### Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Development Control Committee 5th August 2015

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

### **General Information**

The Southend <u>Development Management DPD (DM DPD)</u> and <u>Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule</u> was adopted by the Council on 24<sup>th</sup> July 2015.

In particular, the DM DPD replaces the majority of saved policies contained within the 1994 Southend on Sea Borough Local Plan (BLP). These are set out in Appendix 8 of the DM DPD. Reference to any superseded BLP policies within the agenda and recommendations (conditions and reasons for refusal) should be disregarded and will be deleted.

Members are reminded that the superseded policies do not form part of the development plan.

### Reports on Pre-Meeting Site Visits (4a)

# Page 11 The Esplanade Public House 15/00155/FULM

# 1. The Proposal

The applicant has now offered a payment of £51,223 as a contribution for Affordable Housing. For reasons set out in the main report this is considered to be inadequate.

#### Additional information and comment

The applicant has submitted further comment setting out what they consider to be the benefits of the scheme and associated costs – summarised as follows:

Costs

a) Cliff slip works

£1,121,000

[Officer comment – these works are structurally necessary in only as a result of the proposed development, this cliffs in this location are stable and do not require any general further stabilisation. [These works are only necessary as a result of the development]

b) Highways works

£8.000

[Officer comment – these works are only necessary as a result of the development]

c)Education £28,846

[Officer comment – this contribution is now covered by CIL]

d) Replacement trees

£5,500

[Officer comment – trees are to be removed this sum is to pay for replacement trees and these works are only necessary as a result of the development]

e) Public Art - £40,000

[Officer comment – the applicant has offered this payment in response to officers request. Public art is standard requirement for major schemes]

f) Council costs £1,500 g) CIL £137,502

[Officer comment - CIL was introduced nationally in 2010, CIL is a levy that the Council applies to new developments in the borough. The money collected is spent on new infrastructure within the borough (i.e. roads, flood defences, schools, parks) to support growth. CIL is governed by the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended). This is a nonnegotiable payment. The principle behind CIL is that most development has some impact on infrastructure and should contribute to the cost of providing or improving infrastructure].

g) Contribution for off-site affordable housing

£51,223

Design – the applicant considers the design is acceptable and should be recommended for approval.

S106 – The applicant does not agree to a claw back or similar clause because this will impact upon funding. Development would start of site in November 2016 is permission granted in September 2015 and would take 3 years.

What will Southend get long term?

- a) The building will generate/safeguard 29 jobs, making a substantial addition to GDP. The applicant estimates this will equate to £1m [officer comment no evidence has been submitted to the support this assertion]
- b) Council tax from 24 apartments. The applicant estimates this will equate to £90k per annum.
- c) Repairs to park land around the site [officer comment the issue is being negotiated with Parks and does not form part of the planning application].

#### Reports on Main reports (4b)

Page 30 1 Great Hays 15/00979/FULH

#### **Public Consultation**

- **7.1** One letter in favour of the development has been submitted stating:
  - Amendments have been incorporated to the previously refused plans.
  - The house is too small for the family.
  - No. 10 Great Hays opposite the application site has a two storey side extension. [Officer Comment: This extension appears to have

been erected prior to the adoption of the current development plan. Furthermore the two storey extension of No. 10 Great Hays is sited approximately 3.5 metres off the boundary adjacent to the highway.]

- The proposal would not affect the neighbours to the east No. 47 Eastwood Old Road.
- No objection to the proposed windows to the south flank elevation.
  The property has existing windows to this elevation.
- The proposal should be complementary to the extension of No. 10 Great Hays. There should be minimal impact on the streetscene.