support from the Highway Authority, with a proportionate financial contribution secured towards the highway works already secured through Countryside's application.

I'd like to finish by saying that this is a scheme that we are all proud of as a team, and we hope that you will be able support your officers' recommendation this evening.

Thank you for listening.

#### Item 8

##### 1) Question from Mr B

**Representation on a Planning Application**

**Chelmsford City Council Planning Committee : Tuesday 18<sup>th</sup> April 2023**

**Planning Application Reference: 22/02196/FUL**

## **Objection made by Evolution Town Planning on Behalf of 7, 8 and 9 Glebe Road**

We object on behalf of numbers 7, 8 and 9 Glebe Road. These homes are immediately to the west of the application site. They are separated from the site by a narrow walkway. The application site is a surface car park so the homes receive light to the front rooms. The homes are terraces and to the front are kitchens on the ground and bedrooms on the first floor. They only have windows to the front facing the application site and to the rear. As the homes have limited principal windows, half of which face towards the application site, the impact of the development on these homes needs to be carefully considered.

Policy DM23 of the Local Plan states that '*development must be compatible with its surroundings having regard to scale, siting, and form.*' The proposal fails to respect the amenity of the homes to the west because of overlooking, an overbearing impact, and by increasing the possibility of crime in the area.

The new development has a 3 storey section fronting Glebe Road. This is to be some 10.36 metres high, and will be 12.5 metres from the homes to the west. The new development will take light from these homes and will have an overbearing impact because of the height and its proximity to the homes. The 3 storey section will impact on principle rooms and windows of the homes to the west and should be reduced in height.

There are large windows in the North West Elevation of the new development. The occupants of 7, 8 and 9 are particularly concerned about the loss of privacy into their first-floor bedroom windows from homes only 12 metres away. Currently these rooms are private so any loss of privacy will have a significant impact. The application should be amended to remove this overlooking.

Numbers 7, 8 and 9 are accessed from a narrow walkway which leads to a dead end. There has been anti-social behaviour in the walkway. Currently the open aspect to the car park provides views of the walkway and increases security.

The proposal does not comply with policy DM23 and so should be refused or amended to better protect the amenity of the residents to the west of the application site.

### **Item 9**

#### **1) Question from Mr W**

Ferrers Dental Surgery

In July 2021 an application was refused for a similar proposal to the one being presented today. My question is why this application is being put forward for approval?

The only difference that I can see is that a six-bay cycle shelter is now being proposed.

Alongside the rear parking spaces being re-aligned.

Currently the surgery has a maximum of 21 spaces. The proposed development would provide 1 additional space.

However, the surgery currently has 6 surgery rooms, and the proposal would increase to 8 surgery rooms. The additional rooms will accommodate at least two further staff, plus have another customer, therefore 6 further spaces should be provided. Plus, any additional admin staff to accommodate extra surgery provision.

I have no issue with an expansion, but it should be carried out with local resident's concerns being taken into consideration.

I find it offensive that by including a cycle shelter as part of the parking strategy, this now makes the scheme acceptable. Knowing full well that these will be used very infrequently. As an example, today, I came home from work, there were three cars parked on Blacksmith Close, next to the surgery, so assume these are customers attending the dentist. However, there was ample spaces within the on-site car park.

My house is approx. 100 yards down the road from the surgery, we regularly have cars blocking our driveway.

- How will the surgery encourage customers and employers to cycle?

- Pump Lane is a very unpleasant road to cycle on, what measures will be put in place by the surgery or others to make Pump Lane easier to cycle on?

In a worst-case scenario that it does go onto being approved, what measures/conditions will the surgery and Chelmsford City Council put on parking within Blacksmith Close. There has been clear objections from the residents. Accepting this proposal does not diminish the issue that cars will continue to be parked on Blacksmith Close.

## 2) Question from Mr D

We and the residents of Blacksmith Close and Anvil way **STRONGLY OBJECT** to this proposed planning application for the following reasons, in no particular order:

Parking on Blacksmiths Close and Anvil Way is an ongoing problem with patients choosing to park on the surrounding roads rather than the car park. Even with the proposed changes to the car park it will still not be enough for staff and patients. Regularly cars are parked on the corners of the road, which is dangerous, causing visibility problems for residents entering and exiting the estate, also Emergency vehicles could have problems should they need to access the estate.

Many times at the moment there are more cars on the road than in their car park, unfortunately patients just seem to 'find it easier to use the surrounding roads to park'. A significant number of cars not using the car park are large SUV type vehicles, and we feel that the small amount of additional car park space will not lead to any change in their parking habits.

No evidence has been provided to back up the suggestion that patients will cycle and walk to the surgery.

There is not usually a need for a large car park in a residential estate and this business premises and proposed application is an over development of the original site (a residential home).

Our property in Anvil Way backs onto the Dental Surgery and this application will be built on the boundary of 2/3 of our garden. The 2 storey extension to the main building will be very close to our boundary fence with windows that will face into our Kitchen/conservatory. We moved into our property before the dentist was there. Original planning in 1995 stated no new windows were to be installed at the rear of the property to maintain our privacy and this should be taken into account.

The proposed extension coming further down the existing garden will be significantly closer to our house. This will almost definitely result in more noise pollution. Noise emanating from the dentist continues to be a problem. In the summer months frequently doors and windows are opened and we can hear consultations with patients and the noise from the machinery (drills, compressors etc.).

Machinery above background noise levels should not be able to be heard at the boundary of any adjoining property and as such is a statutory nuisance. All doors and windows to the rear & side nearest to our property are to remain closed at all times under the current conditions imposed by the council in 1995, but the Dentist ignores this rule and we have to remind them on many occasions to shut the windows and doors. This has been ongoing for over 25 years, therefore they do not adhere to current planning restrictions & rules which leads us to believe they will not follow any new ones implemented. Our understanding is that state of the art air conditioning & ventilation has been installed. We therefore fail to see why any windows or doors need to be open and this should at the very least continue to be part of any future planning conditions.

We hope ours and our neighbours concerns are taken into account when considering this application.