

ADDENDUM

Eastbourne Planning Committee

Addendum Date: 20th September 2021

Meeting date: 21st September 2021

Item No 7: 2 Mill Road

Application number 210339 (Pages 9 - 20)

No update to provide.

Item No 8: Land at 57 – 63 Cavalry Crescent and 25 – 31 North Avenue

Application number 210411 (Pages 21 - 34)

Response from ESCC on the revised car parking layout is awaited. As such, delegated authority is still sought to conclude the consultation process.

ESCC Highways has confirmed that a Travel Plan is not required for this development. As such, the Travel Plan requirement is omitted from the recommended Heads of Terms for S106 detailed within the report.

ESCC has requested bus transport infrastructure improvements and this would form a Head of Term for S106 to secure a contribution to be agreed. The revised Heads of Terms would therefore include:

- local labour agreement
- affordable housing provision
- bus infrastructure contribution
- TRO contribution
- car club contribution

The Committee report incorrectly refers to the wrong applicant, which is Eastbourne Borough Council.

Item No 9: 38a Motcombe Road

Application number 200598 (Pages 35 - 52)

Regrettably, additional comments received from ESCC Highways had not been made visible on the Council's website. These comments are crucial in that they confirm the highways officer is satisfied that initial objections relating to the safety of the site access had been addressed. The comments are provided in full below:

Regarding fire safety, the argument that the pump appliance could drive 20 into the site means that it stops in the alleyway, which doesn't seem like a logical place to stop just to meet the standards. With that being said, Manual for Streets does expand, stating that where 'an authority or developer wishes to reduce the running carriageway width to below 3.7m, they should consult the local Fire Safety Officer.' With this in mind, I would defer to any comments from the local Fire Safety Officer on this matter.

Similarly, regarding refuse collection, I would defer to you waste collection team for their comments, as they would ultimately service the proposed development.

I'm happy that the applicant have addressed my other comments satisfactorily.

Item No 10: 5-7 Enys Road
Application number 210333 (Pages 53 - 62)

6 additional objections have been received in relation to the application following completion of the Committee Report, which are based upon the following material planning grounds:

- Impact upon trees
- Overlooking
- Safety
- Parking
- Quality of accommodation
- Layout and density
- Number of occupants should be limited to 19

There has been uncertainty regarding the statutory requirements regarding consultation on revised planning proposal to reduce the proposed number of flats. The Local Planning Authority does not have a statutory duty to consult regarding the proposed reduction in units from 10 to 9.

An additional condition is recommended to secure the agreement of a lighting scheme at the rear of the property in the interest of safety and crime prevention, whilst preventing light pollution.

Item No 11: 59-63 Summerdown Road
Application numbers 200968 and 200983 (Pages 63 - 88)

An additional letter of objection has been received from Rebecca Madell (EBC Heritage Champion). The letter is reproduced in full below:

As former chair of planning, and Eastbourne Borough Council's Heritage Champion, I welcome the planning officers' decision to recommend refusal for both of these applications.

I find it incredible that they have proposed two such diverse schemes in the wild hope, no doubt, that committee members might feel persuaded to choose between them. Unfortunately, both applications suffer from the same blight in that they are cramming in far too many units into what is actually a comparatively small space.

I am sure that all of you, having visited the site on several occasions now, appreciate that the introduction of blocks of flats would be alien and completely out of keeping within this special area. I am, to be honest, amazed that the applicant could consider such a overbearing proposal as being appropriate, or acceptable, when it would have such a devastating impact on its neighbours.

Call me cynical but it would seem that the applicant is hell bent on ensuring that both these qualify as Major applications in the belief that this would add additional pressure on both the planners and the committee. Whilst there may be a threat from the Housing Minister to be careful in refusal of major housing applications such as this, may I remind you that this application should be considered purely on planning grounds alone.

The Design Review Panel's 10 points are all criticism of the design, site layout and effect on the Summerdown area. Frankly, they don't have a good word to say about it.

The Eastbourne Society also opposes the application, finding it totally out keeping with the surrounding Edwardian architecture. They also were most concerned about the proposed parking at the rear as it would inevitably cause disruption to residents of Summerdown Close.

At the moment, Summerdown Close is a peaceful green oasis. This development, with 15 houses, 9 flats and dozens of cars would totally destroy this forever. This is a design for an inner city, not garden suburbs.

The height and mass of these designs would have an unacceptably detrimental impact on the residents and the whole area. It is the duty of officers and members of this committee, alike, to protect our heritage.

Let me remind you that change can be good, and we welcome inspirational applications in our beautiful town. Both these applications, before us this evening, fall sadly short on every front and should be rejected immediately.

This page is intentionally left blank