



Public Document Pack

Southend-on-Sea City Council

Executive Director (Strategy, Change and Governance):

Stephen Meah-Sims

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

 01702 215000

 www.southend.gov.uk



13 December 2023

Dear Councillor

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY, 13TH DECEMBER, 2023

Please find enclosed, for consideration at the meeting of the Development Control Committee taking place on Wednesday, 13th December 2023, a copy of the supplementary report that provides further information on applications listed on the Agenda, which was unavailable when the Agenda was printed.

Tim Row

Principal Democratic Services Officer
Democratic Services

This page is intentionally left blank

Southend-on-Sea City Council

Development Control Committee 13th December 2023

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

3

**Agenda Item 4
23/00976/FUL**

Pages 57 - 114

**Land Rear Of 2 Smallholdings Eastwoodbury Lane,
Southend-on-Sea (St Laurence Ward) (Pages 7 - 56)**

Section 4

Additional Consultation response received:

Since the publication of the agenda, a further representation has been received from an existing objector to the scheme. For clarity, the additional comments received are summarised as follows:

- Concerns with the development already approved at 1 Smallholdings.
- Development is for developer greed only.
- Additional congestion concerns.

Officer Comment: These respective submissions are not considered to alter the officer's assessment contained in the Committee report.

**Agenda Item 5
23/00265/OUTM**

Pages 57 - 114

**Empire Theatre, Alexandra Street, Southend-on-Sea
(Milton Ward)**

Section 4

Additional Consultation response received:

Since the publication of the agenda, a further representation has been received from Milton Conservation Society which reiterates initial points of objection. For clarity, the additional comments received are summarised as follows:

- Concerns with the design of the scheme, specifically the bulk of the proposal and its impact on Clifftown, an historic 2-3 storey part of the city which borders Clifftown conservation area and is surrounding by Frontages of Townscape Merit. These are protected in the Local Plan and SCAAP.
- The bulk is evident in the CGI images.
- 4 and 5 storeys next to 2 and 3 storeys is harmful and exceeds other development in the city at the centre of street blocks.
- The proposal is not sympathetic to local context. It is bold and has 2 storey stepped arch openings.

- The changes from the initial submission have not addressed the initial harm identified.
- Proposal represents over development of the site.
- Could set a precedent for similar development.
- Conflicts with Policy PA6 and harms the gentle scale and fine grain of Clifftown.

Correspondence has been received from the scheme's Architects in response to the Milton Conservation Society comments outlined above.

The responding comments are summarised as follows:

- Disagreement with the notion that the proposal is bulky and harms the Frontage of Townscape Merit.
- The design introduces depth and detailing to animate the façade and create a high-quality building that is responsive to its context.
- These design features include the following:
 1. Introduction of an arcade-like form to the ground floor facing Alexandra Street to create a sheltered area for year-round alfresco seating and add animation to the façade and street. Feature double-storey arches create grandeur whilst introducing depth and interest.
 2. Recessed balconies with decorative balustrades along the south elevation to create depth, relief and detail.
 3. The proposal is of a similar scale to the previous Empire Theatre which occupied the site.
 4. In the case of the Clarence Street elevation, the proposal is both shorter and narrower than the previous building to provide relief to Clarence Yard (a locally listed building) as well as providing a public square and to help create an active frontage along the footpath connecting Alexandra Street and Clarence Street.
 5. The previous Empire Theatre featured a flat façade with very little animation and did not contribute to or complement its context.
 6. The proposal is reflective of the grain of the adjacent buildings with a significant 'cut out' in the centre of the plan to provide relief from the built form.
 7. The reduced mass and 'bulk' relative to the old Empire Theatre is demonstrated by the daylight assessment which notes that the impact of the proposal on neighbouring properties is less than the old Empire Theatre.
 8. Whilst the theatre has been demolished, in the context of the built environment this was present relatively recently and its previous height, scale and massing on the site should not be discounted.

9. Disagree that the arches are out of context. A character study was undertaken of the local context and the proposal responds to this.
- For the above reasons, do not believe the proposal is harmful.
 - Do not dispute that the proposal is taller than its surroundings, but the previous buildings were taller than their surroundings. The height is appropriate.
 - Is high architectural quality and can become a landmark building.
 - Proposal creates 22 high-quality homes in a highly sustainable location, and any perceived or subjective negative impacts are outweighed by housing delivery and the public benefits including the new public space and the S106 and CIL contributions to Education and Infrastructure.

Officer Comment: These respective submissions are not considered to alter the officer's assessment contained in the Committee report.

Section 2

Officer clarification

Paragraph 8.17 states "...within the SCAAP Clifftown Policy Area which is characterised by its fine grain and well-articulated buildings, many of which have heritage designations."

Paragraph 8.22 states "...it is considered that the proposed development would preserve the setting of the designated and non-designated assets, inclusive of the Clifftown Conservation Area (to the west and south) and the adjacent Frontages of Townscape Merit along both Alexandra Street and Clarence Street."

Officer comment: For clarification, the non-designated heritage assets referred to in the 'Design and Impact on the Character of the Area including Heritage Assets' section of the report and as outlined in paragraphs 8.17 and 8.22 (see above) includes the locally listed buildings within the vicinity of the site, including at 23-29 Clarence Street to the east of the site and 29-35 High Street further east.

Section 2

Paragraph 8.31

Wording Correction:

22No units are proposed, 16No units would be provided with a private external amenity space in the form of either a balcony or a terrace. 6No units would not be served by a private external

balcony but do have Juliette balconies and use of the communal terrace.

Paragraph 8:62

Wording correction:

There is a typographical error, the residential waste is collected from Clarence Street, not Chichester Road as stated in the report.

Recommendation
Section:

Updated job title:

Following a change to Kevin Water's job title, the recommendation sections need updating from "Director of Growth and Planning" to "Director of Planning and Economy."

Agenda Item 7 Pages 145 – 166
22/00341/UNAU_B 15 Leslie Close, Leigh-on-Sea (Eastwood Park Ward)

Since the publication of the agenda, correspondence has been received from an interested party which is summarised as follows:

- The single storey rear extension contains set of bifold doors instead of a window and a set of doors on the rear elevation, as per the approved plans.
- The rear dormer has been extended further out than the original plans, some 9 inches (0.22m).
- The front roof tiles have not been altered as per the Enforcement Notice.

Officer comment: In relation to the above correspondence, it is considered that the variation in the rear elevation of the single storey rear elevation, in terms of the window and door, is an inconsequential variation from the approved plans and it is considered that it would not result in any significant harm in any relevant regards. The size of the rear dormer was previously in question in relation to the Development Control Committee report for application ref 22/02471/AMDT. However, that report stated that no objection is raised in principle to the limited enlargement to the depth of the rear dormer by some 0.2m. Therefore, it is considered that it does not result in any significant harm, due to the limited degree of increase. The roof tiles have been addressed in the current Development Control Committee report.