



Leigh-on-Sea Town Council

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

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



MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY 11TH OCTOBER 2011 AT THE COUNCIL OFFICES, 67 ELM ROAD, LEIGH-ON-SEA

Present: Cllrs: Pat Holden (Chairman), Margaret Cotgrove, Donald Fraser, Richard Herbert, Paul Lawrence Carole Mulroney and Cliff Passmore

In Attendance: Andy Exley (Events and Planning Officer)

The meeting opened at 7.30pm

51. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllrs Alex Coulson and Mike Dolby

52. DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Cllr Richard Herbert declared a personal interest in item 54g)

53. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of Planning Meeting held on 26th September 2011 were agreed and signed as a correct record by the Chairman, with the addition of Cllr Margaret Cotgrove to those present.

54. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

a) LOS/11/0215 SOS/11/01258/FUL

9 – 11 Tankerville Drive, Leigh-on-Sea, SS9 3DE (Bonchurch Ward)

Erect single storey side extension, install dormers to side elevation, form two bedroom self contained flats in roof space and alter elevations.

Oppose – Loss of amenity to neighbouring properties, due to real and perceived overlooking from the full height glass doors at first and second floors.. Loss of on-street parking in an already congested area The dormers are too high in the roof and affect the street scene.

b) LOS/11/0216 SOS/11/01275/FUL

18 Broadway, Leigh-on-Sea, SS9 1AW (St Clements Ward)

Install automatic teller machine to front elevation.

That the Borough Council be advised of the Committee's disappointment that the Applicant has carried out the development in advance of obtaining the necessary planning permission but that **no objection** be raised to the development.

c) LOS/11/0217 SOS/11/01150/FUL

84 Elm Road, Leigh-on-Sea, SS9 1SL (St Clements Ward)

No objection

d) LOS/11/0218 SOS/11/01326/TCA

64 High Street, Leigh-on-Sea, SS9 2EP (St Clements Ward)

Prune one Sycamore tree at front (works to a tree in a conservations area).

No Objection

e) LOS/11/0219 SOS/11/01194/FULH

66 Fairleigh Drive, Leigh-on-Sea, SS9 2JA (Elms Ward)

Erect single storey rear extension.

No Objection

- f) LOS/11/0220 SOS/11/01224/FUL
39 Elm Road, Leigh-on-Sea, SS9 1SW (St Clements Ward)
Use motor bike sales (sui generis) to coffee shop (sui generis) (retrospective).
That the Borough Council be advised of the Committee's disappointment that the Applicant has carried out the development in advance of obtaining the necessary planning permission but that **no objection** is raised to the development.
However, the Borough Council's Licensing department is requested to consider the appropriateness of the placement of tables and chairs outside the premises in this position, where the footpath is barely 2metres wide
- g) LOS/11/0221 SOS/11/01284/FULH
3 Warren Road, Leigh-on-Sea, SS9 3TT (Highlands Ward)
Alter roof to form hip to gable end, erect dormer windows to the rear, form rooms in the roof, erect single storey side and rear extension and install swimming pool and plant room.
Oppose – The proposal represents an overdevelopment of the plot and loss of garden area in proportion to the size of the building, also the roof would be over-dominant in the street scene.
- h) LOS/11/0222 SOS/11/01286/BC3M
Belfairs High School, Highlands Boulevard, Leigh-on-Sea, SS9 3TG (Highlands Ward)
Variation of condition 11 of planning permission 09/00841/BC3M granted on 13/08/2009 to state that the approval period for community use from prior to occupation to within 12 months of occupation.
No Objection
- i) LOS/11/0223 SOS/11/01285/FUL
52a Broadway, Leigh-on-Sea, SS9 1AG (St Clements Ward)
Erect first floor extension to be used as beautician salon (sui generis) ancillary to ground floor hairdressers.
No Objection
- j) LOS/11/0224 SOS/11/01293/FUL
2a Dawlish Drive, Leigh-on-Sea, SS9 1QX (Elms Ward)
Erect dormer window to rear and side elevation and roof lights to front.
Oppose – Loss of amenity to neighbours due to overlooking.
- k) LOS/11/0225 SOS/11/01320/FUL
233 Station Road, Leigh-on-Sea, SS9 3BP (Thames Ward)
Demolish bungalow, erect two storey detached dwellinghouse and form new vehicular access onto Station Road.
- The meeting was adjourned to allow a member of the public to address the committee***
- His views were that the proposal would represent an overdevelopment of the site, and would be out of keeping with the street scene. The rear elevation would have an overlooking effect on the neighbours, also the development would create further parking congestion in an already congested area.
- The meeting was reconvened***
- Oppose** – The proposal would represent an overdevelopment of the site the loss of a small dwelling contrary to SBC policy and the loss of an attractive character bungalow in a group of bungalows. It would cause an excessive loss of on-street parking.,.
- l) LOS/11/0226 SOS/11/01134/FUL
9 – 11 Broadway, Leigh-on-Sea, SS9 1PA (St Clements Ward)
Demolish Building retaining South and part West elevation (retrospectively), reconstruct three storey building incorporating basement and containing nine retail units (class A1) to ground floor, eight self contained dwellings (class C3) to second and third floors, lay out roof terrace with balustrade to first floor, erect refuse store, lay out parking for six cars, two loading bays and cycle parking with vehicular onto West Street (amendment to planning permission ref: 10/00960/FUL granted permission on 24.09.2010 comprising enlargement of flats 3 and 7, enlargement of the area of the roof light over the arcade, amendments to the layout of WCS and both refuse stores).

No Objection

55. TO CONSIDER PRINTING OF PLANS FOR MEETINGS
To be discussed with the Town Clerk and Events and Planning Officer.
56. NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (Appendix 1)
That the responses of Cllr Fraser and EALC be circulated to members for a final view to be formed and notified to the Town Clerk by 14 October.

The meeting closed at 9.26pm

National Planning Policy Framework

Consultation questions

We are seeking your views on the following questions on the Government's proposal for a new National Planning Policy Framework.¹

Email responses to: planningframework@communities.gsi.gov.uk

Written responses to:

Alan C Scott

National Planning Policy Framework

Department for Communities and Local Government

Zone 1/H6, Eland House,

Bressenden Place

London

SW1E 5DU

(a) About you

(i) Your details

Name:	Paul Beckerson
Position:	Town Clerk
Name of organisation (if applicable):	Leigh-on-Sea Town Council
Address:	67 Elm Road, Leigh-on-Sea, SS9 1SP
Email Address:	paul.beckerson@leighonseatowncouncil.gov.uk
Telephone number:	01702 716288

(ii) Are the views expressed on this consultation an official response from the organisation you represent or your own personal views?

Organisational response

Personal views

(iii) Are your views expressed on this consultation in connection with your membership or support of any group? If yes please state name of group.

Yes

¹ (see: <http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/draftframeworkconsultation>)

No

Name of group:

(iv) Please tick the *one* box which best describes you or your organisation:

Private developer or house builder

Housing association or RSL

Land owner

Voluntary sector or charitable organisation

Business, consultant, professional advisor

National representative body

Professional body

Parish council

Local government (i.e. district, borough, county, unitary, etc.)

Other public body (please state)

Other (please state)

(v) Would you be happy for us to contact you again in relation to this consultation?

Yes

No

DCLG will process any personal information that you provide us with in accordance with the data protection principles in the Data Protection Act 1998. In particular, we shall protect all responses containing personal information by means of all appropriate technical security measures and ensure that they are only accessible to those with an operational need to see them. You should, however, be aware that as a public body, the Department is subject to the requirements of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, and may receive requests for all responses to this consultation. If such requests are received we shall take all steps to anonymise responses that we disclose, by stripping them of the specifically personal data - name and e-mail address - you supply in responding to this consultation. If, however, you consider that any of the responses that you provide to this survey would be likely to identify you irrespective of the removal of your overt personal data, then we should be grateful if you would indicate that, and the likely reasons, in your response, for example in the comments box.

(b) Consultation questions

Delivering Sustainable Development

The Framework has the right approach to establishing and defining the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

1(a) – Do you agree?

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Strongly agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Neither agree or Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Disagree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |

1(b) Do you have comments? (please begin with relevant paragraph number)

15 – while the presumption in favour of sustainable development is supported, equal weight should be given to environmental and social aspects

Plan-making

The Framework has clarified the tests of soundness, and introduces a useful additional test to ensure local plans are positively prepared to meet objectively assessed need and infrastructure requirements.

2(a) Do you agree?

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Strongly agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Agree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Neither agree or Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |

2(b) Do you have comments? (please begin with relevant paragraph number)

No comment

The policies for planning strategically across local boundaries provide a clear framework and enough flexibility for councils and other bodies to work together effectively.

2(c) Do you agree?

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Strongly agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Agree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Neither agree or Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |

2(d) Do you have comments? (please begin with relevant paragraph number)

Paragraphs 49 – 52 are particularly supported

Decision taking

In the policies on development management, the level of detail is appropriate.

3(a) Do you agree

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Strongly agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Neither agree or Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Disagree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |

3(b) Do you have comments? (please begin with relevant paragraph number)

63 – criteria for the social and environmental aspects should be given equal weight

Any guidance needed to support the new Framework should be light-touch and could be provided by organisations outside Government.

4(a) Do you agree

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Strongly agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Neither agree or Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Disagree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Strongly Disagree

4(b) What should any separate guidance cover and who is best placed to provide it?

What outside organisations would be relevant and would they have the capacity to provide guidance

Business and economic development

The 'planning for business policies' will encourage economic activity and give business the certainty and confidence to invest.

5(a) Do you agree?

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree or Disagree

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

5(b) Do you have comments? (please begin with relevant paragraph number)

73 – The planning system should recognise the that economic gain should not be achieved at the expense of environmental and social factors

5(c) What market signals could be most useful in plan making and decisions, and how could such information be best used to inform decisions?

No comment

The town centre policies will enable communities to encourage retail, business and leisure development in the right locations and protect the vitality and viability of town centres.

6(a) Do you agree?

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree or Disagree

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

6(b) Do you have comments? (please begin with relevant paragraph number)

76 – Councils should be given greater powers to acquire the many empty properties

Transport

The policy on planning for transport takes the right approach.

7(a) Do you agree?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree or Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

7(b) Do you have comments? (please begin with relevant paragraph number)

No comment

Communications infrastructure

Policy on communications infrastructure is adequate to allow effective communications development and technological advances.

8(a) Do you agree?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree or Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

8(b) Do you have comments? (please begin with relevant paragraph number)

No comment

Minerals

The policies on minerals planning adopt the right approach.

9(a) Do you agree?

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Strongly Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Agree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Neither Agree or Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |

9(b) Do you have comments? (please begin with relevant paragraph number)

No comment

Housing

The policies on housing will enable communities to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, in the right location, to meet local demand.

10(a) Do you agree?

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Strongly Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Agree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Neither Agree or Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |

10(b) Do you have comments? (please begin with relevant paragraph number)

No comment

Planning for schools

The policy on planning for schools takes the right approach.

11(a) Do you agree?

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Strongly Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Agree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Neither Agree or Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |

11(b) Do you have comments? (please begin with relevant paragraph number)

No comment

Design

The policy on planning and design is appropriate and useful.

12(a) Do you agree?

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Strongly Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Agree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Neither Agree or Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |

12(b) Do you have comments? (please begin with relevant paragraph number)

No comment

Green Belt

The policy on planning and the Green Belt gives a strong clear message on Green Belt protection.

13(a) Do you agree?

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Strongly Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Neither Agree or Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Disagree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Strongly Disagree

13(b) Do you have comments? (please begin with relevant paragraph number)

139 – Small areas of green belt within urban areas could be threatened.

Climate change, flooding and coastal change

The policy relating to climate change takes the right approach.

14(a) Do you agree?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree or Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

14(b) Do you have comments? (please begin with relevant paragraph number)

No comment

The policy on renewable energy will support the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy.

14(c) Do you agree?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree or Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

14(d) Do you have comments? (please begin with relevant paragraph number)

No comment

The draft Framework sets out clear and workable proposals for plan-making and development management for renewable and low carbon energy, including the test for developments proposed outside of opportunity areas identified by local authorities.

14(e) Do you agree?

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Strongly Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Neither Agree or Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly Disagree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

14(f) Do you have comments? (please begin with relevant paragraph number)

153 – although contributing to energy demand it could be detrimental to the environment of the proposed site.

The policy on flooding and coastal change provides the right level of protection.

14(g) Do you agree?

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Strongly Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Neither Agree or Disagree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |

14(h) Do you have comments? (please begin with relevant paragraph number)

No comment

Natural and local Environment

Policy relating to the natural and local environment provides the appropriate framework to protect and enhance the environment.

15(a) Do you agree?

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Strongly Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Neither Agree or Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Disagree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |

15(b) Do you have comments? (please begin with relevant paragraph number)

165 – Environmental impact should be given the same weight as economic gain

Historic Environment

This policy provides the right level of protection for heritage assets.

16(a) Do you agree?

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Strongly Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Neither Agree or Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly Disagree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

16(b) Do you have comments? (please begin with relevant paragraph number)

185 – No mention is made of locally listed buildings which are an important part of the local street-scene, some weight should be afforded to their protection.

Impact assessment

The Framework is also accompanied by an impact assessment. There are more detailed questions on the assessment that you may wish to answer to help us collect further evidence to inform our final assessment. If you do not wish to answer the detailed questions, you may provide general comments on the assessment in response to the following question:

17a. Is the impact assessment a fair and reasonable representation of the costs, benefits and impacts of introducing the Framework?

No comment

Planning for Travellers

18 Do you have views on the consistency of the draft Framework with the draft planning policy for traveller sites, or any other comments about the Government's plans to incorporate planning policy on traveller sites into the final National Planning Policy Framework?

No comment

Specific questions on the impact assessment

QA1: We welcome views on this Impact Assessment and the assumptions/estimates contained within it about the impact of the National Planning Policy Framework on economic, environmental and social outcomes. More detailed questions follow throughout the document.

Not answered

QA2: Are there any broad categories of costs or benefits that have not been included here and which may arise from the consolidation brought about by the National Planning Policy Framework?

Not answered

QA3: Are the assumptions and estimates regarding wage rates and time spent familiarising with the National Planning Policy Framework reasonable? Can you provide evidence of the number of agents affected?

Not answered

QA4: Can you provide further evidence to inform our assumptions regarding wage rates and likely time savings from consolidated national policy?

Not answered

QA5: What behavioural impact do you expect on the number of applications and appeals?

Not answered

QA6: What do you think the impact will be on the above costs to applicants?

Not answered

QA7: Do you have views on any other risks or wider benefits of the proposal to consolidate national policy?

Not answered

QB1.1: What impact do you think the presumption will have on:

- (i) the number of planning applications;
- (ii) the approval rate; and
- (iii) the speed of decision-making?

Not answered

QB1.2: What impact, if any, do you think the presumption will have on:

- (i) the overall costs of plan production incurred by local planning authorities?
- (ii) engagement by business?
- (iii) the number and type of neighbourhood plans produced?

Not answered

QB1.3: What impact do you think the presumption in favour of sustainable development will have on the balance between economic, environmental and social outcomes?

Not answered

QB1.4: What impact, if any, do you think the presumption will have on the number of planning appeals?

Not answered

QB2.1: Do you think the impact assessment presents a fair representation of the costs and benefits of the policy change?

Not answered

QB2.2: Is 10 years the right time horizon for assessing impacts?

Do you think the impact assessment presents a fair representation of the costs and benefits of the policy change?

Not answered

QB2.3: How much resource would it cost to develop an evidence base and adopt a local parking standards policy?

Not answered

QB2.4: As a local council, at what level will you set your local parking standards, compared with the current national standards?

Do you think the impact assessment presents a fair representation of the costs and benefits of the policy change?

Not answered

QB2.5: Do you think the impact assessment presents a fair representation of the costs and benefits of the policy changes on minerals?

Not answered

QB3.1: What impact do you think removing the national target for brownfield development will have on the housing land supply in your area? Are you minded to change your approach?

Not answered

QB3.2: Will the requirement to identify 20% additional land for housing be achievable? And what additional resources will be incurred to identify it? Will this requirement help the delivery of homes?

Not answered

QB3.3: Will you change your local affordable housing threshold in the light of the changes proposed? How?

Not answered

QB3.4: Will you change your approach to the delivery of affordable housing in rural areas in light of the proposed changes?

Not answered

QB3.5: How much resource would it cost local councils to develop an evidence base and adopt a community facilities policy?

Not answered

QB3.6: How much resource would it cost developers to develop an evidence base to justify loss of the building or development previously used by community facilities?

Not answered

QB3.7: Do you think the impact assessment presents a fair representation of the costs and benefits of the Green Belt policies set out in the Framework?

Not answered

QB4.1: What are the resource implications of the new approach to green infrastructure?

Not answered

QB4.2: What impact will the Local Green Space designation policy have, and is the policy's intention sufficiently clearly defined?

Not answered

QB4.3: Are there resource implications from the clarification that wildlife sites should be given the same protection as European sites?

Not answered

QB4.4: How will your approach to decentralised energy change as a result of this policy change?

Not answered

QB4.5 Will your approach to renewable energy change as a result of this policy?

Not answered

QB4.6: Will your approach to monitoring the impact of planning and development on the historic environment change as a result of the removal of this policy?

Not answered