

# Southend-on-Sea City Council

## Development Control Committee 26<sup>th</sup> June 2024

### SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

Agenda Item 4  
23/01751/FULM

Pages 3 - 94

658 - 664 London Road, Westcliff-on-Sea, Essex, SS0 9HQ (Chalkwell Ward)

#### Listed Plans

PL201, PL300, PL301, PL500, PL501, PL502, PL503 and PL601 are all Rev. C.

#### Section 2 The Proposal – Wording correction

Para 2.1 Planning permission is sought to demolish the building at Nos. 658 - ~~662~~ **664** London Road and to erect a residential-led mixed use development including two separate buildings.

Para 2.3 In total, 25 flats would be delivered across the development site comprising 13x 1bed 2-person units, ~~Four~~**Six** 2bed 3-person units, ~~Six~~ **Four** 2bed 4-person units and 2x 3bed 4-person units.

#### Section 8 Appraisal – Repeated Paragraph

Para 8.61 is repeated.

#### Section 9 Recommendation/Conditions – Variation of condition wording

*02. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: PL001 Rev C; PL003 Rev C; PL10 Rev C; PL11 Rev C; PL003 Rev C; PL10 Rev C; PL11 Rev C; PL12 Rev C; PL31 Rev C; PL32 Rev C; PL33 Rev C; PL34 Rev C; PL35 Rev C; PL100 Rev C; PL101 Rev C; PL102 Rev C; PL103 Rev C; PL104 Rev C; PL105 Rev C; PL110 Rev C; PL111 Rev C; PL112 Rev C; PL113 Rev C; PL114 Rev C; **PL201 Rev C; PL300 Rev C; PL301 Rev C; PL500 Rev C; PL501 Rev C; PL502 Rev C; PL503 Rev C; PL601 Rev C; PL701 Rev C***

*23. Occupation or first use of the development hereby approved shall not begin unless and until a scheme for signage and a ~~localised traffic light system~~ sensor **operated green/red light system** at both ends of the undercroft below Chalkwell Lawns ensuring that vehicles exiting the site via the undercroft give way to vehicles entering the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall then be installed prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved and shall be maintained as such for the lifetime of the development thereafter.*

## Section 2 The Proposal

### Clarification

2.1 The dwelling mix is changing from 4 x 1 bed 2 persons (undersized) and 1 x 2 bed 4 persons units to 2 x 1 bed 1 person and 2 x 2-bed 2-person (all size compliant) and one 94 sqm ground floor commercial unit with a Class E (c) (Financial and Professional Services) use.

## Section 4 Public Consultation

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

- Overlooking concerns.
- Concerns relating to additional parking stress including during construction and as the result of the commercial unit proposed.
- Design concerns – flat roofed, white building in an area of character properties with pitched roofs.
- The report is very informative, and this is appreciated.
- The rationale of improving the building both aesthetically and practically and by bringing it up to required standards is understandable.
- The restriction on the use of the commercial property to Class E (c) Financial and Professional services has satisfied my concerns on that level and is welcomed.
- There is a concern that neighbours car parking spaces in this location will not be accessible during construction. For example, scaffolding will restrict manoeuvring into these parking spaces. Please consider adding to the CMP condition a requirement to consider this issue.

### Officer Comment:

The concerns raised above are noted and have been considered in the main report and an additional condition is recommended below in terms of servicing and deliveries.

## Section 9 Conditions

Partly in response to the issue raised in the final bullet above staff propose an additional condition (Servicing and Deliveries)

*16 Notwithstanding the information submitted and otherwise hereby approved, the commercial unit at ground floor hereby approved shall not be brought into first use unless and until a service plan including full details of how the unit will be serviced, including how deliveries and collections to and from the site will be made and their timings, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority under the terms of this condition. The servicing of the development shall thereafter be undertaken in strict accordance with the approved service plan for the lifetime of the development.*

*Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbours and to ensure a good general environmental standard in accordance with the National*

**Agenda Item 7  
24/00352/FUL**

**Pages 185-234  
135 Marine Parade, Leigh-on-Sea (West Leigh Ward)**

**Section 4 Public Consultation**

A petition of 26 names in support of the application has been received. The petition reads:

*'As residents in the immediate vicinity of the above property, we would prefer to see it remain as a family home. However, given that plans to convert it into 6 flats have already been approved on appeal, this will clearly not be the case. In the light of this, notwithstanding the reservations with regards to traffic on this busy corner, we support the plan for 4 apartments (ref 24/00532/FUL), which we believe represents a better outcome for the locality than the aforementioned approved plans.'*

1 additional letter of representation has been received raising the following summarised issues:

- That house was built by and lived in by E.K.Cole, the joint founder of EKCO Radios, the most important employer in Southend from the late 1920s until the 1960s. It is, therefore, one of the most important houses in Southend historically speaking, and so should not be demolished, but rather listed.

**Agenda Item 8  
24/00421/BC3**

**Pages 235 - 304  
Garages at Bradford Bury, Leigh-on-Sea (Belfairs Ward)**

**Section 4 Consultation**

**4.1 Public Consultation:**

Since the publication of the Agenda, an additional letter of representation has been received which makes the following summarised comments:

- Concerned garages removed without reinstating a similar parking facility for the residents.
- Parking by Progress Road factories takes up normal parking areas, even though they are signposted for local residents only.
- The location of the dwellings is out of keeping with the current buildings, with flat roofs and a better area for these would be 10m to the west of the northerly footpath down to the A127.
- Two trees have Tree Protection Order numbers on them.
- There is a public water supply for the garages attached to the western boundary fence of No's 36-42 Bradford Bury which will need remedial work. The garages form part of the boundary to 36-42 Bradford Bury.
- It is stated that the garages are condemned, so once they are removed, the area should be re-lined and hardsurfaced to provide parking bays for residents parking only and suggests a small barrier is provided with the Council offering a fee for those who wish to use

the parking spaces.

- Concerned current drains within the garage site are blocked and flood.
- Concerns about the conduct of the Council and that users of the garages have been forcefully removed. Considers that the Council has not considered other people/residents and the wishes of local residents including those who are vulnerable and disabled.
- Query whether site visits have been undertaken.
- Concerns about Planning Officer contact with resident to seek information.
- Concerns that the case officer has sent an email stating he cannot reply to emails until 1<sup>st</sup> July 2024.
- The residents who held garages would be interested in retaining them.
- Not adverse to change and the buildings, just not in its current location laid out in this submission.
- Is in conversation with Southend Echo and if required shall pass a motion that it be held in abeyance for a ruling from the Secretary of State.

**Officer Comment:**

- Parking implications have been fully considered and are outlined in detail at paragraphs 8.37 – 8.43 of the report.
- The application must be determined in its submitted form and the LPA cannot make a proposal change its location. It is also noted that the open land to the north and north-west of the site is designated as Protected Green Space.
- No trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) in the vicinity of the application site.
- The public water supply is a civil matter for the owners to address.
- Condition 14 requires details of hard and soft landscaping to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and requires details of all means of enclosing and subdividing the site to be submitted.
- A drainage condition (condition 10) has been recommended and the Lead Local Flood Authority have raised no objections subject to such a condition.
- The public consultation process has been undertaken in accordance with national and local requirements.
- Officers have visited the site.
- The Case Officer contacted the neighbour to invite information which may help establish the facts in light of representations made so potentially helping to inform the decision.
- The Case Officer's automated email response was triggered when contacted.

**4.2 Cllr Representation:**

An additional representation has been received from Cllr Aylen which is summarised as follows:

- Request application is removed from the Development Control Committee meeting and an enquiry set up to investigate the application, or that the application be deferred.
- Considers paragraph 1.1. of the officer report stating that the

garages are undersized for modern cars and therefore underused has no supporting evidence and is misleading. Cllr Aylen has his own supporting evidence.

- 2.11 and 2.12 in the report are not correct. (No further reason given).
- The Council has deliberately failed to give best value for the use of the garages and run down their occupancy.
- The remaining occupants of the 14 garages were forcefully removed. Cllr Aylen has his own written evidence to support this.
- Considers that 4.3 of the report – the highway report – was challenged at the last meeting and was not correct. The area has a number of parking issues which South Essex Homes and Southend Council are aware of. Cllr Aylen has emails on this subject.

**Officer Comment:**

- As set out in Paragraph 8.42 of the report, the existing garages measure approximately 5.1m x 2.4m, which is below the current minimum size requirements for garages to be classed as parking spaces which is 3m x 7m (internally). This is why the existing garages are considered to be undersized for modern cars and therefore underused.
- Paragraphs 2.11 and 2.12 summarise information provided by the applicant relating to the ownership, management and use of the existing garages.
- The last two remaining tenants were served notice by South Essex Homes in February 2024 to facilitate necessary asbestos surveys with possession secured in March 2024.
- Paragraph 4.3 is a summary of the Highway Officer's consultation response, with paragraphs 8.37 – 8.43 of the report considering traffic, transportation and highways considerations.

**Agenda Item 9  
24/00629/FULH**

**Pages 305-328  
6 The Gables, Eastwood**

Since the publication of the Agenda, correspondence has been received from the applicant which is summarised below:

- The submitted plans say the top of the parapet wall is 3.56m high. This is incorrect. The highest point is 3.1m. 10cm over which is due to the thickness of the insulation in the roof.

[Officer comment – the application has been assessed on the basis of the submitted plans]

**Agenda Item 10  
23/02046/DOV**

**Pages 329-348  
Cantel Medical Ltd, Campfield Road Shoeburyness  
(Shoeburyness Ward)**

The expiry date for this application is amended to 27.7.24

Part c) of the recommendation of this application is amended to:

c) In the event that the Deed of Variation referred to in part (a) above has not been completed before 27th ~~June~~ **July** 2024, or an extension of this time as may be agreed by the Executive Director for Environment and Place, the Director of Planning and Economy or the Service Manager –

Development Control, authority is delegated to refuse the application on the grounds that the development would not secure the necessary affordable housing contribution, in accordance with the requirements of the original permission and as the development would otherwise be contrary to National and Local Planning Policy.