

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Development Control Committee 8th July 2015

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Reports on Pre-Meeting Site Visits (4a)

Page 3

**Chartwell Private Hospital, 1629 London Road, Leigh-on-Sea
15/00315/FUL**

Due to the receipt of the amended plan referred to at paragraph 1.4, all references to plan 1615-08-A3 C should be replaced by plan 1615-08-A3 D.

7.3 Public Consultation

Since the preparation of the Officer Report two representations have been received which raise the following issues:

- The proposed extension would result in the loss of a window in the attached Highlands Surgery which would effect hygiene and infection control and reduce the patient experience.
- It is requested that a decision is deferred until such time as Highlands Surgery and Chartwell Hospital combine to propose a comprehensive solution to their combined sites.
- It is reiterated that the buildings that exist at the site do not reflect previously approved plans and approving further developments should be resisted and compound the illegality of the existing situation.
- The suggestion that a parking space can be relocated is unacceptable and the parking spaces would not accord with the EPOA standards.
- The surrounding highways are subject to significant on-street parking and unsafe occurring has been occurring on footpaths.
- The refusal of application 09/02234/FUL by the Council's Development Control Committee should be given more weight than the approval of application 10/02026/FUL by Officers under delegated powers which should be deemed irrelevant.
- Due to inaccuracies in previously approved plans, it cannot be determined what has been approved planning permission before.
- The proposed extension would be detrimental to residential amenity and have an unacceptable visual impact.

Additional letters of complaint have been received by the Local Planning Authority that identify that unauthorised parking has occurred within the surrounding highways that has blocked the public footpath in some instances.

The applicant has submitted further information in relation to the proposed quantum of development. This has been distributed to Members and is summarised below:

- *“I would like to stress that the applicant has never refused to reduce the number of residential units, it is simply the case that there would appear to be no compelling planning case to do so.*
- *Following the resolution to defer the application at Committee in November 2014, the applicants attended a meeting with some of the Ward Councillors and Leading Planning Officers. The purpose of that meeting was to explain the proposals to Members and to discuss the possibility of further consultation with local residents in the form of a Public Meeting.*
- *It should be remembered that at this time, the application had been with the Council for many months and the Council had carried out its own consultation. Even before the application was submitted, the applicant held a public consultation event at the Hinguar Primary School, which was attended by Councillors and local residents.*
- *However despite the level of consultation undertaken, the applicants agreed to hold a Public Meeting, which was attended by many local residents and Councillors. Prior to doing so and whilst meeting with Councillors and Leading Officers, the applicant sought to understand the concerns being expressed, so that this would set an agenda for the Public Meeting. The number of residential units proposed was not a concern expressed by Ward Councillors and during the Public Meeting, nobody raised the number of dwellings as a particular concern or issue.*
- *Officers were asked by the applicant for guidance as to their views on whether or how many units should be removed from the scheme. The response from Officers was that there were no legitimate planning grounds for a reduction in unit numbers. Therefore, the applicant did not consider the Quantum of Development to be an area of major concern. However there has never been an unwillingness on the applicant’s behalf to reduce the scheme, only there has been no case made, which supports a reduction and no advice or indication as to how many.*
- *That said, the applicant is willing to reduce the number of units by ten, which will reduce the overall density of the scheme accordingly”.*

8. Recommendation

[Correction] Please note the flood sea defence contribution should read **£970,000.00** not £970,000.000 as stated on page 53 of the report. This is a typographical error.

Condition 4:

Prior to the commencement of the construction of any residential

and commercial units, the proposed flood defence improvements at Shoebury Common, to the west of the site, shall be fully constructed to the satisfaction of the local planning authority, together with any onsite flood mitigation works. If the flood defence improvement scheme does not go ahead then the FRA will need to be revised to reflect the change in the standard of protection of the defences.

Reports on Main reports (4b)

Page 49

Shelter Western Esplanade
15/00858/BC4

Statement from Agent re missing housing to temporary roof plant

The agent has confirmed that it is the applicants intention to complete the housing to the temporary plant on the roof however this has not yet been possible yet due to health and safety working in and around the major land remodelling and piling works that have been going on to stabilise the cliffs . These works will be completed as soon as the area becomes safe to access.

4.24 In relation to 4.24 the Council's Asset Management Section has confirmed that although they have completed the consultation for the extinguishment of the public open space for the building and forecourt including the roof, this will not come into force until the lease has been signed. This is imminent but has not yet been completed.

7 Representation Summary

7.6 Asset Management

Please note the point at which the open space is formally extinguished is when the lease is granted. This is any day now, and may be before the committee meeting but it has not happened yet.

It should also be noted that the whole section of open space is presently closed for cliff stabilisation works and that whilst none of the conduit will be above roof level, a small section of it may be visible at the western end where it enters the plant room.

Public Consultation

7.13 Officer Note bullet 2

Revision Officer Comment to:

[Officer Comment: It is noted that it is not possible to set the air conditioning units at the required lower level until the works to the service yard have been completed however to ensure that this is achieved within a

reasonable timeframe a condition requiring details to be agreed within 6 months is recommended.]

Three additional objections have also been received and are summarised as follows:

- The balcony is a place of tranquillity for the public at large and needs to be maintained as such. It is a key viewpoint in The Leas Conservation Area
- The noise and disturbance from vents would make it an unwell coming place for visitors and the public to enjoy the balcony
- There would be grills in the footpath that would adversely affect the use of the foot path by the public.
- noise would carry from the vents onto Clifton drive causing a disturbance.
- The placement of vents would adversely affect the character of the environment of the leas conservation area.

[Officer Comment: The recommendation includes a precautionary condition to restrict noise levels from the plant equipment to ensure that the plant does not disturb the amenity of local residents within their properties.]

Conditions

Additional Condition to be added in relation to the positioning of the Air Conditioning units:

Condition 11

Notwithstanding the approved plans, within 6 months of the date of this permission, details of the siting and appearance of the air conditioning units shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The air conditioning units shall then be installed within 1 month of the details being approved and only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity taking account of the Shelter being a locally listed building within The Leas Conservation Area pursuant to the NPPF, policy CP4 of the Core Strategy, policy C4 of the Borough Local Plan and the Design and Townscape Guide

Informatives

Informative 07 to be deleted as this has been replaced with a planning condition.

7.3 Please note 25 additional letters of support have been received in relation to the spa facility as per the comments raised in the main report.

Public consultation

Please note an online petition via the Roslin Hotel's facebook page has been received with over 1000 names in support of the spa facility extensions. The respondents have not left their contact address so we are not able to verify the content.