

APPLICATION NUMBER:	LW/07/0727	ITEM NUMBER:	3
APPLICANTS NAME(S):	Mr & Mrs A Fowler	PARISH / WARD:	Seaford / Seaford East
PROPOSAL:	Outline Planning Application for Demolition of buildings and erection of fourteen houses, six garages and parking		
SITE ADDRESS:	Tudor Manor Hotel, Eastbourne Road, Seaford, East Sussex, BN25 4DB		
GRID REF:	TQ 4999		

x

1. SITE DESCRIPTION / PROPOSAL

1.1 The site is located to the east of Seaford town centre and Sutton Corner, and has a frontage onto the A259 Eastbourne Road. The site is occupied by Tudor Manor, which is a guest house/hotel with on site parking and a single access onto Eastbourne Road. The main building is two storey and centrally located on the site.

1.2 Aside from the A259 frontage, the site is bounded by residential properties to the sides and rear. The properties to the rear front Chesterton Drive and, particularly, no.26 is relatively close to the north-west corner of the application site.

1.3 A Tree Preservation Order covers trees on the A259 frontage.

1.4 This is an outline application for the redevelopment of the site for 14 dwellings. Access, layout and scale are to be determined at this stage, while appearance and landscaping are reserved for subsequent approval.

1.5 The existing buildings on the site would be demolished. A two storey building with rooms in the roof would be erected on the site of the existing building, with single storey wings with rooms in the roof on either side, together providing seven dwellings. A single storey building with rooms in the roof would be erected facing into the site and backing onto the east boundary to an adjacent bungalow, 'Fairfield', which would comprise four dwellings. A two storey building with rooms in the roof, lower than the main building, would be erected also facing into the site but backing onto the west boundary, which would comprise two dwellings. Finally, a two storey 'gatehouse' dwelling would be located towards the centre of the frontage.

1.6 The existing access close to the western boundary would be stopped up and, in its place, a new access would be provided approximately in the centre of the frontage. Nineteen parking spaces would be provided on the site, some being within two garages located in the north-west corner and adjacent to the east boundary. Private gardens would be provided for the dwellings. The TPO frontage trees would be retained. New planting would be undertaken, including trees and a hedge on the frontage.

1.7 The proposal has been subject to amendment since the original submission, following consideration of residents concerns by the applicant and agent.

2. RELEVANT POLICIES

LDLP: – ST03 – Design, Form and Setting of Development

LDLP: – E13 – Hotels, Guest Houses and Other Serviced Accommodation

3. PLANNING HISTORY

LW/03/0341 - Erection of a detached double garage - **Approved**

LW/01/0460 - S.73A Retrospective application for the variation of condition one attached to planning permission LW/99/0148F to allow for the number of rooms to be let to be increased from four to five - **Approved**

LW/94/0490 - Outline Application for the erection of two two storey side extensions to provide four additional self contained flats with ten parking spaces. - **Refused**

4. REPRESENTATIONS FROM STANDARD CONSULTEES

Main Town Or Parish Council – No objection, subject to clarification about the provision of affordable housing. Regret loss of hotel.

Sussex Police - C.P.D.A. – Makes various detailed comments on the security aspects of the proposal, which are generally favourable.

ESCC Highways - Raise no objection in principle in terms of access, parking and traffic generation.

Lewes District Council Cultural Services Officer (Responsible for tourism promotion) – Views awaited.

5. REPRESENTATIONS FROM LOCAL RESIDENTS

5.1 The application has been subject to amendment since the original submission, with changes being made by the applicant in an effort to respond to concerns of residents.

5.2 In response to the original consultation, letters from 12 households were received (including from all except one who bound the site to the rear and side) raising concerns that the proposal amounted to overdevelopment, with too much building on the site. Other concerns related to the height of the development, increased traffic onto the busy A259, and direct concerns such as overshadowing, loss of light and noise to nearby properties.

5.3 In response to reconsultation, letters from 8 households were received (again including from all except one who bound the site to the rear and side). One household considered the scheme acceptable, another felt the design was attractive and that their objections had been taken as far as possible, while others reiterated earlier objections, particularly that the proposal amounted to overdevelopment.

5.4 Four letters of support were received, from households further afield. Grounds for support included that the proposal was well designed, fitted in well, and provided housing for local people.

6. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 The site is within the Seaford Planning Boundary. Within the Planning Boundary, new development can be accepted, subject to such development complying with district wide policies in the Local Plan. These policies include Policy ST3, which in part aims to ensure that all new development respects its surroundings and the amenities of adjoining occupiers. Policy E13 is also relevant, because the policy aims to retain guest house/hotel accommodation within the district, in order to support the tourist economy in the district.

Loss of guest house/hotel

6.2 Information from accountants for the occupiers of Tudor Manor states that their clients “have worked long to make a success of the quality hotel accommodation. In addition to this they also opened the restaurant to non-residents. However, they have never received sufficient support from the local public or passing tourists to turn it into a viable expanding business. It also seems that the Travel Lodges in Newhaven and the Boship Roundabout plus a new establishment at Polegate are having an adverse effect on them.”

6.3 There has been a trend in recent years whereby overnight accommodation for visitors in Seaford has closed and been granted permission for residential use. Examples of lost visitor accommodation in the town, includes the Abbots Lodge Motel, the Clear View Hotel and Haslyn Hotel. In each case business has been declining in the preceding years, to an extent coinciding with the development of the Travel Lodge at Newhaven in the late 1990's.

6.4 While the loss of smaller visitor establishments is unfortunate, in planning terms the trend is difficult to resist. The applicant's agent has pointed out that “It is difficult to force anyone, even under the cloak of policy, to run a failing business”. In the circumstances (and subject to any further views received from the Cultural Services Officer) it is not considered that a refusal on the basis of the loss of the guest house/hotel could be sustained, particularly as the opportunity arises to help increase the district housing supply on the site.

Density

6.5 The density of the proposed development would be about 66 dph, which is clearly above the government density guideline of 30-50 dph indicated as being an ‘efficient’ use of land in PPS3 – Housing. The density is significantly higher than that of existing development in the vicinity of the site.

6.6 The site is, however, unusually large compared to other plots in the vicinity and is considered to provide an opportunity for a higher density development.

Effect on character of area

6.7 The area is predominantly residential in character. The proposed use is residential.

6.8 The height of the tallest building, of two storeys with rooms in the roof, would be similar to the existing main building, and sited in a similar position. The buildings between that building and the frontage would be lower, but would project further forward towards the A259 than the adjacent bungalow 'Fairfield'.

6.9 Given the grass verge adjacent to the Eastbourne Road at this point, the retained and proposed trees and hedge along the frontage, and the set back of the tallest building in the group, it is considered that the effect on the street scene would be acceptable.

6.10 The site would lose some character of spaciousness as a result of the development, which would be particularly evident from adjoining properties, in particular 'Fairfield'. This would result from the density of development on the site. It is considered, however, that the overall affect on the character of the area would be acceptable.

Effect on adjoining residential amenity

6.11 The site is bounded by adjacent properties to the east and north.

6.12 To the east is 'Fairfield', a bungalow fronting onto the A259. 'Fairfiled' has a blank side wall facing the site.

6.13 The main effect on 'Fairfield' would be from the proposed development on the east side of the site. Adjacent to 'Fairfield' itself would be 4 new dwellings backing onto the boundary at a distance of 5m, which would have a ridge height of 6m (the ridge being 7.5m from the boundary). Further from 'Fairfield', adjacent to the rear garden, would be a garage building 1m from the boundary, which would have a ridge height of 3.8m. Adjacent to the end of the rear garden of 'Fairfield' would be the end walls of a wing to the main building, 1.3m from the boundary.

6.14 It is clear that the proximity of development to 'Fairfield', particularly seen from the rear rooms and rear garden of that property, would cause some loss of visual amenity and give rise to some noise and disturbance from the use of the rear gardens of the four dwellings referred to above. There may also be some loss of light to the rear garden, but no undue overlooking as only rooflights would face 'Fairfield'. On balance, however, it is considered that the impact of the development on 'Fairfield' would not be so significant as to justify refusal.

6.15 To the rear are properties fronting Chesterton Drive. Those properties back onto the site. The site is at a lower level than those properties. The proposed development would be seen from those properties, with a loss of

some existing views across the open parts of the site. It is not considered that loss of light or overlooking would, however, be significant. This assessment applies to the effect on 26 Chichester Drive, which is the closest adjacent property to the site.

Traffic Generation

6.16 Local concern has been raised that traffic generated by the development would worsen traffic conditions on the A259. However, it is not considered that there would be a perceptible increase in traffic given traffic levels on the A259.

6.17 Concern has also been expressed that hazards would increase in the vicinity of the site, given that the Sutton Avenue joins the A259 nearby to the west, and permission has been given for development of the Whiteley House site on Sutton Avenue. However, the Highway Authority has not raised objection to the proposed new access (which would be further from the junction) on the basis that any material worsening of traffic hazards would result.

6.18 Parking provision on site would comply with the Council's standard.

Effect on TPO trees

6.19 The TPO trees on the frontage would be retained. It is possible that some pressure would result from future occupiers near the trees to carry out tree works to improve amenity in the future, it is not considered that such a possibility would constitute grounds for refusal in itself. Extra planting would be undertaken on the frontage.

Financial contributions

6.20 If permission is granted, financial contributions would be required towards local infrastructure, being open space provision/improvement and education facilities provision/improvement, in Seaford. The proposed development falls just below the threshold where provision of 25% affordable housing is required (15 dwellings) under Policy RE5 of the Lewes District Local Plan.

Conclusion

6.21 While the loss of the guest house/hotel facility would be unfortunate, the proposal would add to the district housing stock. The development would be relatively high density in relation to its surroundings, but the site is considered to be capable of accommodation a higher density. There would be some effect on adjoining occupiers, but this is not considered to be so significant as to justify refusal. The effect on the character of the area is considered to be acceptable, TPO trees would be retained and planting added to the frontage. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of traffic generation and the new access.

6.22 The proposal is, on balance, considered to be acceptable.

7. RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be granted, subject to completion of a satisfactory Section 106 Agreement to secure financial contributions towards public open space provision/improvements and education facilities in Seaford.

The application is subject to the following conditions:

1. Before the development hereby approved is commenced on site, details/samples of all external materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and carried out in accordance with that consent.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory development in keeping with the locality having regard to [Policy ST3](#) of the Lewes District Local Plan.

2. Before the development hereby approved is commenced on site, details/samples of all surfacing materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and carried out in accordance with that consent.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory development in keeping with the locality having regard to [Policy ST3](#) of the Lewes District Local Plan.

3. Development shall not begin until details of finished floor levels in relation to the existing ground levels have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall then be carried out in accordance with these details.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity and the character of the locality having regard to [Policy ST3](#) of the Lewes District Local Plan.

4. The land indicated on the approved plans for the parking and turning of vehicles for the development hereby permitted shall be laid out prior to the first occupation/use of the development and thereafter kept available for that purpose only.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety having regard to [Policy ST3](#) of the Lewes District Local Plan.

5. The landscaping scheme to be approved as a reserved matter shall be maintained in accordance a regime to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the locality, having regard to [Policy ST3](#) of the Lewes District Local Plan.

6. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development described in [Classes A-E of Part 1 of Schedule 2](#), other than hereby permitted, shall be undertaken unless the Local Planning Authority otherwise agrees in writing.

Reason: A more intensive development of the site would be likely to adversely affect the appearance and character of the area having regard to [Policy ST3](#) of the Lewes District Local Plan.

7. All trees, shrubs and hedges within the site, to be retained, shall be protected by 1m high fences for the duration of the building works at a distance equivalent to the outer most limit of the branches or half the height of the tree or whichever is the greatest or such other distance as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No materials or plant shall be stored, rubbish dumped, fires lit or buildings erected within the fenced area and no changes in ground level or excavations may be made within the exclusion zone of the tree, shrub or hedge without the prior consent in writing of the Local Planning Authority, in accordance with BS.5837 - Trees in Relation to Construction.

Reason: To preserve trees on the site and in the interest of visual amenity and environment having regard to [Policy ST3](#) of the Lewes District Local Plan.

8. Construction work shall be restricted to the hours of 0800 to 1800 Monday to Fridays and 0830 to 1300 on Saturdays and works shall not be carried out at any time on Sundays or Bank/Statutory Holidays.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenities of the neighbours having regard to [Policy ST3](#) of the Lewes District Local Plan.

This decision is based on the following submitted plans/documents:

<u>PLAN TYPE</u>	<u>DATE RECEIVED</u>	<u>REFERENCE</u>
Design & Access Statement	4 June 2007	
Location Plan	4 June 2007	1:1250
Survey	4 June 2007	040507/001
Other	4 June 2007	ARBORICULTURAL SURVEY
Proposed Elevations Sections	24 July 2007	1045/6
	18 October 2007	1045/5C
Proposed Elevations	18 October 2007	1045/5C
Street Scene	18 October 2007	1045/5C
Planning Layout	18 October 2007	1045/4C

Summary of reasons for decision and any relevant development plan policies/proposal:

It is considered that the proposal meets the aims and objectives of Local Plan Policy and respects the character of the location, complying with Policy ST3 of the Lewes District Local Plan.