

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Development Control Committee 4th March 2015

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Report(s) on Pre-Meeting Site Visits (4a)

Page 3

14/01462/FULM

Marine Plaza, Land between Southchurch Avenue and Pleasant Road fronting Marine Parade

1. The Proposal

Following discussion with officers the applicant has offered a further £25k contribution for signage to direct drivers away from the seafront at times when car parking there is reaching full capacity (as referred to at paragraph 4.78 of the report.

Para 1.1 - The reference to A4 drinking establishments uses should be **deleted**. This is in fact a reference to the amount of A4 development that currently exists on site.

6. Representation Summary

6.1 Anglian Water - Further to the comments from Anglian Water set out in the main report the applicant has now confirmed that:

'We confirm that the maximum surface water runoff discharge rate from the proposed development irrespective of the point, or points, of connection will be 22 l/s. Details of the surface water drainage system serving the existing site will be provided and if it is shown that the existing areas of hardstanding are not connected to the public sewer then the maximum runoff rate from the development will be reduced to the greenfield runoff rate of 5l/s.'

Officer comment: This issue will therefore be clarified at connection stage and this matter is therefore considered to have been addressed satisfactorily.

8. Representation Summary

8.1 Highways - Discussions have been on-going between highways officers and the applicant with regard to the contributions for bus stops. The applicants have stated that: *The contribution requested for the bus shelters seems reasonable. However, with regard to the associated works comprising raised borders, which Glanvilles assume refers to bus stop kerbing, it would probably be far easier for these specific works to be carried out by the highways contractor at the same time as all other kerbing installations. Similarly all lining works associated with the development will probably be done on a day rate given the small amount required and hence, it might be possible for the bus stop lining works to be done at the same time. Glanvilles envisage a future co-ordination issue*

when the highway works are finally constructed although this would not be insurmountable. It is suggested that the contribution is reduced to £10,000, thus just contributing towards the cost of the bus shelters.

Officers and accept the above comments and accept the offer of £10,000 for the bus shelters. It should be noted that officers will need to formally agree the detail of the raised kerbs, height, location, length and signing and lining required for each site with their contractor to ensure the works are carried out as required. The recommendation will be amended accordingly.

9.0 Public Consultation

One further letter of objection received on the following grounds:

- Building heights are excessive. 5 of 6 maximum are acceptable.
- Views of the sea should be retained
- No residences on the Golden Mile, they are likely to conflict with existing entertainment uses if residents complain about disturbance.
- Object to the development which will result in healthy developer profit in return for a single floor of potential public space for the town.
- Worries that a supermarket is approved on the seafront and hope this doesn't herald a radical change of purpose in the long term for this area.

One letter has been received on behalf Stockvale Limited, raising no objections to the proposals but making observations. The letter acknowledges the Councils aspiration for regeneration and growth in the tourist industry by means of residential intensification and would like to see this continue. They will be progressing proposals to bring forward the Sealife Centre and Adventure Island for a change of use and will seek a similar approach with 10 -12 storeys buildings. They also note that the application seeks to attract quality eateries which they consider is an interesting proposition as McDonald were unable to maintain a seafront presence. **[Office comment: Each application will be considered on its merits in accordance with policy]**

11. Recommendation

Part (a), bullet point 4 should read:

- **A contribution of £10k for off-site tree planting.**

Bullet point 4, sub bullet point 11 amended to read as follows:

- **Highways works to include but not limited to the following:**
 - Sub bullet point 11 amended to read: Contribution of £10K for 2 x bus shelters
 - Additional sub bullet point: Detail of the raised kerbs, height, location, length and signing and lining required for each site to be agreed and agreed details to be carried out by the applicant's contractor at their expense.

An additional sub bullet point should be added:

- **A £25k contribution for signage to direct drivers away from the seafront at times when car parking there is reaching full capacity**

Part (b)

Amended Conditions:

16. Prior to first occupation of the development renewable energy measures set out in the Energy Statement by Xc02 energy dated February 2015 and plan ref 3202 PL117B shall be implemented and shall be permanently retained thereafter.

35. The reference to A4 drinking establishments shall be deleted.

Additional Condition:

43. Unless otherwise agreed in writing the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL101A, PL102A, PL103A, PL104A, PL105A, PL106A, PL107A, PL108A, PL109A, PL110A, PL111A, PL112A, PL113A, PL114A, PL115A, PL116A, PL117B, PL201A, PL202A, PL203A, PL204A, PL205A, PL206A, PL207A, PL208A, PL209A, PL210A, PL25A, PL26A.

Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the development plan.

Page 77
14/01672/BC4M

Hinguar Primary School, Hinguar Street Shoeburyness

9.0 Public Consultation

One further letter of comment has been received, raising no objection in principle, but seeking conditions relating to:

- Hours of working. **[Officer comment: Condition 13 addresses this issue].**
- Traffic Management Plan for traffic plan during construction works
- Works done by utility companies for the development should not impede/ inconvenience residents **[Office comment: this is outside the planning remit].**
- Hinguar Street residents to be notified of any road or footpath works.
- Ample parking spaces should be allocated for residents within the site.

One further letter from a previous objector has been received raising queries regarding

- The desire for screen planting along the boundary of the site with No4 Hinguar Street
- The condition of the boundary wall with No4 Hinguar Street, is it safe?
- Advertisement of the TRO
- Visibility splays to the site.
- How the traffic generation information is produced/assessed

11.0**Part (a)**

- Education contribution confirmed as £156,639.31

Page 105
14/01744/BC4M

Saxon Lodge, Smith Street, Shoeburyness**9.0 Public Consultation**

One further letter of comment has been received, raising no objection in principle, but seeking conditions relating to:

- Hours of working. **[Officer comment: Condition 13 addresses this issue].**
- Traffic Management Plan for traffic plan during construction works.
- Works done by utility companies for the development should not impede/ inconvenience residents **[Office comment: this is outside the planning remit].**
- Hinguar Street residents to be notified of any road or footpath works.
- Ample parking spaces should be allocated for residents within the site.
- All trees that run along the rear of Saxon Lodge should be removed and not replaced with other trees as they shade gardens, are unsightly and shed needles. Officer comment: **Condition 08 addresses this issue].**

Page 127
15/00101/FULH

54 Braemar Crescent, Leigh-on-Sea, Essex, SS9 3RJ**7.2 Public Consultation**

Two additional letters of objection have been received stating:

- The height of the patio is high and will result in overlooking and loss of privacy.
- No objections to the proposal as long as fences are used instead of obscure screens along the patio area.
- The size of the extension is not in keeping with the character of the houses in the neighbourhood.
- It dominates in appearance and detracts from a well-kept traditional style.
- The extension is greater in height than its surroundings.
- The raised patio infringes on all of the neighbours' privacy, the raised elevation allows sight into neighbouring gardens and for sound and noise to travel further without restriction.
- Privacy can then only be achieved by the erection of screens and fences, which are objected to as they would enclose the gardens of neighbouring properties.

Main reports (4b)

Page 2
15/00124/BC4

10 Lodwick, Shoeburyness, Essex, SS3 9HW

7.2 Public Consultation

Four additional letters of objection have been received and should be read in conjunction with paragraph 7.2 of the main report stating:

- The proposal involves loss of public spaces and could set a precedent.
- Cars and motorbikes do tend to travel much faster than the speed limit along Shoebury Common Road and there is an increased risk when those vehicles are approaching from the east from Ness Road/Waterford Road junction area heading towards Southend, because of the overgrown vegetation and this could result in a catastrophic accident.

Page 17
14/01708/FULM

Wellstead Gardens Sports and Social Club, Wellstead Gardens

7. Representation Summary

7.6 Councillor Courtenay objects to the proposal given the additional parking stress this application will cause to residents of the area particularly in Wellstead Gardens. The area is already between the hospital parking management scheme and three secondary schools. Therefore there are lots of vehicles in this small area. This application will increase the use of the facilities including coaches, yet provide no additional parking.

The size and height of the building does not fit in with the local area. The building would 'tower over' properties particularly St James Gardens and Kenilworth Gardens.

7.7 A letter has been received from David Amess MP supporting the constituent's concerns detailed under paragraph 7.5 of the main report.

9. Recommendation

09. The use of the building hereby approved for sporting activities shall be restricted to the following times:

0800-2100 Monday to Friday
0900-1800 Saturday and Sundays

Page 55
15/00066/FULH

5 Park Terrace, Westcliff-On-Sea, Essex, SS0 7PH

7 Representation Summary Milton Conservation Society

7.1 Comments from Milton Conservation Society received as follows:

- We are concerned that this application for additional storage to 5 Park Terrace is overdevelopment of the 5 Park Terrace due to the earlier construction of a large building in the rear garden which appears to be being used for expanded living space (possibly a separate occupancy). We would request that the existing position on the site is fully established and included in your report on this application so that the context of further expansion of 5 Park Terrace is understood. If the main site of 5 Park Terrace has now become overdeveloped it brings into question the validity of this application for further storage space at the expense of the loss of parking the existing spaces (even if this parking is informal). These parking spaces help reduce the impact on local on-street parking streets which is a known problem in this area.
- On this basis we wish to register our objection to the application.
- The report does not highlight the building in the rear garden to this property which was retrospectively refused planning permission back in 2004 yet enforcement action for its removal was not taken, despite our request for such action. This structure has a significant impact on the development, arguably the over development, of this site which would be further increased should this current application be granted planning permission. **[Officer Comment: With regard to the existing outbuilding in the rear garden of the application site, a retrospective planning application was refused by the Development Control Committee on 2 March 2005. The matter was then referred back to Development Control Committee on 30 March 2005 where it was determined that no further action should be taken against the outbuilding. The existing outbuilding is therefore, lawful in planning terms. The provision of another outbuilding, albeit not in the garden, is reflective of the character of this area which contains a number of garages used for a variety of storage purposes. On this basis the proposal cannot be considered overdevelopment as it will be used in a similar nature to the existing garages regardless of the fact that the dwelling already has an outbuilding.]**
- The description of the parking at paragraph 4.11 is also incomplete in that the existing space is sufficient for and has been used by two cars. The loss of this space to either the one car you have noted yourselves or the two cars we know have used the space will transfer this parking load onto the street. This in turn will cause even greater local parking difficulty and additionally place further stress on the conversion of local front gardens to vehicular hard standings. This could lead to erosion of the garden characteristic of the conservation area. **[Officer Comment: There is no current restriction on the land which requires it to be used for parking although the proposed outbuilding is capable of supporting parking for 1 vehicle. Therefore, the displacement of 1 vehicle onto the highway, if this were to occur, would not be detrimental to the local highway network.]**