

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Development Control Committee 9<sup>th</sup> November 2016

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

### Agenda Item 4 to 7 – Pre-Meeting Site Visits

Page 5

16/01580/FUL

**Roslin Hotel, Thorpe Esplanade, Thorpe Bay, Essex, SS1 3BG**

#### **9. Recommendation**

Please note the additional condition in relation to car parking and revised positive statement.

**05 Sixty two (62) parking spaces shall be retained on site as shown on drawing 01b. These parking spaces shall be permanently retained for the parking of staff and visitors to the Roslin Hotel.**

**Reason: To ensure that adequate car parking is retained to serve the development in accordance with Policies DM15 of the Council's Development Management DPD and CP3 of the Core Strategy DPD1.**

**The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework. The detailed analysis is set out in a report on the application prepared by officers**

Page 39

16/01757/FUL

**10 Clieveden Road, Thorpe Bay, Essex, SS1 3BL**

#### **9. Recommendation**

Please note an amendment to condition 8, an additional condition in relation to car parking and a revised positive statement.

**08 All deliveries and collections must take place between 0900-2100 hours Monday to Saturday and 0900-1700 on Sundays and at no time on Bank Holidays.**

**Reason: To protect the amenities of future hotel guests and adjacent residential occupiers in accordance with DPD1 (Core Strategy) policies KP2 and CP4, policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD2 and SPD1 (Design and Townscape Guide).**

**09 Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, prior to first occupation of the hotel rooms hereby approved 67 parking spaces shall be provided in accordance with drawing 01b, including 3 spaces to the front of no. 10 Clieveden Road. The parking spaces shall be permanently retained thereafter for the parking of staff and visitors of the Roslin Hotel.**

**Reason: To ensure that adequate car parking is provided and retained to serve the development in accordance with Policies DM15 of the Council's Development Management DPD and CP3 of the Core Strategy DPD1.**

**The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework. The detailed analysis is set out in a report on the application prepared by officers**

**Page 67  
16/00889/FUL**

**Unit 6, New Garrison Road, Shoeburyness, Southend**

#### **9. Recommendation**

Please note an amendment to condition 17:

**17 During construction works, the burning of waste material is prohibited given the sites location adjacent to other commercial and residential properties.**

**Reason: In the interests of the character and amenity of the area and nearby occupiers in accordance with NPPF; DPD1 (Core Strategy) 2007 policy KP2 and CP4; DPD2 (Development Management Document) policy DM1.**

### **Agenda Items 8 to 18 – Report on Planning Applications**

**Page 245  
16/02060/TPO**

**Land at Junction of Prince Avenue (A127) and Rochford Road, Westcliff-on-Sea**

#### **5 Representations Summary**

## Section 5.1 Public Consultation

9 additional letters of representation have been received, it should be noted that a number of these are from residents who have previously commented on the application; 8 objecting to the application and 1 in support. The issues raised in the objection letters are:

- Need to keep the trees to combat air pollution – more trees should be planted not **less**
- Concern that the land is needed for junction improvements **[Officer Comment: This application has been submitted by the Parks Section independently of any planned highways works. The Highways Section have advised that plans for possible future junction improvements at The Bell have not yet been designed]**
- Querying why the other poplars in front of the school and 59-61 Rochford Road are remaining **[Officer Comment: these poplars are not included in the application].**
- Concern over increased traffic noise to properties
- Concern over loss of hedge/shrub planting **[Officer Comment: there is no control over the removal of shrubs. Parks have commented that they will consider infill planting in the future but this does not form part of and cannot be required as part of this TPO application]**
- The trees are only likely to fall in high winds which are rare **[Officer Comment: it should be noted that if the trees become dangerous then they can be removed without the need for consent]**
- Impact on wildlife
- The replanting scheme will be inadequate and sterile and not enough trees are proposed
- Concern that the fence will be removed or damaged affecting security for children on the estate **[Officer comment: this is not a material consideration for a TPO application however Parks have provided the following comment in relation to the fence ‘It is not our intention to remove the boundary fence as this should not be necessary to remove it to carry out the tree works. Indeed, over the last few years we have had to remove half a dozen of the poplars and carried out the work without effect on the chain-link fence.’]**
- The trees have been poorly maintained

- Further lopping would be preferred to removal **[Officer Comment: in relation to this suggestion Parks have provided the following comment ‘major crown reductions are not ideal as it increases the risk of further decay at the pruning points. Unfortunately with poplars there are simply no other management options. As you will have seen we have carried out resistograph testing showing that the majority of the trees are decayed in the lower stem. Further hard crown reductions will only set up further points of decay as discussed above and not address the principle fault.’]**
- Concerns that travellers will use the area
- Concerns over impact on water table
- Concerns over possible damage to road and properties in the future
- Concern over impact on house prices
- Concern of future retention of the new trees

The letter of support welcomes the replacement planting scheme and requests that the fence be retained.

#### **5.4 Highways**

There are no highway objections to this proposal however the traffic management will need to be agreed before works commence. **[Officer Comment: An informative is suggested to ensure a co-ordinated approach to the works]**

#### **8.0 Recommendation**

##### **Informative**

01 The applicant is advised that the traffic management issues related to the proposed works will need to be agreed with the Highways Section prior to commencement.

It is noted that the applicant has requested the application to be WITHDRAWN.