

Tuesday, 4 February 2014  
at 6.00 pm



# Planning Committee

Present:-

**Members:** Councillor Harris (Deputy-Chairman)  
Councillors Hearn, Jenkins, Liddiard, Miah, Murray and Taylor

(An apology for absence was reported from Councillors Ungar)

## **73 Minutes of the meeting held on 7 January 2014.**

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 January 2014 were submitted and approved and the Chairman was authorised to sign them as a correct record.

## **74 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.**

None reported.

## **75 17 Rectory Close. Application ID: 130966 (HHH).**

**130966 - 17 Rectory Close** - Proposed extensions at rear and side, together with new garage and internal alterations – **OLD TOWN**. Eight letters of objection had been received.

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

Mr Simmonds addressed the committee in objection stating that the proposal would have a high visual impact and that there would be overlooking and overshadowing to his property.

Mr Gumbrell addressed the committee in objection stating that the proposal would result in a loss of light, overshadowing and would be out of keeping with the surrounding area.

Mr Wells addressed the committee in objection stating that the proposal would be an invasion of privacy, would block access to a sewer, would be detrimental to the overall appearance of Rectory Close and would cause disruption during the construction.

Mr Pearce, Agent, addressed the committee reiterating the Officer's comments and stating that the size of the plot could accommodate the extensions.

**RESOLVED: (By 6 votes to 1)** That delegated authority be given to the senior specialist advisor (planning) to grant the application in accordance with the recommended conditions: 1) Time for commencement 2) In

accordance with approved drawings 3) Materials to be as stated 4) Obscure glazing to be installed and maintained to first floor window on northwestern elevation of extension and windows to be fixed shut; subject to his being able to agree with the applicant and document a further condition relating to the retention of the existing Mock-Tudor timber cladding and its replication on the proposed extension.

**76 19 Sydney Road. Application ID: 131058 (HHH).**

**131058 - 19 Sydney Road** - Retrospective application for the installation of decking and guardrails to flat roof at rear, with removal of bedroom window, to be replaced with access door to decking – **DEVONSHIRE**.

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

The Environment Agency and County Archaeologist made no comment on the applications.

The committee agreed that enforcement action should also be taken.

**RESOLVED: (By 5 votes to 1 with 1 abstention)** That permission be refused on the grounds that 1) the development consisting of the installation of decking and guard rails to the flat roof facilitating the use of the flat roof as a terrace increases overlooking and a sense of overlooking, resulting in a loss of privacy to surrounding residential properties, contrary to saved policy HO20 of the Borough Plan 2007 and policy B2 of the Core Strategy Local Plan 2013. 2) Officers were authorised to commence enforcement proceedings and investigation into other existing terraces opposite.

*Appeal: should the applicant appeal the decision the appropriate course of action to be followed, taking into account the criteria set by the planning inspectorate, was considered to be written representations.*

**77 39 Silverdale Road. Application ID: 130928 (PPP).**

**130928 (PPP) - 39 Silverdale Road** - Retrospective application under section 73a for the provision of a raised platform with fencing in rear garden – **MEADS**. Four objections had been received.

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

The Conservation Officer considered that as the works were not visible from the public realm, there were no conservation issues.

Mr Thornton addressed the committee in objection stating his concerns about the increase in noise and the potential for the area to be used by more children.

Mr Symmonds, Agent, addressed the committee in response stating that the platform had been located so as to minimise the noise disturbance for neighbours and that the proposed planting and fence should further mitigate any effects on the neighbouring properties.

**RESOLVED: (Unanimous)** That permission be granted subject to the following conditions: 1) Time limit 2) In accordance with drawings 3) That the walls surrounding the platform/play area shall be rendered before the development is first brought into use, and permanently retained as such thereafter.

**78 Eastbourne Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) - Draft Charging Schedule.**

The committee considered the report of the Senior Head of Development. The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) allowed local authorities in England and Wales to raise funds from developers undertaking new building projects. It effectively replaced much of the existing process of planning obligations commonly known as 'Section 106' agreements. The primary use of CIL was to gain financial contributions from certain types of viable development to help fund new or improved strategic infrastructure required to support the growth identified in a local authority's Core Strategy. CIL placed a charge per square metre on development. It would not be the sole funding source for all infrastructure delivered, but would supplement other public sector revenue streams.

Members noted that Cabinet had approved a preliminary charging schedule at their meeting on 10 July 2013 for the purposes of conducting a targeted consultation. A summary of the representations received and changes made were outlined in the Consultation and Cooperation Statement which was a background paper to the report. The revised charges were supported by further evidence on development viability.

The committee asked if it would be possible to revisit and amend the fees, and were advised that fee structure would be reviewed annually.

The committee raised no objections to the report and supported the recommendations to Cabinet.

**RESOLVED:** That Cabinet be advised that the committee supports the CIL draft charging schedule for representations to be made over a six week period.

The meeting closed at 7.18 pm

**Councillor Harris  
Deputy Chairman in the Chair**