



Public Document Pack


Southend-on-Sea City Council

Executive Director (Strategy & Change):

Claire Shuter

 Civic Centre, Victoria Avenue, Southend-on-Sea, Essex SS2 6ER

 01702 215000

 www.southend.gov.uk



26 February 2025

Dear Councillor

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY, 26TH FEBRUARY, 2025

Please find enclosed, for consideration at the meeting of the Development Control Committee taking place later this afternoon, a copy of the supplementary report that provides further information on applications listed on the Agenda, which was unavailable when the Agenda was printed.

Tim Row

Principal Democratic Services Officer

This page is intentionally left blank

Southend-on-Sea City Council

Development Control Committee 26th February 2025

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

4

Agenda Item 5
25/00040/GPDE

Pages 25-40
148 Shoebury Road, Thorpe Bay (Southchurch Ward)

Section 8.20-
Amenity impacts

Correction of typo:

[...] The proposed extension would extend some ~~2m~~ 1m beyond no. 150's rear wall. [...]

Agenda Item 6
24/01708/FUL

Pages 41 - 90
74 Leigh Road, Leigh-on-Sea (Chalkwell Ward)

Section 4 –

Public Consultation

8no. additional letters of representation have been received, 1no. from an interested party who had submitted representations previously and 5no. from an additional interested party. The representation includes the following summarised comments additional to those already summarised within the main report:

- Concerns over the location of the proposed vehicle crossover and access to neighbouring properties.
- Overdevelopment of the plot - the development is out of scale with existing character of neighbourhood, which is largely 2-storey Victorian terraced houses or cottages.
- There are inadequate parking spaces/ lack of on-site parking provided for the development size.
- The proposed removal of a parking space on Beach Avenue will lead to additional parking pressure for Beach Avenue residents.
- Parking restrictions in the surrounding neighbourhood have negatively affected Beach Avenue for some time.
- The scale of the development in that space is excessive and a lower number would put a lot less pressure on the local area.
- The crossover would mean taking a parking space away from residents on Beach Avenue.
- The parking restrictions changed on Beach Avenue last week without notice from the Council; there is not enough parking for existing Beach Avenue residents.
- Each new house should have provision for two cars without the loss of existing parking. Considering the family and friends that will be visiting those new houses, 1 space is simply not enough.

Section 9

Recommendation

Conditions

An amended plan has been received since the publication of the agenda which provides coloured detail to the proposed streetscene elevations. Following receipt of the amended plan, it is recommended that condition 02 is amended to reflect this and is changed from:

02 The development shall only be undertaken in accordance with the following approved plans: 840P01; 840P02 Rev A; 840P03 Rev A; 840P04 Rev A (~~Proposed Elevations~~); ~~840P04 Rev A (Proposed Streetscene)~~; 840P06 Rev A; 840P07.

Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the consent sought, has an acceptable design and complies with Policy DM1 of the Development Management Document (2015).

To:

02 The development hereby approved shall only be undertaken in accordance with the following approved plans: 840P01; 840P02 Rev A; 840P03 Rev A; 840P04 Rev A; **840P05 Rev B**; 840P06 Rev A; 840P07.

Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the consent sought, has an acceptable design and complies with Policy DM1 of the Development Management Document (2015)

Agenda Item 7 25/00021/AMDT

Pages 91 - 152 Roslin Hotel, Thorpe Esplanade Thorpe Bay (Thorpe Ward)

Section 4 –

Public Consultation

134no. additional representations have been received since the report was published.

132no. of the representations received are supporting the proposed development.

2no. have been submitted from interested parties who have submitted representations previously. The representations include the following summarised comments additional to those already summarised within the main report:

- The report is not clear that conditions in place are not working or effective and that there is history of non-compliance with rules already in place;
- The application which showed digging of trenches was unlawful. This is significant information. It is just shown as refused and should have had enforcement action;

- The current application is showing further documentation that has been added onto the system after the consultation period. This new document cannot be commented on by the public;
- There is no detail regarding environmental complaints again;
- Breaches on the deliveries prior to 9am in 2022 are not highlighted;
- Hotel is not using the loading bay provided by highways creating highways issues;
- Noise and pollution concerns from the idle running of vehicles;
- There is a current License Review which may end up limiting the venue to 11pm anyway;
- No mention of Roslin's financial accounts showing deficit;
- 16/01757/FUL and 22/00647/AD - Cycle storage – the business is in breach of an application dating back to 2016 – breach of condition;
- Travel plan breach of condition;
- The application 20/01199/FULM has expired;
- Council has no control over the business.
- Concerns with CCTV installed and subsequent loss of privacy.

[Officer comment:] The proposed development has not been commenced and therefore is not the subject of any of the conditions imposed by the LPA with respect to 20/01199/FULM. The scope of the officer's report is limited to the variation of operating hours only and the relevant material planning considerations related to that. The planning breaches identified are being dealt with by the LPA. The consent associated with 20/01199/FULM is not yet expired.

Section 9

Recommendation

Conditions

Conditions 13 and 14 to be revised to the following (additional words underlined):

13 From the commencement of the development hereby approved the premises of the hotel hereby approved shall not be open to non-residents outside the hours of 7am to midnight on any given day, with the opening times extended by one additional hour (to a maximum 1am finish) on New Years Eve (into New Years Day Morning) only. No access after 11pm will be permitted for non-residents wishing to enter the venue.

14 From the commencement of the development hereby approved deliveries to and collections (including refuse and recycling collections) from the premises hereby approved shall not take place outside the hours of 7:30 am to 6 pm on weekdays, between 8 am and 1 pm on Saturdays and not at any time on Sundays and Bank or Public Holidays.

**Agenda item 8
24/01865/FUL
Section 4**

**Pages 153-196
42 Honiton Road, Southend-on-Sea (Kursaal Ward)
Public Consultation**

1no further representation an interested party who has submitted representations previously. The representation includes the following summarised comments additional to those already summarised within the main report:

- No objection to the type of housing per se, but only where it is situated. Too many HMO's in the area.
- Condensed housing creates higher chance of anti-social behaviour as this type of housing creates pressure and stress for residents and also has a tendency to propagate low-level criminal behaviour.
- Compounding the issue of creating a 'ghetto'. Often HMO landlords and their residents do not take care of the front of their properties, they are often littered with rubbish and plant life is unmanaged, or bears a resemblance to a utilitarian sovietesque concrete block devoid of character further bringing down the area that is trying to improve.
- Overcrowding or over condensed housing in an area has a direct impact on the opportunities for social mobility for all.
- There needs to be diversity in housing and how it is distributed throughout the city. Permitting landlords to jam in as many as they can in a property such as the one in question, which ultimately impacts the mental health of the tenants and those around is not a reasonable solution to housing and will create an unbalanced negative impact on residents.
- Do not want any more HMO's in the area, we want a chance to build an area for families as well not just endless rows of HMO's and expanding one that already isn't wanted creates a dangerous precedent that will ultimately destroy the family friendly and safe feeling of the area by overcrowding it with what likely tenants will be single men.

**Agenda item 12
25/00002/UNAU_B**

**Pages 259-288
19 Blatches Chase, Eastwood (Eastwood Park Ward)**

Corrections to report

[...] The case officer has notified the owners [~~owner's agent~~] that the unauthorised use must cease.

Summary of comments from agent

- A valid appeal has been lodged with the Planning Inspectorate against the Council's decision to refuse planning permission.
- The proposed planning conditions previously recommended by officers were standard and likely to be deemed acceptable by an Inspector; this is in direct response to Councillors' concerns about the conditions being unacceptable, which formed the basis of the original refusal.
- The Planning Practice Guidance advises against enforcement action when a planning application is a viable route to regularize a situation,

particularly where conditions might be imposed and this approach was followed in this case.

- There were no objections from Environmental Health or Highways, and no formal Environmental Health actions regarding noise or amenity impacts have been recorded.

This page is intentionally left blank