



Working in partnership with **Eastbourne Homes**

Planning Committee

Minutes of meeting held in Shackleton Hall in the Welcome Building, Devonshire Quarter, Compton Street, Eastbourne, BN21 4BP on 26 May 2021 at 6.00 pm.

Present:

Councillor Jim Murray (Chair).

Councillors Peter Diplock (Deputy-Chair), Jane Lamb, Robin Maxted, Md. Harun Miah, Colin Murdoch, Barry Taylor and Candy Vaughan.

Officers in attendance:

Leigh Palmer (Head of Planning First), Neil Collins (Senior Specialist Advisor for Planning), Helen Monaghan (Lawyer, Planning) and Emily Horne (Committee Officer)

1 Introductions

Members of the Committee and Officers present introduced themselves via roll call during the meeting.

2 Apologies for absence and notification of substitute members

There were none.

3 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 Diplock declared a personal interest in item 49, Broomfield Street, as he knew two people who might be affected directly by the application.

4 Minutes of the meeting held on 20 April 2021

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 April 2021 were submitted and approved as a correct record, and the Chair was authorised to sign them.

5 Urgent items of business.

There were none.

6 36 Broomfield Street. ID: 210108

Outline planning permission (Access, Appearance, Layout and Scale) for demolition of existing dwelling and garage block and erection of 4 x detached 3 bedroom dwellings, 2 x semi-detached 3 bedroom dwellings and 2 x semi-detached 2 bedroom dwellings (8 residential units in total following

amendments) - resubmission of 200302 – **OLD TOWN.**

The Committee was advised by way of an addendum report of six additional representations that had been received.

The Committee were reminded that the application had been amended following a previous refusal for its scale and impacts on street scene and neighbouring buildings to address the concerns raised.

Mr James Whelan, local resident, and Councillor Ungar, East Sussex County Councillor, addressed the Committee in objection to the application.

The Senior Specialist Advisor – Planning addressed the matters raised by the objectors and members, and confirmed that the separation distance between dwellings would prevent loss of privacy and daylight, that the density of a back-land development site was considered acceptable and would have minimal impact on street scene and that the layout and plot sizes would be in keeping with the area. The highway authority had raised no objection regarding parking spaces or traffic generation but had requested the site access width be suitable for two-way traffic, and there would be an opportunity to improve the visibility splay as part of a future reserved matters application.

Some concerns were raised regarding the proximity of some dwellings to adjacent gardens and buildings and Councillor Lamb requested the application be deferred for a site visit to view the plots, but this was not seconded.

It was asked if the brick flank wall at Plot 5 could be turned into a green wall to reduce its prominence, and the Senior Specialist Advisor – Planning advised this could be done via delegated authority to officers to negotiate amendments to the drawings and materials.

Councillor Taylor proposed a motion to approve the application in line with the officers' recommendation and delegated authority to re-negotiate the materials, this was seconded by Councillor Vaughan and was carried.

RESOLVED: (by 7 votes to 1 against) that outline planning permission be granted, with all matters reserved, subject to the conditions set out in the report and to delegate authority to Officers to negotiate with the applicant regarding materials.

7 Wood Winton, 63a Silverdale Road. ID: 210147

Section 73A retrospective application for the Installation of 1x door and 1x first storey window on side facing elevations - **MEADS**

The Committee were reminded that this was a retrospective application which sought amendments to the fenestrations on units 2-6.

A written representation objecting in part to the application was read aloud by the Head of Planning First on behalf of Mr Heath, Director and resident of

Kesselville Court and the neighbouring community.

In discussing the application, Members raised concerns regarding overlooking, the potential to change the obscure glazing to clear glass and future modifications, and if they could specify the door materials and if fencing could be installed.

The Senior Specialist Advisor – Planning advised the upper floor windows would be obscured and fixed shut to limit overlooking and noise emissions. He suggested amending the wording of the Condition 10.3, Obscure Glazing (Windows) to include the words “for the lifetime of the development”. The door was considered acceptable by officers, however an amendment could be sought to omit it. The soft landscaping scheme had not been agreed, but fencing could be considered to mitigate members concerns.

Councillor Murray proposed a motion to approve the application in line with the officers’ recommendation, subject to the amendment of Condition 10.3. This was seconded by Councillor Maxted and was carried.

RESOLVED: (unanimously) that retrospective planning permission be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the report and that obscure glazing is installed for the lifetime of the development (Condition 10.3).

8 1 Elmwood Close. ID: 200855

Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 3no three bedroom dwellings with new vehicular access - **LANGNEY**

The previous outline planning application was refused for four dwellings on grounds of scale, site arrangement and safety concerns relating to the access. This full planning application for three dwellings, sought to overcome the reasons for refusal by the reduction in scale, bulk and improved vehicular access arrangements.

Members welcomed the reduction in dwellings and design, but raised concern regarding parking, width of the crossover, safety of pedestrians and lack of vehicle charging points.

The Senior Specialist Advisor – Planning, explained that the width of the crossover was considered acceptable and the parking spaces could be re-negotiated to allow dual parking at both plots with a safe space for pedestrians/wheelchair users. Provision for electric vehicle charging points had been proposed but could not be enforced. If members requested, the permitted development rights could be removed.

Councillor Taylor proposed a motion to approve the application in line with the officers’ recommendation, subject to further negotiation with the applicant regarding the parking spaces and the removal of the permitted development rights by condition of approval. This was seconded by Councillor Miah and was carried.

RESOLVED: (unanimously) that planning permission be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the report; that Officers re-negotiate the parking spaces with the applicant and the removal of the permitted development allowance.

9 54-56 Upperton Road. ID: 210045

Reserved matters for 29 flats approved by outline permission 190626 requesting consideration of appearance, landscaping and layout - **UPPERTON**

The Committee was advised by way of an Addendum of the details of the render (maintenance programme), for information.

Members welcomed the design of the development.

Councillor Taylor proposed a motion to approve the application in line with the officers' recommendation. This was seconded by Councillor Miah and was carried.

RESOLVED: (unanimously) that Reserved Matters be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

10 Date of next meeting

Resolved:

That the next meeting of the Planning Committee which is scheduled to commence at 6:00pm on Tuesday, 29 June 2021, be noted.

The meeting ended at 7.50 pm

Councillor Jim Murray (Chair)

Addendum to Planning Committee

Addendum Date: 28th June 2021

Meeting date: 29th June 2021

Item No 7 – 41 Brampton Road - Application Number 210324

No further representations have been received relating to the application.

Member's attention is drawn to a misnumbering of paragraphs from 10.7 of the Committee Report and that the recommended landscaping condition is incorrectly copied at both paragraphs 10.8 and 10.10. As such, only one landscaping condition would be applied to any permission that is granted.

Item No 8 – 1 Matlock Road – Application Number 210901

One additional representation has been received in relation to the application, which raises concerns regarding the height of the proposed extension above an existing neighbouring chimney.

This issue is not a material planning consideration and any fire safety issues would fall to the Building Regulations regime for separate consideration.

This page is intentionally left blank