

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Development Control Committee 9th December 2015

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Reports on Main reports (3b)

Page 3

15/01189/FULM Southend High School for Boys, Prittlewell Chase

Public Consultation

6.5 One additional letter of objection has been received requesting that that reasons for objection submitted prior to the deferral are still taken into account.

6.6 Councillor Davidson comments following the deferment of the application by the Development Control Committee on 11th November 2015:

SHSB has expanded over the past ten years or so, both in terms of pupil numbers and in new buildings. This has brought with it a significant increase in school related traffic and parking demand. SHSB's parking provision has not kept pace with these developments and currently it does not meet the parking standards set out in the Council's policy DM15.

The school's plan to have a purpose built car park for the first time and an increased number of parking spaces is very welcome. The point of contention is that SHSB remains unwilling to allow 6th form students to park on site. Consequently, SHSB's proposed parking provision does not include parking places for students. This means that SHSB will not be compliant with Council policy DM15 in two key respects: firstly, in terms of the requirement set out in the Council's parking standards that there should be parking spaces provided for 6th form students and secondly in that by allowing students to drive to school whilst forbidding them to park on site, SHSB is relying on on-street parking in the vicinity of the school. Section 5 of DM15 states: "*Reliance upon on-street parking will only be considered appropriate where it can be demonstrated by the applicant that there is on-street parking capacity.*" This the school has failed to do.

Version three of the Transport Statement which has been submitted along with the head teacher's statement contains the results of a travel survey conducted on 18th November 2015. This shows that **39** 6th form students drove themselves to school that day and parked in the vicinity of the school. As the academic year progresses, this figure will rise and by May 2016 there could be over 50 SHSB students looking for parking spaces on the residential streets around the school.

In 2009 there were 273 students in the 6th form: this year there are 385 and the number is due to increase further to 400 by next year. The rapid expanse of the 6th form and the increased student parking demand that has come with it has taken its toll on the neighbourhood. The parking congestion in Earls Hall Avenue has steadily worsened to the point where it is having an increasingly detrimental effect on the lives of local residents. It could be argued that this represents *a severe residual cumulative impact from the developments* at SHSB and is therefore grounds for refusal of the application on transport related grounds (paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework)

The head teacher in his statement says that their parking and vehicle access proposals entail *“significant vehicular traffic sharing the rear driveway with pupils”* which *“represents an unreasonably high risk environment in which to permit 6th form drivers”*. If this is the case, then one must question whether this arrangement poses an unacceptable risk to all drivers and pedestrians sharing this space.

I believe that SHSB needs to “go back to the drawing board” and draw up a fresh set of proposals for car parking and vehicle access arrangements on the school site. This would enable SHSB to reconsider the proposed one-way system whereby all traffic would enter the site from Holeythick Lane and come out at a new left-only turn exit on Prittlewell Chase. The revised plans could also include on-site parking provision for 6th form students. SHSB could follow the example of secondary schools which already provide parking for their 6th form students by creating a 6th form parking area separate from the main car park for staff and visitors. This would mitigate the potential health and safety risks which SHSB believes are posed by allowing 6th form drivers on the school site.

Please note an additional condition relating to cycle provision.

8. Recommendation

21 No part of the development shall be occupied until 34 bicycle secure and covered parking spaces have been provided in accordance with plans and details which shall have been previously submitted to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority and the bicycle parking spaces shall be permanently maintained thereafter in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that satisfactory secure bicycle parking is provided in the interests of sustainability, amenity and highways efficiency and safety, in accordance with NPPF, DPD1 (Core Strategy) 2007 policy KP2, DPD2 (Development Management Document) 2015 policy DM15 and SPD1 (Design and Townscape Guide)

22 No development shall commence until details of a traffic calming signage has been submitted to and agreed in writing to the local planning authority prior to first occupation of the extension hereby permitted to the new one way vehicular access. The agreed details shall be permanently retained.

Reason: In the interest of highway and pedestrian safety in accordance with Core Strategy Policy KP2, Development Management Document policy DM1, and the Design and Townscape Guide SPD1.

Page 36

15/01125/FULM St Hilda's School, 13-15 Imperial Avenue

Plan numbers

6271-12220-Rev A amended to read 6271-1220-Rev C.

Standard of Accommodation for Future Occupiers

4.38 The applicant has assessed the proposed development against Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations, 2015 in respect of accessible and adaptable dwellings. It is not feasible to meet part M4(2) in terms of the conversion of the existing building. An additional condition is detailed below to ensure that all of the new dwellinghouses rather than the flats shall meet part M4(2). In order to ensure that at least 10% of the new dwellings on the site are wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users as required by Policy DM8, the additional condition detailed below also requires that a minimum of two of the proposed dwellinghouses shall achieve part M4(3) of the Building Regulations, 2015 (wheelchair user dwellings).

Sustainable Construction (SUDs)

A drainage strategy report has been received. This details that permeable paving is proposed for the main vehicular access and parking. Overall the proposed development will reduce the surface water flows generated by impermeable areas on the site. All foul water will be disposed of from the site via a gravity drain connected to the main public sewer system. A condition regarding SUDs provision is proposed.

Developer Contributions

The applicants have submitted a viability assessment which identifies the development is not viable with a policy compliant provision of planning obligations.

For viability assessment in decision-taking, the guidance is that this should be informed by the particular circumstances of the site and the proposed development in question. A site is viable if the value generated by its development exceeds the costs of developing it and also provides sufficient incentive for the land to come forward and the development to be undertaken. Local planning authorities are advised to be flexible in seeking planning obligations where it is demonstrated that these would cause development to be unviable. This is stated to be particularly relevant for affordable housing contributions which are often the largest single item

sought on housing developments. These contributions should not be sought without regard to individual scheme viability.

An assessment of the applicant's viability appraisal has been undertaken independently by the District Valuer Service (DVS). Best practice guidance advocates a residual land value approach in order to assess the viability of a development.

The DVS have carried out their own appraisal to scrutinise the applicant's position and assess all inputs and they are in agreement that the proposed development is not viable with a policy compliant provision of affordable housing. Therefore, the applicant's offer of £10,000 is the maximum contribution that the scheme can viably support.

8. Recommendation

Amended condition wording:

02. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: 6271-1110-B, 6271-1320-A, 6271-1230-A, 6271-1501-A, 6271-1601-A, 6271-1330A, 6271-1300-, 6271-1102-, 6271-1321, 6271-1331, 6271-1105, 6271-1200, 6271-1210, 6271-1220-Rev C.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with provisions of the Development Plan.

Additional condition:

17. Prior to occupation all four dwellinghouses shall comply with Building Regulations Optional Requirement Approved Document M4(2) Category 2: Accessible and adaptable dwellings (2015 edition) and a minimum of two dwellinghouses shall also comply with Building Regulations Optional Requirement Approved Document M4(3) Category 3: Wheelchair user dwellings (2015 edition). Evidence of compliance shall be notified to the building control body appointed for the development in the appropriate Full Plans Application, or Building Notice, or Initial Notice to enable the building control body to check compliance.

Reason: To ensure that the internal environment of the proposed development is flexible to meet the changing needs of residents in accordance with Policy DM8 of the Development Management Document.

Reports on Main reports (3c)

Page 10

The Kursaal, Eastern Esplanade, Southend-on-Sea Essex 15/01390/LBC

Recommendation (revised condition)

Condition 7

Notwithstanding the details noted on the approved plans, prior to the first occupation or operation of the coffee shop, children's play centre or Quarsar Centre, details of the proposed vinyl's for all shopfront windows shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The vinyl's shall only be installed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: Same as reported in the main agenda

Page 51

658 London Road, Westcliff-on-Sea, Essex 15/01591/FUL

6. Representation Summary

A formal response has been received from Anglian Water raising no objection to the proposal.

Wastewater Treatment

The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Southend Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows.

Foul Sewerage Network

The sewerage system at present has available capacity for these flows. If the developer wishes to connect to our sewerage network they should serve notice under Section 106 of the Water Industry Act 1991. We will then advise them of the most suitable point of connection.

Surface Water Disposal

From the details submitted to support the planning application the proposed method of surface water management does not relate to Anglian Water operated assets. As such, we are unable to provide comments on the suitability of the surface water management. The Local Planning Authority should seek the advice of the Lead Local Flood Authority or the Internal Drainage Board. The Environment Agency should be consulted if the drainage system directly or indirectly involves the discharge of water into a watercourse **[Officer Comment: Condition 14 requires the applicant to submit details in relation to SUDS to ensure the surface water runoff is minimal]**

6.3 Public Consultation

Two letters of objection have been received stating:

- The proposal is a hideous construction of no value in the streetscene;
- Pasta Pia has spent a great deal of money building up a very popular business and their attractive café front is a credit to the area.

The objections above should read in conjunction with pages 61-63 of the main report.

8. Recommendation

Please note one additional condition has been recommended by Anglian Water as detailed below;

18. The development site is within 15 metres of a sewage pumping station. Whilst Anglian Water takes all reasonably practicable steps to prevent any nuisance arising from the site, there should be no development within 15 metres from the boundary of a sewage pumping station of this type if the development is potentially sensitive to noise or other disturbance or which might give rise to complaint from the occupiers regarding the location of the pumping station.

Reason

To avoid causing future amenity problems in accordance with policies KP2 and CP4 of the Core Strategy DPD1 and policy DM1 of the Development Management Document DPD2.