

# Public Document Pack

## Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

### Legal & Democratic Services

Strategic Director: John Williams

📍 Civic Centre, Victoria Avenue, Southend-on-Sea, Essex SS2 6ER

☎ 01702 215000

🌐 [www.southend.gov.uk](http://www.southend.gov.uk)

*Creating a better  
Southend*  
[www.southend.gov.uk](http://www.southend.gov.uk)



08 April 2019

Dear Councillor

### **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY, 3RD APRIL, 2019**

Please find enclosed a copy of the supplementary report that was considered at the meeting of the Development Control Committee held on Wednesday, 3rd April, 2019.

Yours faithfully

Tim Row  
Principal Democratic Services Officer

This page is intentionally left blank

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

P7

18/01820/FULM

**Car Wash, 120 Broadway, Leigh**

### 7.4 Education

The education contribution will be used for secondary expansion at St Thomas More High School not Chase High School.

### 8.0 Public Consultation

An objection has been received on behalf of the owner of the Grand Hotel raising the following issues:

- The proposal will block some sea views from apartments in the Grand which will affect their sales value. This will affect the viability of the development.
- The proposal will impact on public views of the estuary from the conservation area which will cause harm to the significance of this designated heritage asset and to the Grand itself which is a non-designated heritage asset. This harm would be substantial.
- The proposal will impact on views of the Grand from Grand Drive.
- The proposal is much larger than the existing building on site and is over scaled. The proposal will dominate The Grand.
- The appeal for 136 Broadway acknowledged the importance of the Grand as a local landmark and considered that new development in this area should not compete with this building.
- The public benefits of the proposal do not outweigh the harm to the heritage assets.
- The illustrative views are inconsistent.

#### Officer Comment:

- **Private views are not a material planning consideration.**
- **The proposal will not have a material impact on the public views of the estuary along roads and between buildings in the conservation area and therefore does not cause harm to the heritage asset in this regard.**
- **As noted in the main report the taller areas of the proposal have been deliberately located at the northern end of the scheme adjacent to the existing 5 storeys of 136 Broadway in order to preserve a key view of the Grand Hotel from Grand Drive. The proposed view from this street is very similar to that of the 2016 proposal which was accepted in terms of height and scale.**
- **Proposed view in the Heritage statement is an outdated impact and is slightly different to illustrative view 1 however the changes relate to the stairtower on the east side which does not materially impact on views of The Grand. Illustrative View 1 is an updated view of the proposal which was amended during the course of the application. The proposal has been assessed on this basis.**

P91

There is a typographical error on the agenda – for clarity the reference number is 19/00237/FUL.

The photograph on page 121 of the agenda does not relate to this application and has been included in the agenda in error.

The ICT Service Delivery Manager has provided the following comments in relation to this application:

*In 2017, CityFibre built a metro network in partnership with SBC and connected over 120 public sector sites and businesses and has over 90km of existing network in the Borough. This has set the foundations for the Council's "Smart City" initiatives in the coming years.*

*In late 2018, CityFibre announced Southend as one of the first 10 locations to deliver Gigabit full fibre broadband to all its residents in the borough. CityFibre has committed £35million of private investment to Southend to realise this ambition and this digital infrastructure will pass an estimated 70,000 homes within the boundaries. Currently, only 6% of the UK's population has access to full fibre broadband. Broadband connectivity is a key component of the infrastructure offer that a city can make to business, entrepreneurs, residents and visitors. In the 2019, Centre for Cities Outlook report, Southend was identified as one of the cities in the country with the lowest "ultrafast" (>100mbps) broadband penetration rate.*

*A key benefit of the CityFibre project is the creation of an "Open Access Network" across the borough which means this will be open to all internet service providers and not just one in the future. It creates a robust marketplace that fosters great competition. This "Open Access Network" is crucial as it underpins Southend Council's Connected and Smart 2050 vision by becoming a leading digital city with world class infrastructure that enables the whole population.*

*The FTTP (fibre to the home) project has a far reaching economic impact for our city.*

*The benefits are:*

*£35m private investment Over 200 jobs created £19m direct network build*

***What are the benefits to homeowners and residents?***

- *\*£93m economic impact in private household benefits. It will provide gigabit-speed broadband to residents in their homes, transforming user experience with seamless multi-device streaming, buffer-free video calling and real-time gaming.*
- *Connects the entire community, schools, hospitals, libraries, community centres, residents thus making smart city applications more effective to deploy.*
- *\*£14m economic impact in worker flexibility as more flexible working practices become more adopted. Home working & e-learning with seamless online file sharing and video conferencing Increase in house prices due to connectivity.*
- *Better home treatment & telemedicine, with convenient online consultations & remote monitoring opportunities*

***What are the benefits to business?***

- *\*£15m economic impact with new business start-ups capitalising on gigabit broadband to operate new digitally dependent business models at lower cost and more flexibly than established businesses or other locations.*
- *\*£12m economic impact as the tech sector expands: the continued rise of the fintech and govtech industries will be powered by full fibre and make a significant contribution to growth in our future economy.*

#### **What are the benefits to visitors?**

- *\*£31m economic impact of Smart city infrastructure. The Council will have the capacity to deploy Smart applications to enhance the visitor experience, for e.g. Smart traffic systems, smart bin sensors etc.*
- *\*£171m with regards to 5G innovation. 5G mobile requires full fibre infrastructure which has potential positive benefits for visitors and residents alike through being able to seamlessly connect whether it be for work or pleasure.*

*\*Regeneris report: 'Economic Impact of full fibre infrastructure in 100 towns and cities 2018'.*

**P279**

**19/00297/FUL –**

#### **11 Leigh Park Road**

Leigh Town Council have commented as follows:

*"Despite all the amendments, the Town Council still objects to the west roof pitch and dormer windows to the north roof as this will substantially alter the street scene in a conservation area and is not in keeping with the character of the existing property. It is therefore contrary to Policy DM1 as does not respect the character of the site, its local context and surroundings in terms of its architectural approach. It will not make a positive contribution to the character of the original building (DM5). It must adhere to conservation guidelines".*

Officer comment – the alterations described in the objection have been found acceptable in the recent appeal decision further to application 17/01007/FULH.

**P329**

**19/00284/FUL**

#### **135 Marine Parade, Leigh**

#### **6.4 Public Consultation**

5 additional neighbour letters have been received which raise the following issues:

- The existing building is unique and should be retained. It is a recognisable landmark on this junction. The proposed alterations add nothing to its character.
- The proposal has little private amenity for occupiers. The lack of garden to the rear is a concern.
- Concern over poor outlook from neighbouring properties onto proposed car parking area and nuisance caused by manoeuvring cars.
- The peace and privacy of the site will be destroyed.
- Lack of landscaping in car park area suggests overdevelopment and is harmful to those who look out onto this area.
- Detrimental impact on busy junction.
- Conflict with bus stop.
- Increased congestion.

- Increased air pollution.
- Increased risk of accidents. The junction is used by commercial traffic as well as local traffic and pedestrians.
- Increased congestion during construction would impact on local residents.
- Loss of trees and other vegetation would be counter to environmental objectives.
- Gross overdevelopment of the site.
- The proposal ignores the principles of the Marine Parade Guidelines and does not preserve the character and unique charm of the area.
- Even 5 flats would be too many here.
- The proposal is out of character.
- The existing area is characterised by houses and bungalows, some of which have been converted into 2 flats but which have maintained the low density of the area.
- The proposal would be better split into 2 or 3 flats.
- It is not unusual for properties to have more than 1 car per household; the parking provision is therefore inadequate.
- The existing property is attractive and should be preserved.
- The proposal is driven by profit.

**P381**

**19/00075/FUL**

**22 - 24 St Benet's Road, Southend-On-Sea, Essex, SS2 6LF**

Expiry Date is 5<sup>th</sup> April 2019. Not 2<sup>nd</sup> April as stated.

**P149**

**19/00032/FULH**

**18 Vardon Drive**

A statement from the applicant Miss E Johnson has been received on 27<sup>th</sup> March 2019 and makes the following points:

- Originally the application proceeded under prior approval process. It was noted that there were no neighbour comments and so work was commenced.
- Unfortunately I was not advised that this was premature and the application was refused as work had already commenced.
- The second and third applications were refused due to impact on No.20 Vardon Drive. However, I discussed this with the then owner who had no objections and also with his son who inherited the property. I am at a loss to understand the objection which the son now makes as he was always friendly and made helpful comments.
- I employed a planning consultant and a rights-of-light expert to examine the extension. They both agreed that it was satisfactory for its location and critically would not impact unduly on No.20 Vardon Drive.
- As you will appreciate this matter has caused me great anguish, escalating costs and so far no settlement.
- I do hope that the committee [having seen the property] will agree that the extension does not cause sufficient harm to my neighbours and warrants the grant of planning permission.

**P242**

**18/00839/FUL**

**Land Rear Of 106 To 112, High Street, Shoeburyness**

### **Public Consultation**

An additional letter of representation has been received which makes the following objections;

- Land is not under ownership of the applicant;
- The land must be kept clear for access and parking.

Officer comment: Land ownership matters do not form material planning considerations. During the course of the application the applicant has submitted a corrected ownership certificate and served notice upon interested parties. The LPA is satisfied that the correct ownership certificate has been received.

### **Supplementary TPO Report**

#### **Page 1**

Correction - The TPO number in the proposal box should be 3/2018 not 01/2017.

This page is intentionally left blank