Development Control Committee 31st March 2004

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Agenda Item 5a – Pre-Meeting Site Visits

86 Eastwood Road, Leigh on Sea

Proposal
A statement of support from the applicant has been received, this is summarised below:

The style of this property has been designed by your office completely. The picture was faxed to Mr A Coot our Architect who is very well known in the Castle Point area and well respected. It is different from what we wanted, but we complied with your choice of design.

Stepping in on one side and losing the garage, but giving us a side access, you assured us that if we did this you could see no reason that our plans would not go through this time, we has complied with everything you ask.

The houses in this road are all individual and very different from each other, some taller, some wider, no one is the same.

One side of 86, no84, same style in design and no88 is a modern redbrick detached structure. Our house in between was built 1890? In an old fashion crittel window design. It was both brick and render and in no way can look like a terrace property.

The space between no’ 84-86 is 1.75m approx and 86-88 is 2.00m approx, far greater than several properties in this road. We hope you will take this into consideration at the meeting.

It has structural damage to the front and side owing to the Council Oak Tree, which has now been removed.

The applicant also expresses concern that after several discussions and amended plans the matter has not be resolved; points out that the property is in a bad state of repair; and that the family need a property of the size proposed. A number of other properties are identified where there is said to be less than 1m isolation from neighbours.

Comment
Design advice has been given and, as the main report points out, the applicants have made changes and endeavoured to overcome design criticism. The front elevation has been improved but there is still concern about bulk in close proximity to the boundary.

Publicity
One further objection received from adjoining neighbour. Objection is made to the 0.75m separation to the boundary and the need to achieve 1m clear to prevent terracing from the street. The design is still considered to represent over development of such a narrow plot, building to three stories in height and elevating the height of the roof will be dominating and impact on the street scene. The second floor side windows could have a detrimental effect on our privacy in the garden and being on the second floor would give the impression of towering over us, the neighbour requests that it is stipulated that these windows should be opaque and fixed to protect privacy should approval be forthcoming.
20 Avenue Road, Leigh on Sea
External Consultation
Leigh Town Council – Oppose the application, overlooking adjacent property causing loss of amenity.
Leigh Society – object to the proposal on the grounds of loss of privacy and loss of amenity.
Publicity
Letter received from 16 & 16A Avenue Road stating no objection to the balcony, but strong objection to the erection of an opaque privacy screen which will restrict light and obscure views of the seafront.

Agenda Item 5b – Report on Planning Applications

Adjacent to Guildford Court, Guildford Road, Southend
Proposal
Further amended plans have been received since the previous set was found by the architect to be inaccurate.
Internal Consultation
Highway Comment – no objections
Design Comment – the proposal is very bland. Improvements have been made, however some further refinements in relation to entrances, barge boards and rainwater dispersal is still required. The contemporary approach suggested in the outline permission would be preferred.

Comment
PPG1 advises that ‘the appearance of proposed development and its relationship to its surroundings are material considerations – relating to the design of buildings and urban design, i.e the relationship between different buildings, the relationship between buildings and the streets…. Good design should be the aim of all those involved in the development process and should be encouraged everywhere… and local planning authorities should reject poor designs, including those inappropriate to their context but should not impose a particular architectural taste or style arbitrarily. Local planning authorities should not concern themselves with matters of detailed design except where such matters have a significant effect on the character and quality of the area’. It is not felt that the current proposal represents poor design, rather that there are details that could be improved upon, partly by negotiation and partly by conditions controlling the submission of details. The design of the building at outline stage was not formally considered and whilst the approach shown on the sketches previously submitted may be preferred – the current design is felt to be acceptable in its context.

Recommendation
Members are recommended to Delegate to resolve detailed design issues

Additional conditions
19 submission of details of barge boards and location
20 submission of details of rainwater goods and location
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SOS/04/0042/FUL

27 High Street, Leigh on Sea

Publicity
Response received from neighbouring resident of 5 Theobalds Cottages. The resident strongly opposes any further delay in the alterations of the extract duct, or its removal, expressing the view that they expect the work to be carried out within 3 months as they do not wish to experience another summer with the presence of odours, smoke and excessive noise.
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SOS/04/00114/FUL

60 High Street, Shoeburyness, Southend on Sea

Internal Consultation
Highway Comment – The proposal may lead to additional one or two cars being on street. However, it appears that the surrounding roads will be adequate to be able to accommodate any extra parking. No objection raised.
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SOS/04/00359/FUL

Building at Rear of 60 High Street, Shoeburyness, Southend on Sea

Internal Consultation
Design Comment – The amended scheme is a significant improvement, particularly in terms of scale and massing, however, a few details still require attention:
1) The roof lights to front should be of the same size and on the same alignment.
2) A window (one third the size of the lounge window) should be added
3) A triangular entrance feature (or no windows at all) would be more in character and preferred to a circular feature.
Materials and front boundary treatment to be agreed.
(These are relatively minor changes which – if Members wish them to be passed – could be dealt with whilst the publicity period expires)
Highway Comment – The proposal could lead to additional vehicle being parked on street. However, the surrounding roads will be adequate to accommodate any extra parking – therefore it is unlikely an objection would be raised by T & T Section.
Environmental Health Comment – no objection.
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SOS/04/00158/FUL

33 Chalkwell Esplanade, Westcliff on Sea

Publicity
Objection received from resident adjoining the north site boundary, issues raised include the possible creation of flats within the house, proximity of the rear extension and potential for loss of privacy, and the rebuilding of the garage within the garden and its resultant form.
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SOS/04/00169/FUL

56 Arlington Road

Publicity
One further letter of objection – loss of light from side extension, disruption detrimental to health of neighbouring occupiers.
Objection from Cllr Mrs Holland – very near to boundary wall of neighbouring property, and there will be loss of light.
35 Alexandra Street, Southend on Sea

The Proposal
Amended plans have been submitted showing the proposed rear elevation of the building where the proposed ducting would be positioned. The ducting and associated equipment would be located in close proximity to the first and second floor windows on the rear elevation and the roof lights.

Internal Consultation
Environmental Health – The proposed carbon/de-odourising filters in the kitchen extract system will not prevent odours having a detrimental affect upon the occupiers of the higher floors, and therefore recommends that planning permission should be refused.

Publicity
Site Notice and Neighbour Notification – 2 letters of objection concerning:
- The positioned of the extract ducting and associated equipment
- Noise pollution that would result from the ducting
- Emissions and smells from equipment
- No access for servicing

Comment
Environmental Health concern is that the proposed positioning of the ducting would have a detrimental impact upon the upper floors of the building. The ducting is large and unattractive in appearance and would be viewable from the public car park to the rear. As such it would be harmful to the public domain and is therefore unacceptable in it’s present form. The application raises two main issues, the change of use and the installation of the ducting. If the Committee finds the change of use acceptable then it is recommended that approval be delegated pending the resolution of the design of the ducting.

Recommendation
Members are recommended DELEGATE subject to a satisfactory design of the duct being achieved and subject to the conditions set out on the main agenda.

40 Eastern Esplanade, Southend on Sea

Environmental Health Comment – no objection

Publicity
One letter raising no objection to the proposal

Comment
Amended plans have been submitted showing revisions are proposed to the door on the rear elevation of the existing building within the well. The existing rear door and window would be removed and replaced with a new larger window. A new back door would be formed in the lobby area in the existing rear projection. These amendments are relatively minor and are considered acceptable.
The Proposal

A layout plan of the Meteorological Station enclosure has been provided, showing details of the instruments and structures on the site. The proposed instrument mast will be located in the same place as the existing mast, and will be the same width at the base, but will be 10m high, as opposed to the 6m high existing mast.

Details have also been provided of the instruments to be installed on the new mast. These will be as on the existing mast, with the addition of a Barometric Pressure Transducer, and an anti-climb collar.