

# **Southend-on-Sea Borough Council**

Development Control Committee 5<sup>th</sup> October 2016

## **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**

### **Pre Meeting Site Visits**

#### **Report on Planning Applications**

Page 329-368  
16/01182/FUL

181 West Road, Westcliff-on-Sea, Essex,

#### **Appraisal**

The proposed extension to the first floor flat in the form of a roof extension will facilitate a change from a one bedroom to a two bedroom unit. The increased floorspace for the two bedrooms flat will not affect the overall design of the building, impact on residential amenities of adjacent occupiers, traffic and transport considerations and the flat as proposed will provide adequate amenities for future occupiers in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, policies KP2 and CP4 of the Core Strategy, policies DM1 and DM8 of the Development Management Document DPD2 and the Design and Townscape Guide SPD1.

The proposed extensions are considered to be acceptable and policy compliant with respect to the protection of amenities of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, policies KP2 and CP4 of the Core Strategy, policies DM1 and DM8 of the Development Management Document DPD2 and the Design and Townscape Guide SPD1.

#### **8. Recommendation**

Please note the wording changes to the following conditions:

Members are recommended to **GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION** Subject to conditions:

**03** The premises shall not be open for use as an education facility other than during term time between the hours of 0900-2000 Monday to Friday and 0900-1700 Saturday, Sundays and Bank Holidays.

**Reason: To safeguard the amenities of adjoining residents, in accordance with policy DM1 of the Development Management Document DPD2.**

**04 The premises shall be used only as an educational facility within in (Class D1) and for no other purpose including any other purpose within Class D1 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended), or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification.**

**Reason: To define the scope of this permission in light of protecting the character and appearance of the area and the absence of parking facilities at the site, in accordance with policy DM1 and DM15 of the Development Management Document DPD2.**

**06 The development shall not be occupied until details of any air conditioning, ventilation, heating or fume extraction, plant or machinery shall be installed until details of design, siting, discharge points and predicted acoustic performance have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The development shall not be occupied or brought into use until the development has been implemented in full accordance with the details approved under this condition and shall be maintained as such in perpetuity.**

**Reason: To minimise the impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of the street scene and amenities of adjacent occupiers in accordance with This is set out in National Planning Policy Framework, DPD1 (Core Strategy) 2007 policy KP2 and CP4, DPD2 (Development Management Document) policy DM1, and SPD1 (Design and Townscape Guide).**

**07 Prior to commencement of the proposed use, details of cycle storage shall be submitted to and approved by the local authority. The development shall not be brought into use until the cycle storage have been provided in accordance with the details approved under this condition and shall be retained as such in perpetuity**

**Reason: To ensure that satisfactory secure off-street bicycle parking is provided in the interests of sustainability, amenity and highways efficiency and safety, in accordance National Planning Policy Framework, DPD1 (Core Strategy) 2007 policy KP2 and CP4, DPD2 (Development Management Document) policy DM1, and SPD1 (Design and Townscape Guide).**

**Written representation received from the applicant Mr. Gibbons.**

- The accommodation in its current form does not provide sufficient accommodation for our 5 children. The motive for expansion is therefore practical and for family reasons.
- Increase to the ridge height was proposed to provide adequate head height for the planned second floor accommodation. Without this increase in height the alternative would have been to reduce the height of the existing ceiling on first floor, adversely affecting the character of the high ceilings within the house.
- Section 4.9 of the officers' report refers to the proposed three pitched roof dormers as being dominant and not in keeping with the character of the area. There is an example of a 2 storey house on the corner of Theobalds Road and Marine Parade with at least 3 dormers.
- Section 4.13 states that "it is considered the proposed three pitched roof dormers to the elevation would not be overbearing or result in a sense of enclosure for the occupants of the surrounding properties." How on the one hand can we state they are dominant, yet on the other state they are not overbearing or provide a sense of enclosure?
- 5.1 can be challenged on 2 counts
  - a) The front elevation being proposed is consistent with adjacent properties at numbers 70 & 69. The pitch being proposed will bring my property up to a height which is only consistent with these properties. Additionally there are numerous properties along Marine Parade where the mass and scale is far in excess of what is being proposed, including a number of 3 story properties.
  - b) The dormer proposed to the east flank elevation is stated within the report under section 4.15 'as not being materially worse than the impact of that development (being the development of 'No 70 Marine Parade which has recently added a large dormer / roof extension'). These 2 statements regarding the dormer appear contradictory. If the impact is considered detrimental to the surrounding area, surely the same argument could be applied to the large dormer at No 70?
- It is asked why this application has been called in by Cllr Evans

- The proposals in my view provide an opportunity to create a property which is keeping with the scale and mass of many other properties on Marine Parade yet at the same time provide much needed accommodation for large family.

**Pages 293-328  
16/01139/FUL**

**1026 London Road, Leigh-on-Sea**

### **8. Recommendation**

Please note the additional condition relating to surface water drainage in response to Anglian Water consultation response:

#### **Condition 11:**

**No development hereby permitted shall commence until details of surface water attenuation for the site, based on SUDS principles, have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The works agreed shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.**

**Reason: To ensure satisfactory drainage of the site in accordance with policy KP2 of the Core Strategy DPD1 and DPD2 (Development Management) policy DM2.**

**Pages 391-408  
16/01529/FULH**

**96 The Ridgeway, Westcliff-on-Sea.**

### **Section 6.1 - Public Consultation**

In addition to the objections that have been received that are set out within the Officer's Report, complaints have been received in relation to the handling of previous planning applications. The complaints focus on an application for the removal of a condition which was incorrectly attached to an earlier permission.

It has previously been established that it would be unreasonable to impose a condition to prevent the use of the forecourt area in front of the building for outdoor dining purposes. The land is within the curtilage of the building at the site and can therefore be used for purposes ancillary to the building including outdoor dining. Conditions are in place under the terms of previous permissions to restrict direct access to that curtilage from the building after 9pm and to ensure that noise does not spill at unreasonable times.

From this basis, noting the background noise levels of the intensively used highway and railway line, it remains the

opinion of officers that the use of the outdoor area would not cause harm to residential amenity to an extent that would justify the refusal of this application which solely relates to the provision of retractable canopies/awnings above the outdoor area.