

## **Planning Committee**

**Minutes of meeting held in Court Room at Eastbourne Town Hall, Grove Road, BN21 4UG on 11 December 2018 at 6.00 pm**

**Present:**

Councillor Jim Murray (Chair)

Councillors Janet Coles (Deputy-Chair), Sammy Choudhury, Paul Metcalfe MBE, Md. Harun Miah, Colin Murdoch, Margaret Robinson and Barry Taylor

**Officers in attendance:**

Leigh Palmer, Senior Specialist Advisor for Planning

James Smith, Specialist Advisor for Planning

Chris Wright, Specialist Advisor for Planning

Joanne Stone, Lawyer for Planning

Jazmin Victory, Committee Officer

**69 Minutes of the meeting held on 20 November 2018**

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 November 2018 were submitted and approved and the Chair was authorised to sign them as an accurate record.

**70 Apologies for absence**

There were none.

**71 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**

Councillor Metcalfe MBE declared a personal interest in Planning Application ID 180569 136, Wood Winton, 63a Silverdale Road, Eastbourne as he knew the architect in so far as he had used their services for his own property.

Councillor Metcalfe MBE was of the opinion that he did not have a prejudicial interest in the matter and remained in the room and voted thereon.

Councillor Coles declared she would not take part in Planning Application ID 181008 Rose Corner, 34 Dillingburgh Road, Eastbourne as she had predetermined the matter. She confirmed that she would be speaking from the public gallery in objection to the application on Councillor Ungar's behalf who unfortunately could not attend the meeting and would leave the room for the remainder of the item after speaking, and take no part in the debate or vote on the application.

**72 Wood Winton, 63a Silverdale Road, Eastbourne. Application ID: 180569**

Outline planning permission for the construction of seven houses on the site. (amended description following reduction of units) – **MEADS**.

Attention was drawn to typographical errors in section 8.1.4 which referred to a development of flats rather than houses.

The committee was advised, by way of an addendum report, that the application had received an additional objection by an occupant of Kesselville Court, to the south of the site. The objector was concerned that the proposed development would cause overshadowing of gardens used by occupants of the flats there.

Councillor Smart requested to speak against application 180569, Wood Winton 63a Silverdale Road, Eastbourne, but was refused by the Chair as there was already one Councillor speaking against the application. This was amicably agreed before the meeting.

Mr Doel addressed the committee in objection of the application, stating that this application proposed an overdeveloped site, which already had a restricted access route. Considering that the site was on the edge of a conservation area, the application was out of character in terms of appearance and the removal of trees which would be required.

Councillor Ballard addressed the committee in objection of the application, stating that the Council were being asked to approve an outline, which meant that key issues would be resolved at later date without input from the planning committee. There was also an issue of overcrowding and this would have a detrimental effect on the surrounding trees and also the already restricted access of the site.

Ms Madell, Eastbourne Heritage and Design Champion, addressed the committee in objection of the application, stating that the accessibility to the site would be too restricted and raised concerns regarding emergency vehicles being able to access the site.

Mr Dato, applicant, had been invited to attend the meeting, but was not present.

The committee discussed the application and agreed that the site was overdeveloped and would produce crowded accommodation with very restricted road access. Although the committee were happy that the existing Wood Winton property would be retained, the site could not adequately accommodate seven additional residential properties without harm to wider area such as the removal of trees.

Councillor Taylor proposed a motion against the officer's recommendation, to refuse the application as set out in the resolution below. This was seconded by Councillor Robinson.

**Resolved: (Unanimous):** That permission be refused on the grounds that the Council were not satisfied that seven residential properties could be adequately accommodated on the site without causing harm to the character of the wider area, and that the application was likely to result in a cramped over-development of the site with poor access arrangement and poor quality living environment for residents.

#### Appeal

Should the applicant appeal the decision the appropriate course of action to be followed, taking into account the criteria set by the Planning Inspectorate, was considered to written representations.

### 73 **14-29 Brassey Parade. Application ID: 180913**

Planning permission for the erection of a mansard roof over existing building to provide additional two storeys, formation of additional twenty nine residential flats within first, second and third floors, retention of retail units on ground floor and seven existing residential flats on first floor, and single-storey extension to northern elevation for use as bin and cycle store. – **HAMPDEN PARK.**

Mr Hearn addressed the committee in objection of the application, stating that a three story building would be an overdevelopment of the site. Mr Hearn also raised that there was not adequate parking space which would allow for the safe entry and exit of a large vehicle such as a refuse collection vehicle.

Mr Foster addressed the committee in support of the application, stating that this was best use of the brownfield site as the proposed scheme would provide a valuable contribution towards housing provision within the Eastbourne Borough. Transport assessments had been provided and there had been no objection from the relevant highways bodies. The application was in accordance with National Planning Policies which encouraged mixed-use developments, vertical extensions and more intensive uses of brownfield sites in sustainable locations.

The committee discussed the application and were in agreement that they were happy to see the area being developed. Whilst they acknowledged that there was a shortage of parking spaces across the town, there were excellent public transport links near the site which would provide alternative transport options to residents.

Mr Bennett, applicant, was present but chose not to speak.

Councillor Miah proposed a motion to approve the application subject to the following conditions. This was seconded by Councillor Coles.

**Resolved: (By 7 votes to 1 against)** That the application be approved subject to the signing of a Section 106 legal agreement to secure provision of affordable housing and the conditions set below:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of permission.

Reason: To comply with Sections 91 and 92 of the Town and County Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings:

279800-31 – Location and Block Plan  
279800-37 Revision B – Proposed Ground Floor Plan  
279800-38 Revision C – Proposed First Floor Plan  
279800-39 Revision C – Proposed Second Floor Plan  
279800-40 Revision C – Proposed Third Floor Plan  
279800-41 Revision C – Proposed Roof Plan  
279800-42 Revision B – Proposed Elevations (Sheet 1)  
279800-43 Revision B – Proposed Elevations (Sheet 2)

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. No development shall take place until details and, where appropriate, samples of the materials (including colour of render, paintwork and colourwash) to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development.

4. Prior to the commencement of development, an Employment and Training Plan shall be agreed with the Local authority together with a written commitment detailing how the developer intends to undertake the works in accordance with the Local Employment and Training Supplementary Planning Document. The Employment and Training Plan must include, but not be limited to, the following details:

a) A Local Employment Strategy to include the advertising of all new construction and operational vacancies locally (i.e. in the Borough of Eastbourne and within East Sussex), a strategy to secure the recruitment and monitoring of apprentices, work experience placements for those unemployed and NVQ training places associated with the construction and operation of the development as appropriate

to the development and calculated in accordance with the Local Employment and Training Supplementary Planning Document.

b) The agreed Employment and Training Plan shall thereafter be complied with and all construction works to establish the development and the operational stage of the development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in accordance with the Employment and Training Plan Strategy approved pursuant to part a) above.

Reason: To ensure that the development helps secure Local Employment and Training in accordance with the requirements of the Eastbourne Employment Land Local Plan Policy EL1 and to meet the requirements of the Local Employment and Training Supplementary Planning Document adopted on 16<sup>th</sup> November 2016.

Further conditions relating to highways, parking and construction management will be added in receipt of formal advice from ESCC highways, which is currently awaited. These conditions will be set out on the Committee addendum sheet as below:

Further to paragraph 10.6 of the committee report, detailed comments have now been received from ESCC Highways which include suggested conditions to be attached to any approval. These conditions are listed below and would be added to the approval, if granted:-

1. No part of the development shall be occupied until the car parking has been constructed and provided in accordance with the approved plans. The area[s] shall thereafter be retained for that use and shall not be used other than for the parking of motor vehicles.

Reason: To provide car-parking space for the development.

2. No part of the development shall be occupied until cycle parking spaces have been provided in accordance with the approved details. The area[s] shall thereafter be retained for that use and shall not be used other than for the parking of cycles.

Reason: To provide alternative travel options to the use of the car in accordance with current sustainable transport policies.

3. No development shall take place, including any ground works or works of demolition, until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the approved Plan shall be implemented and adhered to in full throughout the entire construction period. The Plan shall provide details as appropriate but not be restricted to the following matters:

- the anticipated number, frequency and types of vehicles used during construction,

- the method of access and egress and routing of vehicles during construction,
- the parking of vehicles by site operatives and visitors,
- the loading and unloading of plant, materials and waste,
- the storage of plant and materials used in construction of the development,
- the erection and maintenance of security hoarding,
- the provision and utilisation of wheel washing facilities and other works required to mitigate the impact of construction upon the public highway (including the provision of temporary Traffic Regulation Orders),
- details of public engagement both prior to and during construction works.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and the amenities of the area.

4. Upon the occupation/commencement of use, the Applicant shall implement the measures incorporated within the approved travel plan. The Applicant shall thereafter monitor report and subsequently revise the travel plan as specified within the approved document.

Reason: To encourage and promote sustainable transport

#### **74 Kempston, 3 Granville Road, Eastbourne. Application ID: 180985**

Planning permission for demolition of existing building, and redevelopment to provide x16 residential units (use Class C3) (x8 net additional), new vehicle access on Granville Road and car parking. (Resubmission following refusal of p/c 180040). – **MEADS**.

The committee was advised that this application had been determined against the Revised National Planning Policy Framework in July 2018.

Councillor Ballard requested to speak against application 180985, Kempston 3 Granville Road, Eastbourne, but was refused by the Chair as there was already one Councillor speaking against the application. This was amicably agreed before the meeting.

Ms Terry addressed the committee in objection of the application, stating that the application was an overdevelopment of the site, the owners had tried to sell the property at an unrealistic sale price and were not marketing the property properly, and that none of the proposed properties in the application would be affordable housing.

Ms Madell (Heritage Champion) addressed the committee in objection of the application, stating that the application worked against preserving the heritage and townscape and was not complimentary to the area.

Councillor Smart addressed the committee in objection of the application, stating that a draft report regarding an extension to the College Conservation area would be presented to the committee in January, and that the property may then be within a Conservation area.

Ms Nagy addressed the committee and was given the opportunity to speak for 6 minutes because she was speaking on behalf of the applicant and herself. She spoke in support of the application, stating that the site had been renovated and was therefore not a historic building. The redevelopment would work in the public interest as it would provide good quality accommodation to the Meads area. The proposed building complied with the parameters and made use of the site well as the design included many features which referred back to the original building, such as the colours of bricks, balconies.

The Chair informed the committee that commenting on the marketing of the site or the demolition of the existing building was not material and should be withdrawn from consideration, referring the committee to paragraph 8.2.4 which specified that the existing building could be demolished without planning permission.

Officer informed the committee that the application could not be refused because of the likelihood that the site could become part of a Conservation area.

Mr Saville, applicant, was present but chose not to speak.

The committee discussed the application and agreed that the proposed building was too large and not keeping with the existing character of the Meads area as it would be removing the garden and replacing it with concrete.

The committee also requested that should the applicant wish to appeal, such an appeal should be in the form of an informal hearing so as to allow all interested parties the opportunity to raise their concerns.

Councillor Taylor proposed a motion against the officer's recommendation, to refuse the application as set out in the resolution below. This was seconded by Councillor Robinson.

**Resolved: (Unanimous)** That the planning application be refused on the grounds that the proposal, by virtue of the height, footprint, bulk, scale, detailed design and materials is an overdevelopment of the plot which does not respect the character and appearance of the Area of High Townscape Value nor the pattern of development in the area, contrary to saved policies UHT1, UHT4, UHT5 and UHT16 of the Borough Plan 2007, and policies D10 and D10a of the Core Strategy Local Plan 2013.

Appeal

Should the applicant appeal the decision the appropriate course of action to be followed, taking into account the criteria set by the Planning Inspectorate, was considered to be an informal hearing.

**75 Rose Corner, 34 Dillingburgh Road, Eastbourne. Application ID: 181008**

Planning permission for proposed single storey side extension to provide a ground floor flat. – **OLD TOWN**

Councillor Coles addressed the committee (from the public gallery) on behalf of Councillor Ungar, Ward Councillor, who was unable to attend. She addressed the committee in objection of the application, stating that the application proposed a self-contained flat which would be small, overcrowded and not provide good living conditions to the resident.

Mr Foster addressed the committee in support of the application, stating that the accommodation this extension would provide was required within the town.

Mr Bennett, applicant, was present but chose not to speak.

The committee discussed the application and agreed that the extension looked like part of the existing building and were pleased that it would provide the resident with an outside space area.

Councillor Murray proposed a motion to approve the application subject to the following conditions. This was seconded by Councillor Miah.

**Resolved: (Unanimous)** That the planning application be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of permission.

Reason: To comply with Sections 91 and 92 of the Town and County Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings:
  - Drawing No. 2018-76-03a- Proposed Floor Plans- Submitted 28 November 2018
  - Drawing No. 2018-76-09 Proposed Layout Plan and garden layout- Submitted 5 November 2018
  - Drawing No. 2018-76-05-Proposed Site Location Plan- Submitted 31 October 2018
  - Drawing No. 2018-76-08- Proposed Refuse and Cycle Storage-

- Submitted 31 October 2018
- Drawing No. 2018-76-04- Proposed Elevations- Submitted 31 October 2018

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and ensure that development is carried out in accordance with the plans to which the permission relates

3. No part of the development shall be occupied until the Bin and Recycling Storage facilities have been provided in accordance with the approved plans. The area shall thereafter be retained for that use and shall not be used other than for the use of bin/recycling storage,

Reason: to provide adequate refuse disposal for the future occupants.

4. No part of the development shall be occupied until the Cycle parking spaces have been provided in accordance with the approved plans. The area shall thereafter be retained for that use and shall not be used other than for the parking of cycles.

Reason: to provide alternative travel options to the use of the car in accordance with current sustainable transport policies.

5. No part of the development shall be occupied until the private amenity space to the rear garden is provided in accordance with the approved plans. The area shall thereafter be retained for that use and shall not be used other than for the approved new dwelling.

Reason: to provide adequate amenity space for the future occupiers.

6. The boundary fence hereby approved to the centre of the existing rear garden to provide separate amenity space should be no higher than 2m and retained as such.

Reason: To prevent adverse impact to the residential and visual amenity of neighbouring properties in accordance with policies D10a and UHT4.

## **76 South Downs National Park Authority Planning Applications**

There were none.

The meeting ended at 8:06pm

Councillor Jim Murray (Chair)