

Planning Committee

Minutes of meeting held in Court Room at Eastbourne Town Hall, Grove Road, BN21 4UG on 26 February 2019 at 6.00 pm

Present:

Councillor Jim Murray (Chair)

Councillors Janet Coles (Deputy-Chair), Sammy Choudhury, Paul Metcalfe, Md. Harun Miah, Margaret Robinson, Barry Taylor and Penny di Cara (Reserve) (as substitute for Colin Murdoch)

Officers in attendance:

Leigh Palmer, Senior Specialist Advisor for Planning
James Smith, Specialist Advisor for Planning
Chris Wright, Specialist Advisor for Planning
Helen Monaghan, Lawyer for Planning, and
Emily Horne, Committee Officer

Also in attendance:

93 Minutes of the meeting held on 22 January 2019

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 January 2019 were submitted and approved as a correct record, and the Chair was authorised to sign them.

94 Apologies for absence.

An apology was reported from Councillor Murdoch. Councillor Metcalfe MBE had advised that he would be arriving later in the meeting.

95 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests (DPIs) by members as required under Section 31 of the Localism Act and of other interests as required by the Code of Conduct.

There were none.

96 Urgent items of business.

There were none.

97 Right to address the meeting/order of business.

The business of the meeting proceeded in accordance with the agenda.

98 Spring Mead, 25 Meads Brow. Application ID: 181058

Outline planning permission (Access and Layout) for demolition of the existing house and the construction of a new building housing 17 one and two bedroom apartments, with associated access and parking – **MEADS**

The Committee was advised by way of an addendum report, that the application had received one additional letter of objection commenting on traffic speed and limited visibility from Darley Road. The officer response was that East Sussex County Council (ESCC) Highways had raised no objection to the application.

Mr Colin Couch, local resident, addressed the Committee in objection, stating that the scheme would cause overdevelopment and result in overlooking and loss of privacy.

Councillor Smart, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee (from the public gallery) in objection, stating that the scheme was of poor design and visually intrusive and out of scale and character for the area. He recommended additional conditions be added to the resolution, to strengthen the officers' reason for refusal.

Mr James Caldwell, agent, addressed the Committee in support of the application, stating that the applicant had followed government guidance and that the scheme would not be deliverable if affordable housing was imposed. He further advised that officer advice should be consistent.

Councillor Metcalfe MBE arrived at this juncture and took no part in the discussion or debate and did not vote on this application.

The Committee was informed that a planning application submitted and approved in 1978 for flats had not been progressed by the applicant due to a land ownership issue.

Officers advised that current concerns raised regarding overlooking were not deemed to be intrusive given the distance between the buildings was considered sufficient. In addition, access matters could be addressed by conditions or at the Reserved Matters Stage.

The Committee discussed the application and felt that the scheme was too obtrusive and would cause an overuse of the site. Members raised concerns

regarding inappropriate access for refuse vehicles, lack of a public footpath, speed of traffic, limited visibility and unsuitability of Meads Brow as the main access point.

Councillor Taylor proposed a motion to refuse the application, and was seconded by Councillor Coles.

Resolved (Unanimous): That permission be refused for the reasons set out in the officers' report, and the following additional reasons requested at the meeting:-

The proposed development would, by reason of the layout and scale, be likely to be discordant and unduly dominant in relation to the form, scale and character of the existing housing within the immediate locality. The proposed development therefore conflicts with policies UHT1 and UHT4 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan.

The failure to provide direct footpath access to the site entrance results in an unsatisfactory arrangement that would present a danger of pedestrians coming into conflict with motorised vehicles entering and leaving the site. The proposed development therefore conflicts with para. 109 of the Revised NPPF (2018)

In addition, an informative would be added to highlight members concerns in relation to the suitability of the access to Meads Brow from Beachy Head Road for increased activity as well as the poor quality of the footpath network in the wider surrounding area.

99 Kempston, 3 Granville Road. Application ID: 190103

Application for prior notification of proposed demolition. Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, Schedule 2, Part 11, Class B – **MEADS**

The Committee was advised by way of an addendum report, that the application had received an additional seven letters of objection, commenting on the neglect and loss of a historic building and the potential for the area to be included in the conservation area.

Mr Dennis Scard, Chair of Meads Community Association, addressed the Committee in objection to the application, stating that the area of was high townscape value. He urged the Committee to save the building and delay its demolition until the extent of the College Conservation Area is known.

Councillor Smart, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee (from the public gallery) in objection, stating the landlord had failed to maintain the building and to apply for a court injunction to prevent its demolition.

Marie Nagy, Agent addressed the Committee in support of the application, stating that consent for demolition was not required, and that the application specifically related to the disposal of materials and reinstatement of the site. In response, she stated the comments raised were unfounded, hence enforcement action had not been taken. Furthermore, the site was regularly checked, and the applicant had retained the mains services and installed security shutters to avoid vandalism.

The Committee discussed the proposal and felt the building was of high townscape value and would benefit from being included in the College Conservation Area, which was under public consultation. Members raised strong concerns as to the neglect of the building.

Following discussion, the Committee was advised that drainage and bat surveys were not a requirement for the application. The Planning Lawyer referred to the Council's Constitution and advised the Committee that it was not permitted to vote to apply for a court injunction to prevent the building being demolished.

Councillor Murray proposed a motion to reject the application. This was seconded by Councillor Taylor.

Resolved (Unanimous): That Prior Approval be required for demolition of the existing building.

100 Appeal Decision - 12 Eversfield Road

Members noted that the Inspector dismissed the appeal.

101 South Downs National Park Authority Planning Applications.

There were none.

The meeting ended at 7.25 pm

Councillor Jim Murray (Chair)