

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Development Control Committee 2nd June 2021


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Agenda Item 5 **Pages 19-64**

20/01726/BC3M **Garages at Eagle Way, Shoeburyness, Essex**

Page 20 **Site Location Plan**

Whilst the site location plan for the flatted block was included at the front of the agenda, the site location plan for the 5x terraced houses proposed was omitted from the front of the agenda. For clarity, a copy is included below:



Page 30 **RAMS Update**

The RAMS tariff has increased to £127.30 per dwelling in line with the Retail Prices Index (RPI) for February 2021. The additional payment has been made by the applicant and the proposal continues to offer suitable mitigation for its in-combination effects to designated sites.

Agenda Item 6 **Pages 65-124**

20/02224/FUL **51 Chalkwell Avenue, Westcliff-on-Sea, Essex**

Page 68 **Public Consultation**

12 additional letters of representation have been received from 11 households raising the following issues. Many of these representations are

repeats of the letter of representation sent in relation to the consultation of the initial design so have already been covered in the main report:

- Concern over the number of amendments listed on the plans over the last few months.
- Lack of parking and traffic generated by development. No space for deliveries.
- Impact on neighbours from car fumes and noise and disturbance.
- Proximity of access to junction and safety, lack of visibility, gradient of access. Reversing onto Chalkwell Avenue frontage is safer for vehicles than exiting forwards onto Kings Road levels are more even.
- Overlooking of neighbouring properties.
- Overbearing and loss of light to neighbouring properties.
- The site is suitable for only 1 family house. Flats are out of character. Houses have been approved/built on other sites in this area. Chalkwell should be maintained for family housing not flats.
- The proposal is over scaled. Overdevelopment of site. The density and mass is out of character. Concern over precedent. The amended proposal is the same density and the initial submission. The footprint is larger than the previous house.
- This is a prominent site suitable for an appropriate landmark building.
- The amended design now blends in with the character of Chalkwell Avenue but there is a concern about elements of the Kings Road elevation design.
- The Chalkwell Avenue façade is visually more in keeping with the surroundings but the south façade facing the neighbour is south is stark and unattractive.
- Out of character with the original property and area. An Edwardian like for like replacement should be built.
- Balconies are out of character in this location. Balconies are in front of the building line. Flat roof rear projection (terrace) is poor design.
- The windows do not match. The proposal lacks architectural ambition.
- Loss of trees and impact on nature. Loss of greenspace and increased hard landscaping.
- Concerns about surface water flooding.
- Light pollution from car park lighting.
- The CGIs exaggerate the space available. The existing neighbour's garages are not shown. Question over size of parking spaces.
- Lack of amenity space.
- Impact on local services.
- Greed of developer.

21/00674/FUL

59 First Avenue, Westcliff-On-Sea

Section 4

Representations


Two additional representations have been received and the concerns raised are summarised as follows;

Potential future change of use to a dwelling;
Concerns at impacts of a future dwelling upon neighbour privacy;
Impacts on outlook from neighbouring flats;
Sense of enclosure and visual impact from neighbouring flats;
Effect on existing resident parking and legal entitlements to the space;
Displacement of parking during construction with no alternatives;
Notification and advertising of the application not sufficiently prominent;
Impacts upon legal covenants;
Precedent for further development.

An objector provided photographs with their own captions as follows:



View from my garden - Before



After. (Just a representative volume of the oversize and disharmonious structure.

Views from my living-dining room open plan to conservatory. This is The first thing I see every time I enter my living space. If blinds are down, there will be obvious invasion of privacy from the back garden right to the entrance of my flat.



Page 131

Conditions

Condition 03 reads:

‘The outbuilding hereby permitted shall only be used for vehicular **paring** and storage purposes ancillary to the residential units at no.59 First Avenue. It shall not be used for any other purposes and shall not be sold or let separately or used for residential accommodation’.

There is a typing error within this condition and it should read:

‘The outbuilding hereby permitted shall only be used for vehicular parking and storage purposes ancillary to the residential units at no.59 First Avenue. It shall not be used for any other purposes and shall not be sold or let separately or used for residential accommodation’.

Pages 139 to 141 Photographs

The unnumbered photographs in sequence of photograph 4, 6 and 7, to be found on pages 140 and 141 relate to a different site and should be ignored.

Agenda Item 8 Pages 143-182

21/00692/AMDT Development Land at Underwood Square, Leigh-on-Sea, Essex

Page 147 Public Consultation

2 additional letters of representation have been received raising the following summarised issues:

- The windows facing south need to be obscure glazed.
- The flat roof to the rear projection should not be used as a balcony.
- Concerns relating to neighbour consultation and that neighbour objections cannot be viewed on public access.

Page 150 Recommendation

A condition has been omitted from the agenda. The recommendation to grant planning permission is subject to the following condition, in addition to those in the agenda:

Condition 18

No external lighting shall be installed on the rear elevations of the dwelling hereby approved other than in accordance with details that have previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason:

A condition is justified to ensure any protected species and habitats utilising the site are adequately protected in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), Core Strategy (2007) policy KP2, Development Management Document (2015) policy DM2.

Agenda Item 9 Pages 187 - 188

21/00316/AMDT Westcliff Eruv, Finchley Road, Westcliff-on-Sea

Title page The listed ward is Chalkwell but this application amends the substantive permission so applies to all of the original wards subject of that substantive permission which are within parts of Westcliff, Leigh and Southend.

Section 7 Appraisal

Paragraphs 7.4 and 7.8 should refer to Carlingford Drive, not Carlingford Road.

Agenda Item 10 Pages 261 - 284

21/00396/AMDT 25 Mount Avenue, Westcliff-on-Sea (Chalkwell Ward)

Page 266-267 Conditions

One of the originally imposed conditions was omitted by mistake from the officer's recommendation. The same condition is suggested to be imposed if Members decide to support the officer's recommendation. The condition states:

05 With the exception of a top hung clear glazed opening fanlight, the windows belonging to the two side dormers facing No.21 Mount Avenue shall only be glazed in obscured glass (the glass to be obscure to at least Level 4 on the Pilkington Levels of Privacy, or such equivalent as may be agreed in writing with the local planning authority) and fixed shut to a height not less than 1.7m above finished internal floor level and shall be retained as such in perpetuity.

Reason: To protect the privacy and environment of people in neighbouring residential properties, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Core Strategy (2007) policy CP4, Development Management Document policy DM1 and advice contained in the Design and Townscape Guide (2009).

Agenda Item 11 Pages 285 - 306

21/00721/FULH 237 Prittlewell Chase, Westcliff-on-Sea, Essex

Page 285 Extract from OS Map with location of the site

It is noted that for Item 11 the same OS Map extract was used as for Item 10. The correct extract is shown below:



Two (2) additional letters of neighbour representation have been received raising the following issues:

- The application should be refused as the applicant is a council employee who did not declare this in the necessary submission documents.
- On this basis the outbuilding development at the bottom of the garden should also have gone to Committee.
- Concerns remain about the installation of 3 first floor flank windows to the west flank and how they will overlook the private amenity areas of properties beyond the junction with Prittlewell Chase. Whilst existing first floor flank windows are noted, these are for a staircase.
- The additional windows to the first floor western flank should be conditioned to be permanently obscure-glazed.

A representation has also been received from the applicant, this is summarised as follows;

- We have been resident in Westcliff since 2006 and at our current address, 237 Prittlewell Chase, since 2013. We are committed residents of the area and it remains our long-term plan to reside locally. Our children attend local schools and participate in numerous activities in close proximity to our home.

- We are a family of seven with four children aged between 6 and 13 and in addition care for an elderly parent who has recently moved into the property.
- We are now a multi-generational family which is mutually beneficial however it means that we are in need of additional space within the property to comfortably accommodate all of us.
- Our long term aim is to continue to care and support for our parent to avoid the need for alternative arrangements to be made.
- We note the concerns raised by neighbours however these appear to have been thoroughly addressed within the planner's report.
- We are sympathetic to the impact that building work can have on the local community and will be mindful of this should planning be agreed and work is able to commence.
- Having spoken to the owners of the directly adjacent properties in advance of submitting a planning application they have confirmed their support of our proposal and understand our reasons for it. They have not cited any detrimental impact.
- The planner's report is robust, fully considered and importantly documents the process that we have followed in relation to addressing concerns cited in a previously refused application.
- As noted the planner has addressed the concerns from neighbours and is not of the view that they are of a great enough significance to refuse planning.

Page 303 & 304 Photographs

Site photographs are showing the view to No.235, not No.243 Prittlewell Chase

Additional site photographs have been received in relation to existing views from upper floor windows.

1. View from side dormer window serving stairwell to loft room.



2. View from first floor flank window serving stairwell to loft room



3. View from flank window within the first-floor rear bay serving the rear bedroom



4. View from forwardmost first floor flank window serving a bedroom

