

Item No 6	4 Rutland Close	181031
<p>An additional representation has been received from 6 Rutland Close, objecting to the proposed development for the reasons summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contrary to national and local planning policy. • Un-neighbourly. • Similar applications have been refused elsewhere. • Loss of light. • Overlooking. • Loss of privacy. • Inaccurate information. • Detrimental impact on residential amenity. • Poor design. • Access for maintenance works and guttering. • Lack of consultation. <p>[Officer Response]</p> <p>The matters raised are addressed in the main Committee report. The case officer in this instance has visited the neighbouring property as well as the application site.</p> <p>There is a gap between the proposed development and the boundary with the neighbouring property. Rainwater goods and guttering will not encroach on neighbouring property. The proposed extension is set back from the principal elevation of the recipient property and the flat roof design mimics previous approvals nearby.</p>		
<p>Para 8.1 (page 14) – The reference to the National Planning Policy Framework should state it is the 2018 legislation not 2012.</p>		

Item No 7	Land west of Cross Levels Way	180637
<p>There have been some formatting errors in the report, these being as follows:-</p> <p>Para 6.3 and 6.4 (page 21) have been duplicated.</p> <p>Para. 8.5.3 and 8.5.4 (page 33) have been duplicated.</p> <p>Para. 8.7.1 (page 34) in the third line of the paragraph it should state 'to' rather than 'wo'.</p>		
<p>Para. 10.4 (page 35) the policy supporting the reason for refusal has not been included. The paragraph should read:-</p> <p>The proposed development would result in the substantial loss of existing green</p>		

space which currently helps generate a verdant, semi-rural environment on this part of Cross Levels Way as well as a valuable green buffer between the built environment in the Rodmill neighbourhood and that in Hampden Park to the north. The presence of buildings on the site would result in an incongruous appearance and a sense of coalescence of buildings within this semi-rural environment. The proposed is therefore in conflict with **Eastbourne Borough Plan Policies UHT1 and UHT4 and chapter 8 of the Revised National Planning Policy Framework (2018)**.

Item No 8	Westgate Motors	180979
<p>Letter of objection received from Cllr Wallis as follows:-</p> <p>Planning application reference: 180979 - BN22 8LG</p> <p>I write in reference to the above planning application.</p> <p>I write objecting to the plans on the following grounds:</p> <p>UHT1 - Design of the new development. UHT2 - Height of buildings. UHT4 - Visual amenity. HO1 - Residential development within the existing built-up area. US4 - Flood protection & surface water disposal.</p> <p>The area is mainly residential, therefore the design and height of the building will impact on existing residential properties, impacting on loss of light and privacy, this is unacceptable.</p> <p>I cannot see from the plans the overall height of the new buildings, but they look significantly higher than the surrounding properties. Please confirm the height. Additionally, what environmental impact assessments have there been? I am aware of a well in this area and wondered if this has been considered in the application.</p> <p>Please note my objections and I would also like to address the Planning Committee when this application is heard, please confirm the date.</p>		
<p>Para 3.3 and 3.4 have been duplicated, with minor variation. Para. 3.3 should be disregarded.</p>		

Item No 9	4 Denton Road	181020
<p>Nothing further to add.</p>		

Item No 10	16 Old Drove	181039
<p>Page 72 – The sentence relating to Dwelling , Bedroom 3 should read:-</p>		

Dwelling 2 Bedroom 3 is proposed to be approx. 9.7 m² and for 1 person, this is larger than the 7.5 m² required by the Nationally Described Space Standard.

Item No 11

2-4 Moy Avenue

180006

Representations

Following the publication of the revised details a further 12 letters have been received commenting in the main on the following issues

- Added pressure on schools
- Pressure on parking
- Very busy area
- Overdevelopment
- Traffic congestion
- Should be housing
- Route to school
- Pedestrian safety
- Overbearing development
- Design would be more appropriate in an industrial estate
- Overlooking
- Small amenity space for the development
- Domestic size car parking spaces may not cater for all types of vehicles and as such there may be displaced parking to on street
- Very limited on street parking in the locality
- Would impact upon localised flooding
- High volumes of traffic in the at local junctions
- May impact on local wildlife
- Development is out of character.

Planning Conditions

The development shall be in accordance with conditions listed on pages 95- 100 of the agenda save for condition No 2 (Approved Plans) that is amended to take account of amended details:-

No 2

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings;

190_P001 Rev C – Proposed Site Layout

190_P004 Rev D – Block 1 Ground & Plant Mezzanine

190_P005 Rev C – Block 1 First & Second Floor Plan

190_P006 Rev B – Block 1 Third Floor & Roof Plan

190_P007 Rev D – Block 1 North & East Elevation

190_P008 Rev D – Block 1 South & West Elevations

190_P009 Rev A – Block 1 Section AA

190_P010 Rev C – Block 1 Demolition & New Construction Layout

190_P011 Rev C – Block 2 Ground & First Floor Plan

190_P012 Rev C – Block 2 Second & Third Floor Plan

190_P014 Rev D – Block 3 North & East Elevations

190_P015 Rev D – Block 3 South & West Elevations

190_P016 Rev C – Block 3 Ground & First Floor Plan
 190_P017 Rev C – Block 3 Second & Third Floor Plan
 190_P019 Rev D – Block 3 North & East Elevations
 190_P020 Rev D – Block 3 South & West Elevations
 Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Item No 12	SDNPA	
------------	-------	--

Nothing Further to add

Item No 13 & 14	Appeal decisions	
-----------------	------------------	--

Nothing Further to add

Item No 15	College Conservation Area Appraisal	
------------	-------------------------------------	--

Further Information

Consultation with the local community and other stakeholders upon the proposed extension of the Conservation Area is proposed to take place over a 6 week period and the results will be reported back to Planning Committee.

Legal Implications

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (“the Act”) places a continuing duty on LPAs to consider whether they should designate new conservation areas or extend existing ones. It also requires local planning authorities to formulate and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of conservation areas. Although there is no statutory requirement for LPAs to consult they are encouraged to do so and without consultation, case law shows that the council will be open to challenge. The decision maker must have regard to the representations made by those who replied to the consultation. The production and adoption of a Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan ensures the Council is acting in compliance with these statutory requirements.

The Act requires the local planning authorities to notify the Secretary of State and English Heritage of any new designations, and to advertise the designation in the London Gazette and a local newspaper. Once adopted the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan will become a material consideration in the planning process. Although there is no statutory requirement determining the length or exact nature of the consultation process, the time period of 6 weeks for public consultation is considered to be proportionate and reasonable in the circumstances

Amended Recommendation

1. To approve the 6 week consultation period to receive representations and comments on the proposed extension of the College Conservation Area.

--

Item No 16	East Beach Hotel	
------------	------------------	--

Nothing further to add
