

Planning Committee

MEMBERS: Councillor UNGAR (Chairman) HARRIS (Deputy Chairman)
Councillors COOKE, HEARN, JENKINS, MIAH, MURRAY and TAYLOR.

34 Minutes.

The minutes of the meeting held on 4 September 2012 were submitted and approved and the Chairman was authorised to sign them as a correct record, subject to an amendment to minute number 23, item 12 – removal of the words 'in objection' relating to Councillor Ansell's address – Planning Committee 7 August 2012.

35 Declaration of Interests.

Councillor Cooke declared an interest items 1 and 2 Edmond Evangelical Church, 39 Church Street, having expressed views on the application prior to its determination, and withdrew from the room whilst this item was considered.

36 Report of Head of Planning on Applications.

1 & 2) EB/2012/0472(CA) & EB/2012/0473(FP) (CONS AREA) - Edmond Evangelical Church, 39 Church Street - (A) Demolition of rear hall extension, (B) Change of use from a church to accommodation for 24 people with learning disabilities, with a community/activity centre, tearoom and retail shop, involving the demolition of rear hall extension and construction of part two, part three storey extension – **UPPERTON**. 37 letters of objection and 46 letters of support had been received.

The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report.

The observations of Southern Water, Environment Agency, Environmental Health, Conservation Consultant, County Archaeologist and Highway Authority, were detailed within the report.

At their meeting on 17 July 2012, the Conservation Area Advisory Group had no objections in principle to the scheme or to the demolition of the rear hall, but raised concerns regarding the impact on visual amenity in relation to the Church Street frontage from the proposed first floor balcony/terrace, the height of the central block, and the design of the windows (the projection above the eaves of the arched windows and the angled windows at eaves height).

Mr Loxley-Harding, resident, addressed the committee in objection stating that a petition had been submitted with 80% of the local residents objecting

to the scheme. Mr Loxley-Harding raised concerns about the parking and queried the change in the Highways Authority comments.

Councillor West, Ward Councillor, addressed the committee on behalf of residents stating that the scheme would result in a reduction of residential amenity, would be an overdevelopment and out of keeping with the surrounding area. Residents were concerned that the design and detail would impact on their properties and expressed concerns for the new residents and the proximity to the A259 one of the main routes into Eastbourne.

Councillor Liddiard, Ward Councillor, addressed the committee on behalf of the residents, stating that whilst the local residents were in support of the scheme, the proposed site was not suitable due to parking and highways issues previously mentioned.

County Councillor Rodohan addressed the committee stating that whilst he was supportive of the charity he was concerned about the poor provision of accommodation and the potential loss of light, sunlight and views. Councillor Rodohan felt that the scheme was an overdevelopment of the site, with a lacking of parking and poor access for maintenance to neighbouring properties.

Ms Zoe Volkes, resident, addressed the committee in support stating that the scheme complied with Borough Council policies and that the applicants had worked closely with Council officers to develop a scheme that would be suitable for the area. Ms Volkes stated that the variation in levels of the site ensured that the scheme did not obstruct views and that the design would bring character to the area. Parking provision should be sufficient due to visiting times. Finally Ms Volkes stated that the scheme would bring much needed diversity to the area and much needed accommodation for those in need.

Mrs Pat Newton, DIG, addressed the committee in support stating that there were no facilities for learning impaired; the scheme would tailor support to the residents needs. Residents would have access to local parks and access to main bus routes. Mrs Newton also highlighted that County Highways had withdrawn their previous concerns.

Jill Parker, JPK, Applicant, addressed the committee in response stating that JPK had searched for a site for 12 years and had liaised with the Council's Planning Department at every stage of the process. Following consultation with ESCC Adult Social Care, a site had been located within an urban setting in an established community, as suggested. The scheme would enable learning impaired members of the community to gain experience and participate in training. All residents and staff would be provided with bus passes.

The committee considered the application in particular the maintenance issues for neighbouring properties, parking, deliveries and highways issues. Members also discussed the possibility of a reduction in the size of the scheme therefore alleviating parking and other issues.

(NB: Councillor Cooke withdrew from the room whilst this item was considered).

RESOLVED: (By 5 votes to 2) That permission be refused on the grounds that **EB/2012/0472(CA)** - The demolition of the rear hall, in the absence of an approved redevelopment scheme, would result in an unacceptable and detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy UHT15 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001-2011. **EB/2012/0473(FP)** - The proposed development, by reason of its layout and site coverage, would result in an overdevelopment of the site with insufficient on-site parking to service the proposed use, which would lead to displaced parking in the surrounding streets to the detriment of highway safety and the amenities of nearby residents. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies TR2 and TR11 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001-2011.

Appeal: Should the applicant appeal the decision the appropriate procedure to be followed, taking into account the criteria set by the Planning Inspectorate, is considered to be written representations.

3) EB/2012/0518 - 65 Churchdale Road - Erection of two storey, detached dwelling to the side with parking space to the rear – **ST ANTHONY'S.**

The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report.

The observations of the Highway Department and Downland, Trees and Woodland were detailed within the report.

RESOLVED: (By 6 votes with 2 abstentions) That permission be granted subject to the following conditions: 1) Time Limit for Commencement of Development 2) Submission of Samples of Facing Materials 3) Ground and Floor Levels 4) Hours of building operation 5) Submission of Details of Surface Water Drainage Scheme 6) Landscape Design Proposals 7) Provision of cycle parking areas 8) Vehicular Access 9) Parking Areas 10) Accordance with Plans

4 & 5) EB/2012/0539 & EB/2012/0540 - Land to the rear of 18-34 Rangemore Drive - Re-development of garage block and rear gardens with the erection of 2 pairs of semi-detached two-storey houses with garages, a detached two-storey house with integral garage, and alterations to existing vehicular access to Rangemore Drive (Reserved Matters). The reserved matters to be determined are access, layout, appearance, landscaping and scale – **RATTON.** Four letters of objection had been received.

The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report.

The observations of the Highway Department, Planning Policy, Trees and Woodland and Southern Water were detailed within the report.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That permission be granted subject to the following conditions: 1) Time commencement 2) In accordance with plans

6) EB/2012/0573 - 42 The Rising - Erection of two storey extension to the side – **ST ANTHONY'S**. Two letters of objection had been received.

The committee discussed the application and were minded to approve the application subject to the roof design being amended to provide a hipped gable on the end in order to meet the objections from residents in Carroll Walk.

RESOLVED: (By 7 votes with 1 abstention) That permission be deferred subject to applicant submitting amended plans showing a hipped gable. The Development Control Manager, in consultation with the Chair, be delegated to issue the consent having secured amended plans and subject to the following conditions: 1) Time limit 2) Materials to match existing 3) Removal of PD rights 'windows' in side elevation 4) In accordance with approved plans

37 South Downs National Park Authority Planning Applications.

None reported.

NOTED.

38 Torfield Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan.

Members considered the report of the Planning Policy Manager seeking approval of the Torfield Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan for adoption and publication.

Members noted that during the period additional consultation, public representation, in the form of a petition was made to include Potential Extension A in the reviewed Torfield Conservation Area. The petition contained 58 signatures in support of the petition calling for the Torfield Conservation Area to be extended to include the area from Torfield Road Junction to Selwyn Road Junction. To the Arundel Road Junction up to the Arundel Road Junction up to Anne's Road up to Torfield, St Anne's Junction and all roads and lanes within the area.

Public comment was invited on the areas' special architectural and historic interest, the appropriateness of the boundary and the content of the draft Appraisal and Management Plan. Therefore, the public was able to view the document explaining the Conservation Area's special architectural and historic character and also to understand why the boundary had not been extended further.

Upon revisiting the existing and potential Extension A, boundaries of Torfield Conservation Area, it was clear that Extension A included no properties which resembled or dated from the interwar period, as designated within the Conservation Area. Torfield Conservation Area had a

clear and defined special architectural and historic character, as a distinct group of homogeneous interwar housing built by P. D. Stonham on the site of the Victorian Villa, Torfield Court.

There were two identified key features within Potential Extension A:

- St Wilfred's Hospice
- The wall surrounding the Mount

Both were Buildings of Local Interest

- It was worth noting that The Cottage was not marked as a Building of Local Interest, and it may be prudent to review this, given its significance in the old Torfield Manor estate.

The Torfield Conservation Area Appraisal had been prepared according to English Heritage Guidance Manual (2011) and English Heritage's Guidance. It aimed to set out, in a clear and concise manner, the special architectural and historic interest of the area and to provide information on the best approach to managing change, in order to conserve or enhance the special interest of the area.

Members were asked consider the Torfield Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, attached at appendix A of the report, which would be presented to Cabinet for adoption and publication.

Councillor Liddiard addressed the committee and expressed his disappointment that the petition had not led to the extension of the site.

The committee expressed their thanks to the officers involved in preparing the Appraisal.

RESOLVED: (7 votes with 1 abstention) That Cabinet be advised that the Planning committee support the Torfield Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan as detailed at Appendix A of the report.

The meeting closed at 8.02 pm.

**Councillor Ungar
(Chairman)**