

Southend-on Sea City Council

Development Control Committee 01 March 2023

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

Agenda Item 4	Pages 9-122
22/01118/FULM	Nazareth House, 111 London Road, Southend on Sea (Victoria Ward)
Section 4	Strategic Planning Consultation
	Correction
	Paragraph 4.6 of report incorrectly states the C2 Shared Ownership units as 32 - should be 52.
Section 7	Paragraph 7.51
	Clarification
	In relation to parking provision for the development, members are advised that assessment against the Appendix 6 standards for Block A (Retirement Flats Class C3) would derive a figure of 60 spaces for 60 units. The Development Management Document does not include a parking standard for assisted living units. The only standard for C2 units relates to care homes and the standard for this is 1 space per resident staff and 1 space per 3 dwelling units. The submitted application form gives the predicted employee numbers as 20 although most of these are unlikely to be resident staff. As a guide, if that figure were applied as a maximum, the required parking provision for block B's 84 assisted living units, would be some 48 spaces. That would give a total requirement of 108 parking spaces for the whole development. A total of 95 car parking spaces are proposed for both blocks which is 13 spaces or 12% less than the above calculation. As demonstrated in paragraph 7.52 consideration has been given to the sustainable location of the site when finding that the proposed parking provision is acceptable and policy compliant.

Agenda Item 5

22/02098/BC4

Section 4

Pages 123-156

Adventure Island, Western Esplanade, Southend-on-Sea (Milton Ward)

Consultation

Natural England

No objections - Based on the plans submitted, Natural England considers that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on statutorily protected nature conservation sites or landscapes.

Agenda Item 6

22/02368/FUL

Section 2

Pages 157-192

995-1003 London Road, Leigh-on-Sea (Blenheim Park Ward)

para 2.5 Correction & Additional Clarification

The paragraph should read:

“To the rear of the site are 8 parking spaces to be laid out. The agent has specified four of the spaces will be for the **existing** flats, three for the **proposed 1bed 2-person** flats and one for the commercial unit. **The 3x 1bed 1-person flats will not have allocated parking.** Refuse and cycle storage are also shown to the rear of the site. Also proposed is a living green roof over the proposed flat roof of the development.”

Section 4

Public Consultation

Additional response received from an existing objector.

Where additional comments have been raised beyond those already listed in the officer’s report, these are summarised below:

- Query the accuracy of the report in relation to the withdrawal of planning application 21/01900/FUL. Report references the application was withdrawn due to ownership concerns however the head of planning made reference to the application being completely withdrawn with a suggestion that the applicant go back to revise the scheme as far as possible with neighbours before resubmitting with a correct ownership certificate. The (2022) approved

scheme is a significantly better scheme than this latest submission in relation to its design, layout, density and neighbour impact.

[Officer comment: the decision whether, and on what basis, to withdraw the 2021 application was at the applicant's own volition].

Before / after images provided by the objector are below. **[Officer comment: these images have not been verified for accuracy including with the applicant's architects so should be regarded as indicative only].**

Existing View from 10 Grasmear Avenue



Proposed View from 10 Grasmear Avenue



Agenda Item 8

Pages 217 – 250

22/02471/AMDT

15 Leslie Close, Eastwood, Leigh-on-Sea (Eastwood Park Ward)

Section 4

Public Consultation

Since the preparation of the agenda 2 additional neighbour representations have been received from existing objectors which raise the following summarised concerns:

- Concerns that the plans still do not show the first-floor rear doors opening onto the flat roof. Concerns regarding these

doors which allow the roof of the rear extension to be used as a patio causing an overbearing loss of privacy.

- It is nothing like what was approved on appeal.
- Request the amendments to the external finish are refused and the doors in the dormer are instructed to be removed.

Agenda Item 9

Pages 251- 276

22/02444/FUL

151 Hamlet Court Road, Westcliff-on-Sea (Milton Ward)

22/00283/UNA_B

Section 4

Representations

Since the publication of the agenda, the Agent has written to the Local Planning Authority stating that the fascia referred to in the report is signage which they consider requires a separate application for advertisement consent and they confirm does not therefore form part of the application and should be removed from the reason for refusal. The Agent states that the original hardwood fascia has been kept and restored.

Officer comment: The fascias have been included in the officer assessment from which they formed part of the reason for refusal of the retrospective planning application. The letter received is not considered to negate the harm caused by the fascias or the need for them to be included in the scope of the enforcement notice. In that regard the assessment of fascia-related harm at paragraphs 7.9 to 7.13 remains relevant. Officers request that Members still authorise enforcement action in this regard including if needed, under the provisions of the Advertisement Regulations within the scope of proceedings outlined under the Recommendation at Section 10 of the report. Given the applicant's confirmation that they did not intend for the fascias to be considered as a part of their planning application staff request that the reference to fascias be disregarded so far as the planning application assessment is concerned and that the reason for refusal of the planning application be altered accordingly to the following:

01 The development, by reason of the detailed design and materials of the replacement windows at first and second floor level on the east and north elevations has resulted in visually prominent, out of keeping and incongruous alterations to the existing building which are harmful to the character and appearance of the site, the streetscene, the Frontage of Townscape Merit, the wider Hamlet Court Road Conservation Area and harm the setting of the Grade II listed Havens building opposite the site. Whilst this harm is less than substantial, it is nevertheless significant in degree and

is not outweighed by any public benefits of the development. This is unacceptable and contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), Policies KP2 and CP4 of the Core Strategy (2007), Policies DM1, DM3 and DM5 of the Development Management Document (2015) and the advice contained within the National Design Guide (rev 2021), the Southend-on-Sea Design and Townscape Guide (2009) and the Hamlet Court Road Conservation Area Appraisal (2021).