



Leigh-on-Sea Town Council

67 Elm Road, Leigh-on-Sea, Essex SS9 1SP - Tel: 01702 716288
council@leighonseatowncouncil.gov.uk www.essexinfo.net/leigh-on-sea

Chairman: Cllr Pat Holden
Vice Chairman: Cllr Carole Mulroney
Town Clerk: Paul Beckerson



MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY 14th June 2011 AT THE COUNCIL OFFICES, 67 ELM ROAD, LEIGH-ON-SEA

Present: Cllrs: Pat Holden (Chairman), Alex Coulson, Margaret Cotgrove, Geoff Crawford, Mike Dolby, Donald Fraser, Paul Lawrence, and Carole Mulroney.

In Attendance: Andy Exley (Events and Planning Officer)

The meeting opened at 7.30pm

7. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllrs: Richard Herbert and Cliff Passmore.

8. DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Cllr Pat Holden declared a prejudicial interest in 10(c)

9. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of Planning meeting held on 1st June 2011 were agreed and signed as a correct record by the Chairman.

10. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

a) LOS/11/0119 SOS/11/00600/FUL

44 – 46 Broadway, Leigh-on-Sea SS9 1AH (St Clements Ward)

Vary opening hours for premises and land used as an outdoor seating area from 8.00 – 18.00 Monday to Saturday and between 8.00 – 17.00 Sunday and Bank or Public Holidays (variation of condition 03 and 04 on planning application SOS 11/00109/FUL dated 01/04/2011 which states the use hereby permitted shall not take place other than between the hours of 09.00 – 18.00 Monday to Saturday and between 10.00 – 17.00 on Sunday and Bank or Public Holidays..

No Objection

b) LOS/11/0120 SOS/11/00560/FULH

39 Kathleen Drive, Leigh-on-Sea SS9 3EN (St James Ward)

Erect single storey side extension and conservatory to rear.

No Objection – on condition that the windows in the south flank are obscured and fixed shut to 1.7 meters if there is any possibility of overlooking number 37 Kathleen Drive.

Cllr Pat Holden and Andy Exley left the meeting

c) LOS/11/0121 SOS/11/00671/FULH

1457 London Road, Leigh-on-Sea SS9 2SB (Highlands Ward)

Erect part single and part two storey rear extension and alter elevations.

No Objection

Cllr Pat Holden and Andy Exley re-joined the meeting

d) LOS/11/0122 SOS/11/00562/FUL

121 Broadway, Leigh-on-Sea SS9 1PG (St Clements Ward)

Install new shopfront and roller shutters.

Oppose - As the shop is in the conservation area, the security shutters should preferably be of the open grille type or have larger gaps than the punched lath type appears to. They should be in a dark colour, suitable for a conservation area.

- e) LOS/11/0123 SOS/11/00601/AD
44 – 46 Broadway, Leigh-on-Sea SS9 1AH (St Clements Ward)
Application for approval of details pursuant to condition 05 (barriers), 06 (doors), 07 (doors and shopfront) and 09 (landscaping) of planning permission 11/00109/FUL dated 01/04/2011.
No Objection
- f) LOS/11/0124 SOS/11/00636/FULH
35 Eaton Road, Leigh-on-Sea SS9 3PF (Highlands Ward)
Demolish existing garage, conservatory and side extension, and erect single storey extensions to rear and side elevations.
No Objection
- g) LOS/11/0125 SOS/11/00756/FULH
25 Tankerville Drive, Leigh-on-Sea SS9 3DE (Bonchurch Ward)
Erect single storey side extension.
No Objection
- h) LOS/11/0126 SOS/11/00771/FULH
47 Leigh Cliff Road, Leigh-on-Sea SS9 1DN (Leigh Road Ward)
Erect single storey rear extension incorporating first floor terrace (retrospective).
No Objection
- i) LOS/11/0127 SOS/11/00759/FULH
82 Crescent Road, Leigh-on-Sea SS9 2PG (Thames Ward)
Erect single storey rear extension.
No Objection
- j) LOS/11/0128 SOS/11/00770/FULH
19 Thames Drive, Leigh-on-Sea SS9 2XQ (Thames Ward)
Increase height of existing garage and erect single storey rear extension.
No Objection

11. **Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council - Proposal Pursuant to the Sustainable Communities Acts 2007 and 2010**

Introduction/urgency

This proposal is designed to apply to all large planning applications that the Town Council thinks will have a significant impact on our town.

There is currently an application to which we would like this to apply – hence our request for an urgent decision. This application (from Tesco Ltd) arouses strong feelings in the Town. But there is one issue on which both the ‘antis’ and the ‘pros’ agree: it will have a significant impact on Leiston. Some say that will be a bad impact: others say it will be for the good.

We have to make up our minds on our response by reading the application, listening to both sides, assessing any other evidence we can gather and in the end using our judgement. This proposal is to help us get as much evidence as possible on which to base our final judgement.

The Resolution passed by the Town Council on 7th June 2011

We ask the current Minister at the Department of Communities and Local Government (Greg Clark MP) to make the following planning policy/guidance to apply to large planning applications in the area of a Town or Parish Council

That any applicant or representatives of any applicant who submits such an application that will have a significant effect on an area must, if requested by the Town or Parish Council attend a meeting of

- (i) that Council to answer questions from elected councillors; and
- (ii) a Town Meeting, should one be duly called, to answer questions from all electors.

That any applicant who submits such an application that will have a significant effect on an area must, if requested by the Town or Parish Council, or a Town Meeting, pay for the Council or Meeting to get an independent assessment carried out as to how the proposed development will affect the sustainability of the local communities.

That if we agree the above or either of the above that we communicate this to Suffolk Coastal District Council with the request that they delay determination of the Tesco application for a reasonable amount of time to enable us to act on this proposal and to get a decision from the Minister.

And if we agree to the above, we seek the support of other Town and Parish Councils.

Rationale

Re Proposal 1 above. The current application referred to above is about 10 inches thick running into thousands of pages with numerous specialist reports from consultants. Some of our councillors have read some of it; they will have many questions. As a Town Council we need them answered to enable us to make our best judgement. There is no way that this can be done by letter or email. It is reasonable, and indeed necessary to enable us to make the best judgment (whichever way that judgement goes), to seek the right, using the SCA, for us to require any such applicant to attend our meeting.

Re Proposal 2 above. The current applicant, to which we refer above, has spent hundreds of thousands of pounds on this application. The consultants they have used do not come cheap! Inevitably their evidence supports the application: there is nothing wrong or improper in that. But there may be other views that 'other' consultants may take. Indeed, we need an alternative view, or even a 'critique', so we can make the best decision based on a fair weight of evidence from both sides. There is no way we can afford this amount of money. The current applicants have spent hundreds of thousands of pounds presenting their case; they will almost certainly have budgeted for an appeal if one should be necessary. They are going to significantly affect our town. It is reasonable that they pay what will be a far smaller amount (perhaps circa £25,000) to enable us to get evidence to carry out our quasi-legal duty regarding assessing this application. There is no way that we can afford to pay for this ourselves.

Re Proposal 2A above. This is a reasonable request to enable us to get more information and to involve our electors. We have checked with the Planning Officer – it is not against the law for this reasonable delay to be agreed – but it is more likely to be so if the process that we have requested in place, as this would give the local planning authority a good reason to postpone their decision.

Members were asked to read the above proposal. The Committee recommended to support the proposal.

12. Communities and Local Government Consultation – Relaxation of planning rules for change of use from commercial to residential.

Several members gave comments as regards the document. It was concluded that the Committee should read the document again, and feed comments back in readiness to form conclusions and give a response at the next meeting.

The meeting closed at 8.25pm