

Planning Committee

Minutes of meeting held in Court Room at Eastbourne Town Hall, Grove Road, BN21 4UG on 22 January 2019 at 6.00 pm

Present:

Councillor Jim Murray (Chair)
Councillors Janet Coles (Deputy-Chair), Sammy Choudhury, Paul Metcalfe, 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
Danielle Durham, Specialist Advisor for Planning
Joanne Stone, Lawyer for Planning
Emily Horne, Committee Officer

77 Minutes of the meeting held on

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 December 2018 were submitted and approved as a correct record, and the Chair was authorised to sign them subject to the amendment of minute 72. Members agreed to the removal of the following paragraph: "This was amicably agreed before the meeting".

78 Apologies for absence.

There were none.

79 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 prejudicial interest in minute 89, 16 Old Drove and land to the rear of 12 & 14 Old Drove, Eastbourne (ID 181039), as the Applicant for the application is known to him. Councillor Metcalfe MBE, withdrew from the room whilst the application was considered and did not vote thereon.

80 Urgent items of business.

There were none.

81 Right to address the meeting/order of business.

82 2-4 Moy Avenue, Eastbourne. ID: 180006 - amendments

Planning permission for the proposed refurbishment and extension to existing former telephone exchange building and the construction of:- 2no. part two, three and buildings to the rear to provide a total of 72 residential units. 45no. 1 and 2 bed flats and 27no. two storey 1 and 2 bed maisonettes. A total of 88 on site car parking spaces will be provided – ST. ANTHONYS.

The Committee was advised, by way of an addendum report, that the application had received an additional 12 letters of objection commenting on parking, traffic congestion, impact on local wildlife and overlooking. Condition no.2 was corrected to take account of the amended details.

Mrs Anne Clarke, local resident, addressed the Committee in objection stating that the current scheme would result in loss of privacy and lack of amenity space.

Nicola Mason, Neighbour Panel, addressed the Committee in objection to the application regarding potential flooding, height and design, construction vehicle activities, access limitations and concerns regarding asbestos.

Councillor Tutt, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee (from the public gallery) in objection to the number and type of units proposed on the site, the height and proximity to the existing premises, and recommended additional conditions regarding hours of construction and access.

Mr Abe Mohsin, agent, addressed the Committee in support of the application, stating that the development was of high quality, of appropriate density and that the concerns raised, had been considered by the Planning Inspector at appeal and had been addressed.

The Committee was advised that additional conditions could be added. However it could not be imposed that all of the buildings be wheelchair compliant or additional street lighting be erected. The public were advised that any concerns regarding asbestos should be raised with Environmental Health. The Committee discussed the proposals and were in support of the additional conditions discussed.

Councillor Robinson proposed a motion to approve the application this was seconded by Councillor Taylor.

Resolved (Unanimous): That permission be granted subject to a Section 106 Agreement to cover Local Employment, Affordable Housing and Highways Issues identified in the report and the conditions set out in the officers' report; the addendum and the following additional conditions requested at the meeting:-

1. Construction Method Statement
2. Access & egress onto Waterworks Road with exploration of a Table Top junction'
3. Culvert proof that it is clear
4. Planting to be of a scale to provide sufficient buffer.
5. Ensure that proportion of the units and the amenity space should be accessible.

If there is a delay in processing the S106 agreement (more than 8 weeks from the date of this resolution and without any commitment to extend the time) then the application be refused for the lack of infrastructure provision.

83 Westgate Motors, Stansted Road, Eastbourne. Application ID: 180979

Planning Permission for demolition of existing garage facility and erection of residential accommodation over 3 floors and roof space comprising 10 No – 2 bedroom maisonettes - DEVONSHIRE.

The Committee was advised, by way of an addendum report, that a letter of objection had been received from Councillor Wallis, commenting on the height, design, visual amenity of the development, flood protection and surface water disposal. He also noted that paragraph 3.3 and 3.4 of the report had been duplicated.

Nicola Mason addressed the Committee on behalf of the Neighbour Panel, in objection, stating that the current scheme would be overbearing and result in loss of light and loss of privacy.

Councillor Wallis, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee (from the public gallery) in objection to the application. Further to his comments in the addendum he also stated that the development would be overbearing and result in a loss of light and privacy. He also raised concern regarding access, parking.

The Committee discussed the application and felt that the development was too oppressive and out of keeping. Members further commented that the 4 storey buildings would be too high and overbearing.

Councillor Taylor proposed a motion to refuse the application, this was seconded by Councillor Miah.

Resolved (Unanimous): That permission be refused for the reasons set out in the officers' report.

84 4 Denton Road, Eastbourne. Application ID: 181020

Planning permission for proposed conversion of lower ground floor area to self-contained flat - MEADS.

The Chair advised this report had been omitted from the original agenda pack due to a clerical error. The report had subsequently been published, as it was necessary for the application to be considered at this meeting rather than be deferred for a future meeting.

Mr John Parker, local resident, addressed the Committee in objection to the application, stating that the development would not be in keeping with the building or surrounding area. He also raised concerns regarding loss of privacy, light, inadequate parking and bin storage.

Councillor Smart, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee (from the public gallery) on behalf the adjoining resident, stating that he fully supported all the objections that had been raised in regard to this application.

Councillor Taylor proposed a motion to refuse the application, this was seconded by Councillor Miah.

Resolved (Unanimous): That permission be refused for the reasons set out in the officers' report.

85 4 Rutland Close, Eastbourne. Application ID: 181031

Planning permission for a first floor side extension over existing garage – RATTON.

The Committee was advised, by way of an addendum report, that an additional representation had been received objecting to the proposed development on loss of privacy; loss of light, detrimental impact on residential amenity, poor design and lack of consultation. Paragraph 8.1 (page 14 of the agenda) was corrected to state National Planning Policy Framework 2018, not 2012.

Barbara Wicking, a neighbour, spoke in objection to the application, stating that the proposed extension would be too close and overbearing and that her outlook and light would be compromised. She also said the proposal would be out of keeping with the character of the area.

The Committee discussed the proposals and felt that the development was too oppressive and would block light into the adjoining property. Members were mindful that other extensions in the locality were not built as close to neighbouring property.

Councillor Coles proposed a motion against the officers' recommendation to refuse the application, this was seconded by Councillor Robinson.

Resolved (by 7 votes to 1 against): That permission be refused on grounds that the proposal by reason of its siting scale and design would result in an un-neighbourly and overbearing development causing loss of light and outlook for the occupiers of the adjoining property. The scheme would therefore be contrary to policy HO20 Residential Amenity.

**86 Land West of Cross Levels Way, Cross Levels Way, Eastbourne.
Application ID: 180637**

Outline planning permission (Access, Layout and Scale) for development of the site for restaurant use class A3, and bar/restaurant Class A4, in two independent buildings and the development of a showroom (sui generis) in a third independent building; New vehicular access from Cross Levels Way; and the laying out of access and service roads on site together with relocation of the cycle path.

The Committee was advised, by way of an addendum report, that there had been some formatting errors in the report. The policy supporting the reason for refusal was also included in the addendum.

Mr Peter Lette, agent, was present, but chose not to speak.

The Committee discussed the application stating that the development was not appropriate for the area. Members raised concerns regarding the adjoining junction and speed of traffic, the effect on flora/funa, the cycle route, parking and the potential for anti-social behaviour.

Councillor Taylor proposed a motion to refuse the application, this was seconded by Councillor Miah.

Resolved (Unanimous): That permission be refused for the reasons set out in the officers' report.

87 East Beach Hotel Replacement Windows

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning to provide Members with an update on compliance with an enforcement notice at the above property and to seek Members' views on suggested alternative materials.

Mr Tim Swain, agent/window supplier, addressed the Committee in support of the application, stating that the replacement windows were of a bespoke design that had been agreed by the Conservation Officer.

Heidi Cowderoy, applicant, said she was in full agreement with the proposed design of the UPVC windows. She said she was unable to sell the premises with the existing enforcement notice and that the cost of replacing the UPVC windows with wood, will affect the viability of the business.

Members raised concerns that the applicant had undertaken work on the premises without consultation with Officers and that the heritage of Eastbourne seafront was being lost to UPVC. The Committee was in support of retaining the heritage of the building by removing the unauthorised UPVC windows and reinstating them with wooden windows. Members were further advised that the Council will take enforcement action against other premises which do not comply with the legislation. The Committee discussed and

considered the implications for the applicant and recommended a revised timeline be implemented to enable the applicant to complete the works.

Members were advised that the Enforcement Notice will remain in force subject to the amendment of the alternative material and revised timeline for compliance.

Councillor Murray proposed a motion to approve the amendment to the officers' recommendation as stated below, this was seconded by Councillor Miah.

Resolved (by 6 votes to 1 against, and 1 abstention):

That officers amend the enforcement notice to allow for a revised timeline for compliance. 'The first floor to be completed by end of December 2019, the second floor to be completed by end of December 2020 and the third and upper floor to be completed by end of December 2021'.

88 College Conservation Area Appraisal

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning to seek Members' consent to go out to public consultation on the potential to increase the boundary of the Conservation Area.

Local Planning Authorities have a duty to consider whether they should designate new conservation areas or extend existing ones. There are currently 12 Conservation Areas within the Eastbourne Borough. It is intended that there would be 1 Conservation Area appraisal per year to review this process.

Members were invited to endorse public engagement in relation to the College Conservation Area (including the potential to increase its boundary).

The Committee was advised, by way of an addendum report, that the consultation with the local community and other stakeholders upon the proposed extension of the Conservation Area was proposed to take place over a 6 week period and the results would be reported back to Planning Committee. The recommendation was amended to take account of the time period for the consultation period.

Councillor Smart thanked all those involved in the report and urged Members to agree the recommendation.

Councillor Choudhury proposed a motion to approve the report, and this was seconded by Councillor Robinson.

Resolved (Unanimous): That the 6 week consultation period to receive representations and comments on the proposed extension of the College Conservation Area be approved.

- 89 16 Old Drove and land to the rear of 12 & 14 Old Drove, Eastbourne. ID: 181039**

Planning permission for proposed demolition of detached bungalow and erection of 1 pair of semi-detached 3bed dwellings and 2no. detached 3bed dwellings to include 2no. parking spaces for each dwelling - LANGLEY.

Having declared a prejudicial interest, Councillor Metcalfe MBE was absent from the room during discussion and voting of this item.

The Committee was advised, by way of an addendum to the report, that on page 72, the wording of the sentence relating to Dwelling, Bedroom 3 was incorrect and reworded.

Councillor Miah proposed a motion to approve the application, this was seconded by Councillor Coles.

Resolved (Unanimous): That permission be granted as set out in the officers' report.

- 90 South Downs National Park Authority Planning Applications.**

There were none.

- 91 Appeal Decision - Land to the rear of 1 Windermere Crescent, Eastbourne**

Members noted that the Inspector dismissed the appeal.

- 92 Appeal Decision - Minster House, York Road, Eastbourne**

Members noted that the Inspector dismissed the appeals A, B & C.

The meeting ended at 8.35 pm

Councillor Jim Murray (Chair)