

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Development Control Committee 2nd September 2015

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Reports on Pre-Meeting Site Visits (4a)

Page 3

Shoeburyness High School

14/02050/FULM

Public Consultation

Since the preparation of the committee report a letter has been received from Councillor Jarvis which highlights concern that no objection has been raised to the application on the grounds of the loss of parking and that there are no highway objections to the proposals.

It is stated that an existing deficit of spaces will be increased by four and car parking surveys and discussions with local residents indicate that there is a wish for the school to increase its parking capacity. The leisure centre and youth centre use of the site will also impact on the availability of spaces.

It is therefore considered that the applicant, local councillors and relevant departments of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council should meet to resolve the parking issues that exist. The conversion of a green area fronting Caulfield Road to an additional parking area would be beneficial to alleviate parking stress.

Officer Notes – The applicant’s submissions show that the land at the leisure and youth centres is included within the application site. It is however been advised that those buildings and the associated car parking is on land that is owned by Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.

An amended Location Plan has been submitted by the applicant to exclude this land, which does not change the development that is proposed by this application.

The amount of parking within the application site is not 120 spaces as stated within the Officer’s Report but it appears that 80 parking spaces are available within the application site. The parking standards for schools are maximum standards and therefore the increased size of the building and the loss of four parking spaces is not contrary to the content of the development plan.

The suggestions of Councillor Jarvis in respect of other potential parking solutions are noted, but they are not proposed by this

application and these suggestions should therefore be given no weight in the assessment of this application.

Page 12
Cory Environmental Cleansing Depot
15/01129/AMDT

Consultation Response

6.9 Environmental Protection Team

The Council's Environmental Health Officer has advised the following:

- In respect of Contaminated Land, the submitted details do not enable the discharge of conditions 15, 16 and 17. In line with the advice of the Environment Agency, validation testing of works that have occurred to remove previously identified contaminated land is required, including testing for the presence of hydrocarbons and groundwater sampling. **(Officer Note – The amendment of condition 12 is suggested below)**
- The presence of elevated levels of gas should be assessed and mitigated at the site and the presence of contaminated land elsewhere at the site should also be considered. **(Officer Note – This can continue to be handled under the terms of former condition 18, numbered 13 in the Committee Report for this amendment application)**
- The means of addressing odour is to change. This would be a matter for the Environment Agency who will require the installation of an Odour Management system and the monitoring of the effect of that system under the terms of the Environment Agency Permit for the operation of the site, which is controlled under the terms of the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2010 **(Officer Note – As no objection was raised to the odour control system by the Environment Agency, it is considered that its installation should be deemed to be adequate and this has been addressed by condition 19 in the Committee Report)**
- Concerns are raised about the conditions that have been imposed previously and the re-wording of the conditions is suggested. **(Officer Note – The conditions related to the control of noise are not the subject of this application for the variation of conditions and as such it is considered that it would be unreasonable to amend the conditions).**
- The amended location of the building and the concentration of vehicle movements to the North side of the building rather than around the building will reduce the noise impact of the vehicle movements.
- The reversing of vehicles and the noise of associated beepers should be considered if they are to be used.
- The monitoring of the use of the Vehicle Wash Area and the mitigation offered by the proposed acoustic fence should occur after the development

has been installed **(Officer Note – Only measuring the noise caused by the use of the Vehicle Wash Area would not be worthwhile as it would not enable corrective measures. In this case it is considered adequate to impose a condition to limit the noise generated by the Vehicle Wash Area, as shown at condition 26 below)**

- Dust emissions caused by construction and demolition should be controlled in accordance with Best Practice Guidance **(Officer Note – It is considered that this matter is controlled by other legislation and this need not be duplicated by a planning condition)**

6.9 Consultation Response - Sustainable Urban Drainage Advisor

The Council's Sustainable Urban Drainage Advisor has advised that the submitted Drainage Strategy is satisfactory provided that the site surface is 'dished' to provide 800 cubic metres of surface water attenuation storage as set out within the drainage strategy. **(Officer Note – Condition 15 is amended below to address this advice)**

6.12 Public Consultation

Since the preparation of the committee report, one letter of comment has been received which raised concerns in relation to the following:

- The proposed changes should not be considered a minor material amendment due to the increased size and re-positioning of the WTS.
- The noise impact of vehicle movements and operations within the site.
- The building should be fully insulated to reduce noise impacts.
- The use of the Vehicle Wash Bay is irritating and intrusive due to the 'blasts' of water causing noise and the fact that engines are left running while cleaning occurs. The four meter acoustic fence would not be adequate to mitigate noise from the Vehicle Wash Bay if a ramp is installed. The wash bay should therefore be fully enclosed, relocated or surrounded with a secondary or higher fence. **(Officer Note – Noise emanating from the Vehicle Wash Bay has been considered by the Council's Environmental Health Officer and would be controlled by condition 26 below. The details of the proposed acoustic screen will be required to be submitted and agreed under the terms of condition 24)**
- The grey building would be an eye-sore and should be coloured green, to blend in with the surrounding trees.
- The proposed lighting at the South of the building would be intrusive to residential properties. All lighting should be angled so as to not affect neighbouring properties. **(Officer Note – The lighting submissions indicate that lighting would be fixed to minimise light spillage. This matter is addressed by condition 09)**

- The louvered openings at the sides of the building would enable odours to exit the building and detract from residential amenity. The vents that are shown should be located at the North elevation. **(Officer Note – This matter would be handled by the Environment Agency under the terms of the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2010. Condition 19 requires the installation of an odour management system at the site)**

8. Recommendation

Condition 12 (revised condition)

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved remediation verification details to demonstrate that the remediation works that have occurred at the site have adequately mitigated the land contamination risk shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include further soil tests where necessary to demonstrate that the land is suitably clear of contaminants. In the event that the remediation strategy as undertaken is considered insufficient, further remediation work shall be carried out to the satisfaction of the local planning authority including identifying any requirements for monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action. These requirements shall relate to hardstanding and groundwater in the west of the site in the vicinity of the former fuel tanks only.

Condition 15 (revised condition)

The Waste Transfer Station building hereby approved shall not be put to use until the surface water drainage strategy (Southend Central Depot: Drainage Strategy prepared by Amex Foster Wheeler and dated July 2015) has been fully implemented.

Condition 26 (additional condition)

No noise shall be generated by the use of the vehicle Wash Area that is shown on the approved plans that exceeds a sound rating level of LWA 90dB.

Reason: To protect the amenities of neighbouring residents in accordance with DPD1 (Core Strategy) 2007 policies KP2 and CP4 and DPD2 (Development Management) policy DM1.

Reports on Main reports (4b)

Page 3

Former College Building, Carnarvon Road, Southend-On-Sea
15/00803/BC4M

4.0 Developer Contributions and CIL

Para 4.58 revised as follows:

This application is CIL liable and there will be a CIL charge payable. Section 143 of the Localism Act 2011 states that any financial sum that an authority has received, will, or could receive, in payment of CIL is a material 'local finance consideration' in planning decisions. The proposed development will result in a net increase in gross internal area (for CIL purposes) of 15,958 sqm), which equates to £ 218,620. Since part of the development would be for affordable housing the applicant has applied for an exemption for those areas.

4.61 Public Art

Additional information: The developer has agreed that a minimum of 10 balconies should be included in the public art scheme. Officers consider this acceptable and that the detail of the public art can now be determine by use of a suitable condition rather than included in the S106 agreement.

Recommendation

S106

- Delete reference to public art
- specify AH as follows: overall 30% Affordable Housing (47 units including 16 rented and 31 shared ownership units) (16 rented) in phase 1 and (31 shared ownership units) in Phase 2

10.0 b)

Condition 02 amended as follows:

02. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

A341_P_010 A341_P_020, A341_P_030, A341_P_040, A341_P_041A,
A341_P_042, A341_P_043, A341_P_044, A341_P_045, A341_P_046,
A341_P_047, A341_P_050, A341_P_051, A341_P_052, A341_P_053,
A341_P_054, A341_P_055, A341_P_056, A341_P_057, A341_P_060,

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

Additional Condition 21 as follows:

03. No development of either Phase of the development shall take place until details of the following for each phase have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority the development shall be carried out in accordance with the following details: Balcony detailing including the decorative approach to balustrade, window and door details, including product details, brick detailing including ribbed stacked bonding and

perforated brickwork including exact locations, signage and exterior lighting, details of entrance feature to block A, feature arch and entrances to podium.

Additional Condition 22 as follows:

Prior to first occupation of the development a scheme of public art shall be installed in accordance with details which have first been submitted to and approved by the LPA. The scheme shall generally accord with the unnumbered “Indicative proposal for Public Art Scheme at Carnarvon Road Southend on Sea” plan submitted by Proctor and Matthews and shall include a minimum of 10 balconies unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To secure the provision of public art and in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with DPD1 (Core Strategy) policy KP2 and CP4, DMDPD policy DM1 and SPD1 (Design and Townscape Guide).

c) In the event that the planning obligation referred to in part (a) above has not been completed by the 18th October 2015, the Group Manager, Head of Planning & Transport or Corporate Director be authorised to refuse planning permission for the application on the ground of failure to comply with Policy CP6 and Cp8 of the Core Strategy and the NPPF.