

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Development Control Committee 6th October 2021

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Agenda Item 9 Pages 201-236

21/01370/FUL 58 Lord Roberts Avenue, Leigh-on-Sea (Leigh Ward)

4. Public Consultation

Following reconsultation on a corrected description and reduced ground floor rear projection 2 additional letters of representation have been received raising the following points:

- Impact on light, outlook, views and privacy of neighbours.
- The rearward projection is still greater than other properties in the vicinity.
- The proposal still projects farther forward than others in the vicinity.
- Houses are large in comparison to the plot and will be overbearing.

Agenda Item 10 Pages 237 - 264

21/01323/FULH 29 St Augustines Avenue, Thorpe Bay (Thorpe Ward)

4. Public Consultation

An additional letter of representation has been received raising the following summarised points:

- Does not consider the development has changed enough;
- No site visit has been made from the neighbour's dwelling;
- The development would result in a loss of light to neighbouring dwellings in particular bedroom window at no.31 (photograph below);
- Discrepancies with the plans i.e. the notional 45 degree line and discrepancies in details in the officers report.



[Officer response - sufficient information was available to form a reasoned judgment as to the impacts of the proposal on properties next to and in the

vicinity of the site. Staff are satisfied that accurate plans and maps have been submitted.]

Agenda Item 11 Pages 265-288

21/01701/FULH 28 Fastnet, Eastwood (St Laurence)Ward)

4. Public Consultation

A site notice was posted and a consultation was sent to Rochford District Council. No additional letters of objection or consultation response have been received to date. However the site notice expiry date is 6th October.

9. Recommendation

Delegate to the Director for Planning or Head of Planning and Building Control for approval as set out in the main report subject to any additional representations received up to the end of 6th October raising no new considerations, failing which the application will be brought back to the Committee for consideration.

Agenda Item 12 Pages 289-310

21/01491/FULH 237 Prittlewell Chase, Westcliff-on-Sea (Prittlewell Ward)

4. Public Consultation

Two additional letters of objection have been received raising the following:

- Objector considers the latest two-storey proposal dated 9/9/21 is being bulldozed through by the applicant.
- Objector considers the proposal is gross over-development of the site when considered in conjunction with the Annexe accommodation in the rear garden.
- Objector considers the proposed development would have a detrimental impact on receipt of light to neighbouring gardens.
- Objector considers the proposed development would eliminate the rear garden area at the application site.
- Previous complaint regarding a breach of Data Protection in May 2021. No reply from the Council and is now being escalated to Ombudsman and Information Commissioner.
- Employee of Southend Council did not complete proposal form as requested by Chief Executive. He has since, after further complaints, put in another proposal dated 9/9/21. There is no response in the way of sanctions.
- Objector considers that the properties notified: Play Football; Chase High Sixth Form Centre; Cafe Blue; Chase Sports Centre have no bearing. Properties like 233, 229, 227, Prittlewell Chase and Eastbourne Grove numbers 8, 10, 12, 9 and 11 are much more affected by the latest proposal but were missed out.
- The neighbour at 235 is now against any further development.
- Objector considers the applicant is attempting to deliberately mislead vulnerable neighbours.

- Consultation concerns about the DCC agenda and report being published before the end of the consultation period (30/9/21).
- Objector raises concerns about all the applications submitted in the last year or so. This includes contentious ones (considered) under delegated authority despite the fact that this is in breach of the Council's Constitution. This includes the 25ft bungalow at rear of garden and repeated applications with little or no changes.
- Objector considers there to be lots of illegalities, GDPR, witting or unwitting collusion, maladministration between a Southend Council employee and Southend Council's planning department.

[Officer Response: Bullet points 2 and 3 have been addressed in the design section of the officer's report. With regards to Bullet point 4, a rear garden area approx.50sqm would be retained. With regards to Bullet point 7, consultation was carried out in accordance with the requirements set out in the Development Management Procedure Order (2015). The other issues are not related to the planning application itself but rather matters regarding the handling of the application and other issues which are being separately addressed and/or are covered under separate provisions]

An additional neighbour representation has also been received requesting a specific site visit into a nearby neighbouring dwelling and suggesting that the staff assessment is flawed due to failure to do so.

[Officer response - sufficient information was available to form a reasoned judgment as to the impacts of the proposal on this and other properties next to and in the vicinity of the site. Furthermore, the dwelling in question does not directly adjoin the application site.]

Agenda Item 13 Pages 311 - 328

21/01406/FULH 8 Eastwood Rise Eastwood Essex SS9 5BS

Incorrect Plan reference in report.

Title Page (Page 313) – Plan Number reference should be A102 Rev A not A102

9. Recommendation

Condition No.2 Plan Reference should be A102A not A102 as follows:

02 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No's A100, A101 & A102A

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Development Plan.

[Officer Comment - The difference between A102A and A102 relates to an existing first floor balustrade not being shown on A102 but is now shown on A102A. There are no differences to the proposed extension on the updated plan.]