

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

### AGENDA ITEM 6(a) Pre-meeting site visits

Page 3                      **Storage units at rear of 34 - 36 Crowstone Road, Westcliff-On Sea, Essex, SS0 8BA**

#### **4. Appraisal**

##### **4.13 Use of On Site Renewables**

Additional information has been submitted by the applicant with regards to sustainable energy. It is been submitted that sustainable renewable energy will be provided by an air source heat pump which draws approximately 1/3<sup>rd</sup> to ¼ of the electricity of standard electrical heating systems for the same amount of heating, reducing utility bills and greenhouse gas emissions accordingly. Furthermore the typical efficiency of 300-400% compares to 100% for a resistance heater and 70-98% for a gas fired boiler.

Notwithstanding the submitted details, it is considered appropriate to require the following condition so that it can be formally demonstrated what percentage of energy needs of the dwelling would come from on site renewable resources, and where such measures would be sited:

**10. A scheme detailing how at least 10% of the total energy needs of the development will be supplied using on site renewable sources shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of the development and implemented in full prior to the first occupation of the dwelling houses. This provision shall be made for the lifetime of the development.**

**Reason: In the interests of providing sustainable development in accordance with Policy KP2 of the Core Strategy (DPD1).**

#### **7. Representation Summary**

##### **7.1 Public Consultation**

Five additional letters of objection received raising the following issues

- No evidence has been submitted to support assertion by applicant that a one storey bungalow is not viable on site. A one storey bungalow would be cheaper to construct and result in less traffic along access driveway.
- Previous reasons for refusal for development on this site warrant scrutiny.
- No reference has been made to rubbish collection. It cannot be left on the access driveway as this is a right of way for other users.

- It is not clear if water/drainage/sewer utilities in the proposed dwelling are adequate.
- The stated width of the access driveway at 2.7m cannot be certain as a boundary between the driveway and a neighbouring dwelling is the subject of a legal dispute.
- It is not the case, as stated in documents with application, that there is a very restricted view of the units from houses fronting Crowstone Road. The dwelling would be clearly visible from houses fronting Crowstone Road and perhaps Crowstone Close and Alleyns Place.
- Owners of adjoining properties have not been consulted on proposal prior to submission of application and so documents with application are incorrect in saying that owners of adjoining properties would prefer to see the site developed for residential use so that possible future noise disturbance or other noise related matters are eliminated. The present use of the site/buildings is limited to storage and noise disturbance is limited.
- Should application be approved the following matters should be considered: hours for construction and demolition works; existing high metal gate to property should be removed; and, while application is under consideration users of the building/site should not be permitted to carry out any other activities other than storage.
- Dormer windows would overlook the rear of dwellings on Crowstone Road.
- Dwelling would be very visible from surrounding houses.
- Timing restrictions should be put in place whether permission is granted or not.
- Dwelling would be extremely close to the eastern boundary, especially the outside fire escape and back door.
- Values of surrounding properties would be adversely affected.
- Existing garages are very well suited to existing surroundings. They should be properly renovated.
- Dwelling would increase usage of access driveway, perhaps at unsocial hours. Intensification of use was a reason for refusal in application 11/00323/FUL.
- The dwelling would be higher than existing garages.
- Fire Brigade would not be able to access site

#### **7.4 Fire Authority**

Access:

Access for Fire Service purposes has been considered in accordance with the Essex Act 1987 - Section 13.

Access for fire appliances is not acceptable as shown.

The access path to the proposed premises is below the minimum width of 3.7m and the travel distance from the roadway to the furthest

point (measured to 1<sup>st</sup> floor bedroom) in the building (according to the plans supplied) is 110m.

Although there is a proposed domestic sprinkler system the increased distance will have a detrimental effect on fire service operations due to the equipment that will have to be carried to effect rescues etc.

More detailed observations on access and facilities for the Fire Service will be considered at Building Regulation consultation stage.

Page 14

### 31 Grand Parade, Leigh-on-Sea

A letter has been received from the agent in response to the published report on the agenda.

Paragraph 1.4 should read 10 car parking spaces.

Paragraph 4.3 The agent wishes to emphasise paragraph 60 of the NPPF and the more recent emphasis made by the Government to removing barriers to delivery of housing.

Paragraph 4.5-4.9 As set out in our statement, in the Inspectors decision of 16th May 2007, while the proposed building would not be as tall as the block of flats at the nearby Steven Lodge, he stated that it would be noticeably taller than the immediately neighbouring buildings. She stated that considering the proposed development in context with the wider streetscene and its immediately adjacent neighbours *"it is evident that its height is an issue. The fourth floor projects significantly above the adjacent dwellings and given its juxtaposition in design terms from its traditional neighbours, the development appears overly dominant in this context"*, and it is these that provided the 'unacceptable contrast' with adjacent dwellings. As you have not really noted, there is a range of sizes and styles in the road, including recent flat schemes approved, and would ask that this are specifically referred to. You should also note that we are a full storey lower than the appeal scheme. **[Officer Comment: Whilst it is noted the development is set a storey lower than the previous appeal scheme it is not considered the development has overcome the previous reasons for refusal or the subsequent appeal decision.]**

In this regard, in our pre-application discussions, you suggested that *"as a minimum, the fourth floor should be set back from the frontage and in from the sides to ensure its dominance is reduced. This may help integrate the proposed development more successfully with surrounding properties and would provide the 'penthouse' with a greater provision of private amenity space in the form of a terrace."* This we have done, and indeed have complied fully with the height drawing that Dean Hermitage supplied to my clients at the first meeting. **[Officer Comment: The top floor is set back from the front building line but has not been set in from the sides.]**

We do not consider this to be a landmark building as you suggest, unlike the appeal scheme, which Members should be reminded of at the Committee, but one that derives from a simple and calm building approach, and one which seeks to avoid bland uniformity, which

appears to be what your report suggests. The top floor will not be seen from oblique views in the street scene, as you imply, as we have set back the top floor by the amount you recommended.

You also acknowledged that the waved nature of the front elevations could add some interest in design terms, although there was concern over the extent of white render. In terms of the internal layout, you expressed concern with respect to the ground floor flats 1 and 2 given that they appear very narrow from the front elevation, although other flats were acceptable in terms of living space standards. Again, we made changes to the scheme as a consequence combining 1 & 2 into one flat, and had believed that the design approach was acceptable subject to these changes.

Paragraph 4.19 The distance shown is the closest point between the new building and properties to the rear, the location plan of 1:1250 should not be relied upon for scaling. **[Officer Comment: The applicant's roof and site context plan was used to assess the separation distance between the proposed building and dwellings within Glen Road. The location plan was used to compare the depth of the rear gardens for properties in Glen Road.]**

Paragraph 4.23 - The agent has confirmed that there will be no impact on the tree to the rear and the Inspector did not raise it in the appeal decision **[Officer Comment: It is acknowledged that any trees proposed to be retained can be protected through appropriate planning conditions].**

Paragraph 4.25- The rear doors and Juliet balconies will be deleted from the plans and windows in the side elevations will be shown as obscure glazed **[Officer Comment: This cannot be dealt with under this application as it is a material alteration to the plans].**

## **Public Consultation**

6.4 Please note the total number of objections is 60 (some of these include duplicate addresses) and 14 letters of support.

The additional representations do not raise any new material planning considerations other than those detailed under paragraph 6.4 of the main report on pages 24-25.

## **Planning History**

2006 – Planning permission refused to demolish existing building and erect 7 storey block of 6 flats with parking on ground floor and in basement (05/01722/FUL).