

Public Document Pack

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Department of the Chief Executive

John Williams - Director of Democratic & Legal Services

Our ref:

Telephone: **01702 215000**

Your ref:


Fax: **01702 215994**

Date: 5 July 2017

E-mail: **committeesection@southend.gov.uk**

Contact Name: Tim Row

DX 2812 Southend



Dear Councillor

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY, 5TH JULY, 2017

Please find enclosed a copy of the Supplementary Report considered by the Committee at its next meeting on Wednesday, 5th July, 2017, which provided additional information on the applications under consideration since the publication of the Agenda.

Yours faithfully

Tim Row
Principal Democratic Services Officer

This page is intentionally left blank

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Reports on Pre-Meeting Site Visits

Page 5

16/01475/FUL **Grand Hotel, Broadway, Leigh-On-Sea**

7 Representation Summary

Education

7.8 The School Development Manager has been consulted and a response calculating the education contribution has been provided to the local planning authority. The sum total would be towards a contribution for secondary education and it would equate to £14,317.17.

[Officer Comment: Policy CP6 of the Southend Core Strategy (2007) required “Development proposals must mitigate their impact on community infrastructure by contributing appropriately to services and facilities that would be adversely affected. New development should demonstrate that it will not jeopardise the Borough’s ability to improve the education attainment, health and well being of local residents and visitors to Southend”. It is noted that this will be achieved (inter alia) by:

“2. supporting improvements to existing, and the provision of new, facilities to support the needs of education, skills and lifelong learning strategies”.

On the basis of the above, it is considered that a contribution towards education would be required in order to mitigate the impacts of the proposed development on the community infrastructure and in particular on education. In the absence of a signed legal agreement making a satisfactory contribution towards education, the proposed development fails to mitigate the adverse impacts caused to the community infrastructure and it is contrary to the development plan policies. For this reason, members are recommended to REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION for a second reason, as follows:

- 02 The submission does not include a completed formal undertaking to secure an appropriate financial contribution to the provision of education facilities in the borough, to mitigate the demand for such facilities generated by the development proposed. The application is therefore unacceptable and**

contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies KP2, KP3 and CP6 of the Southend Core Strategy (2007).]

Public Notification

7.11 It is noted that an additional letter of support has been received from a local neighbour as well as two objection letters raising the following concerns:

- The provision of education services.
- It is suggested that the building should be restored and used for the community, family local public house or perhaps a free school to reduce the current problem of over subscribed schools.
- The area is overpopulated and crowded with traffic.
- Current residents and their families are being pushed out of the community because of these excessive agreements to build new dwellings.
- It is suggested that all new builds are sent to Darlington Primary.
- It is noted that catchment changes are due to 'people moving into the area' and not current birth rates.

It is noted that letter signed by Mr Kieron Lilley was sent to Cllrs Waterworth and Mulroney, stating the following (in summary):

- The officers' recommendation for refusal of the application of the ground of the impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the locally listed building and the Leigh Cliff Conservation Area, is disputed.
- It is supported that the proposed penthouse would not be limitedly perceivable from viewpoints, given that it would be set back from the front principle elevation.
- It is accepted that the penthouse would be visible from Leigh Road and Grand Drive; however, by reason of its position and use of materials, would maintain a subservient appearance to the host property.
- The Cllrs attention is again drawn on the comparison between the proposal at the application site and the development at Clements Arcade.
- The preservation and restoration of the building is justified in the Heritage Statement submitted with the application. It is stated that there is no reference to this document in the officer's report.
- Reference is also made to the petition in support of the development and the consultation responses from the Leigh Society, Leigh Town Council and Local Highway Authority, who raised no objection to the proposal.
- A final comment is made to the fact that the development would not be viable without the penthouse.

[Officer Comment: It is noted that full and careful account has been taken to the Heritage Statement submitted with the application. It is considered that the rest of the comments made in the letter are

thoroughly assessed in the main officer's report.]

Following the publication of the officer's report, a 'Community Right to Bid Notification Form' has been received together with a 'Supplementary Appendices Document', which is summarised below:

- The mission statement of The Grand Again Group is to: *To facilitate the regeneration of The Grand as a high-quality eco exemplar, inclusive, community facility - as public house with 3 distinct bar/restaurants, one restaurant of which to be family orientated, with further options for a communal workspace hub, possible post office, daytime crèche and hotel/conference facility for public use; serving the needs of the local community.*
- It is noted that The Grand Hotel has a special inclusive community value within Leigh that could add real community benefit and social well-being.
- The Grand Again Group think it can better serve the local community as a good-quality cohesive family facility that appeals to a wide spectrum of the community, with work hub space, hotel accommodation and function suite on the upper floors; the use for which it was originally designed.
- The Grand Again Group would relish the opportunity to acquire the asset, raise the necessary funds to purchase the building from the current owners and to execute our cooperative business plan that would make good use of all the spaces, including the rear external space as a landscaped garden, connecting with a family eatery for the benefit of local families.
- The groups plan B would be to create a cooperative facility run by a board of local trustee investors for the benefit of the local community.
- Currently, local pubs and establishments serve an ever narrowing demographic from which families with young children and elderly patrons feel excluded. The Grand is large enough to accommodate 3 separate bars for the different user groups.
- A further concern with local families is the proposed school catchment boundary changes, largely as a result of continuing flats development and population increase.
- It is suggested that one of the groups aims in purchasing the freehold would be to offer electric vehicle car pooling and charge points powered largely by renewable energy.

The Grand Again Group identified that the group consist of 25 listed members and 270 Facebook followers.

Coastal Defence Engineer

7.12 The Coastal Defence Engineer has been consulted that given that the proposal would not affect SUDS application, has raised no objection.

Reports on Main Plans List

Page 135

17/00584/FUL 25 Britannia Road, Westcliff on Sea

6.3 Public Consultation

Three additional letters of representation have been received stating:

- The area is already full to capacity so any additional housing and related living requirements would add unnecessary and unacceptable levels of strain to the current residents and surrounding areas;
- Development is land grabbing and fails Councils guidelines on development;
- Loss of two street parking spaces;
- The development does not sit well with the urban grain

The concerns have been noted and taken into account in the assessment of the application. However, they are not found to represent a reasonable basis to refuse planning permission in the circumstances of this case.

Page 191

17/00562/BC3M Multi-Storey Car Park, Victoria Avenue, Southend-On-Sea

Representation Summary

7.12 the applicants have provided further information regarding the operation of the car park as follows:

- The payments would be cashless and via text. The reasoning behind this is to remove cash for the car parks, therefore reduce the potential for crime. Payment machines are regularly vandalised at expense to the council and this ongoing cost will be reduced and visitors will not as can happen have to hunt for a working payment machine.
- Paragraph 4.15 of the Transport Statement states: *'Staff motorcycle parking is also provided at the Civic Centre. No spaces are marked out for motorcycle parking within the car park, however should demand for motorcycle parking increase, then the car park can be easily reconfigured in future to accommodate motorcycles.'*

The demand for motor cycle parking will be assessed through routine monitoring of the car park by Civil Enforcement officers as well as the Parking Management Team. Adjustments will be made accordingly based on need and would be reflected in the annual fees and charges reviews.

- Electric vehicle charging posts are provided with 4 No dedicated bays, the car park is designed to be flexible and infrastructure will be

provided for further charging points to be installed easily if demand increases for this type facility.

Page 257-276
17/00638/DOV
and
17/00639/AD

Shoebury Garrison, Ness Road, Shoeburyness

3 Appraisal

Amended paragraph 3.9 to read as follows:

As the quality and laying of the OSA is an essential part of ensuring that the repair works are satisfactory, it is proposed that the Deed of Variation that will be drafted pursuant to application 17/00638/DOV include clauses requiring the following:

In relation to the Remaining Coastal Defence Works the Owner shall submit to the Council the following prior to carrying out these works:

- a) a detailed method statement setting out how they propose to undertake these works;
- b) a detailed site supervision plan as to how the parties will inspect and test the laying of the material;
- c) a timetable for these works;
- e) Health & Safety Plan under the CDM Regulations (including authorities from BACTEC and QinetiQ/MOD); and
- f) confirmation that the necessary licences from Natural England and the Marine Management Organisation have been secured.

Whilst carrying out the Remaining Coastal Defence Works the Owner shall arrange for the submission to the Council daily inspection and sign off sheets by an appropriately qualified engineer.

Additional comment: Avant Homes have agreed to Mott MacDonald acting in the capacity of 'Engineer' overseeing the sea wall repairs.

Page 277
17/00893/DOV5

32-36 Valkyrie Road, Westcliff-on-Sea

The applicant submitted evidence during the course of the application to show that the following Registered Providers have been contacted in an attempt to find a provider for the affordable housing on-site:

- East Thames Limited
- B3 Living
- Greenfields Community Housing Ltd
- Family Mosaic
- CHP
- Hastoe Group
- Moat
- Swan New Homes Ltd
- Genesis Housing Association
- One Housing

The main reason that the Registered Providers have not been interested in the four affordable flats is that this is considered too small a scheme for them to take on. The Council has experienced a similar response elsewhere, hence the introduction of our 'Interim Affordable Housing Policy' 2016.

Page 285

17/00784/BC3

Barons Court Primary School

A representation has been received from Milton Conservation Society raising no objections subject to a natural complementary colour to the elevations.