

Planning Committee

Minutes of meeting held in Court Room - Town Hall, Eastbourne on 23 July 2019 at 6.00 pm

Present:

Councillor Jim Murray (Chair)

Councillors Peter Diplock (Deputy-Chair), Jane Lamb, Robin Maxted, Paul Metcalfe, Barry Taylor, Candy Vaughan and Sammy Choudhury (Reserve) (as substitute for Md. Harun Miah)

Officers in attendance:

Helen Monaghan (Lawyer, Planning), Leigh Palmer (Interim Head of Planning), James Smith (Specialist Advisor for Planning) and Emily Horne (Committee Officer).

21 Minutes of the meeting held on 25 June 2019

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 June 2019 were submitted and approved as a correct record, and the Chair was authorised to sign them, subject to the amendment of Councillors present. Members agreed that Amanda Morris was the substitute for Jim Murray. Councillor Md. Harun Miah was added to list of apologies in minute 13.

22 Apologies for absence.

An apology was reported from Councillor Md. Huran Miah. Councillor Sammy Choudhury was the appointed substitute for Councillor Md Huran Miah.

23 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 Taylor declared a Prejudicial Interest in minute 26, 61-63 Summerdown Road and minute 28, 13 Upper Avenue, as he was the owner of a care home. He withdrew from the room while the items were considered and did not vote.

24 Urgent items of business.

There were none.

25 Right to address the meeting/order of business.

The business of the meeting was reordered from the agenda. Item 9, 13 Upper Avenue was considered prior to item 8, Eastbourne House, 22-24 Gildredge Road.

26 61-63 Summerdown Road. Application ID: 190019

Outline application for new 64 bed nursing home (Amended description following removal of new building housing residential flats from proposal) - **OLD TOWN**

Having declared a Prejudicial Interest, Councillor Taylor was absent from the room during discussion and voting on this item.

The Committee was advised by way of an addendum report, that should the recommendation to approve be agreed by members, a requirement for a local labour agreement, including monetary contributions towards monitoring, would be attached as a planning condition.

The Committee was further advised in the addendum report, that in response to comments from objectors regarding the assessment of the visual impact of the proposed parking at 59 Summerdown Road, that the proposed parking area would involve the demolition of single-storey extensions that have been made to the original building. It was not considered that any parts of the building to be removed possess any architectural merit and the visual integrity of the original building would be maintained. The proposed parking bays would also not result in the removal of any significant street or site landscaping. It is not considered that the visual impact of parked cars would detract from the character of the area given that they would be directly adjacent to the highway. It was therefore considered that the provision of this parking area would not have any unacceptable visual impact and would comply with saved policies UHT1, UHT4 and UHT7 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan and Policy D10a of the Eastbourne Core Strategy.

In the addendum report, it was noted that Paragraph 8.3.4. of the officers report, should have stated that 2 ½ storey buildings are prevalent within the street scene, not 3-storey buildings.

The addendum report referred to additional correspondence that had been received from the Planning Consultant acting on behalf of the neighbours objecting to the scheme, stating that the provision of parking at 59 Summerdown Road had not been properly assessed. Plans should be marked as illustrative only as, if not, the Local Planning Authority cannot reserve matters shown on them by condition. An Appeal Inspector would also consider these plans as part of the application unless annotated otherwise. A suite of suggested conditions had been provided. Officer response: Further clarification regarding the provision of parking is provided within the addendum. It is noted that these works could be carried out without the need for planning permission, subject to agreement with ESCC Highways. The

plans showing indicative layout and scale would not be listed as approved plans on the decision notice, as informative can also be added to make clear that these plans have been assessed as indicative only. It is agreed that a condition relating to the southern wing of the building would be reasonable and appropriate in order to safeguard the amenities of the occupants of 65 Summerdown Road. The Committee were advised of an additional condition to the resolution, should the application be approved.

Helen Greenhalgh, local resident, addressed the Committee in objection, raising concern regarding the lack of detail in the application, the number of rooms and that the scheme would be too dominant in the area.

Rebecca Maddell, Heritage Champion, addressed the Committee in objection to the application. She stated the scheme would set a precedent and was out of keeping with the area.

Councillor Ungar, spoke as an East Sussex County Councillor and as a relative of a neighbour in objection to the application. He raised concern regarding amenity, parking and wildlife.

Mr Simon Franks, applicant, spoke in response to the concerns raised, stating that the building was already a functioning nursing home and would not set a precedent or result in overdevelopment by increasing by 10%. He said increasing demands and changes in requirements had been addressed in the application and that the outline application was submitted to address concerns.

In discussing the application, the Committee felt there was a lack of detail and raised concern regarding the number of rooms and the height and scale of development, stating that a 3½ storey building would be overbearing and out of keeping in the area.

Members were advised that further details would be covered in a detailed application and that the number of beds could be accommodated on site without harm to the street scene. Also, if the building was lost to residential use, there would be a loss of employer.

Councillor Diplock proposed a motion to refuse the application. This was seconded by Councillor Maxted.

Resolved (Unanimous): That outline permission be refused as set out in the resolution below:-

The Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that a development of the scale specified in the application description can be accommodated within the site without resulting in a detrimental impact upon visual and residential amenities. The proposed development therefore conflicts with saved policies UHT1, UHT4, NE28 and HO20 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan and policy D10a of the Eastbourne Core Strategy.

27 South Cliff Court, 11 South Cliff. Application ID: 190116

Planning permission for the replacement and alterations to balconies (resubmission) - **MEADS**

Mr Daniel Huff, local resident, said there were ongoing concerns regarding the potential for overlooking and asked the committee to consider raising the rear privacy screen height from 1.2m to 1.4m or 1.5m to further prevent overlooking from residents.

The Committee discussed the application and felt that the scheme had been sufficiently modified.

Councillor Murray proposed a motion to approve the application. This was seconded by Councillor Vaughan.

Resolved (Unanimous): That permission be approved as set out in the report.

28 13 Upper Avenue. Application ID: 190127

Planning permission for the change of use from Class C2 Residential Care Home to a Sui-Generis HMO for no more than 26 persons with associated parking and cycle and bin storage – **UPPERTON**

Having declared a Prejudicial Interest, Councillor Taylor was absent from the room during discussion and voting on this item.

Mr Green, local resident, addressed the Committee in objection, raising concern regarding noise and disturbance, loss of privacy, and the number of occupants. He stated that there should be a management plan in place along with a fully trained manager.

Mr Naveed Ali, applicant, addressed the Committee in support, stating that the HMO would accommodate young working people and students. There would be strict vetting procedure, 24 hour CCTV, a resident manager and electronic entry system.

Members welcomed the reduction of occupants from 34 to 26.

Councillor Vaughan proposed a motion to approve the application. This was seconded by Councillor Metcalfe.

Resolved (Unanimous): That permission be approved as set out in the report.

29 Eastbourne House, 22-24 Gildredge Road. Application ID: 181104

Planning permission for extensions to existing building including enlarged floorplate and additional floor to allow Change of Use from B1 (offices) to C3 (residential) with the provision of 22 x individual residential units - **MEADS**

The Committee discussed the application and arrived at differing views. Concern was raised regarding loss of office space; parking, density, design and lack of affordable housing. Members also welcomed the scheme and the approach to encourage cycling and use of public transport.

A motion to refuse the application, proposed by Councillor Taylor and seconded by Councillor Lamb, was lost by two votes to six.

Councillor Murray proposed a motion to approve the application as set out in the report. This was seconded by Councillor Vaughan.

Resolved (by 6 votes for (Councillors Diplock, Maxted, Metcalfe, Choudhury, Murray and Vaughan) **and 2 against** (Councillors Lamb and Taylor)): That permission be approved as set out in the report.

30 South Down National Park Authority Planning Applications (Verbal update)

There were none.

31 Appeal Summary

Members noted the summary report of appeal decisions between 27 June 2019 and 8 July 2019.

- Land between the garage (facing Kinfauns Avenue) of 70 Churchdale Road and rear of 68 Churchdale Road – Appeal Dismissed 03.07.19.
- Land adjacent to 84 St Philips Avenue and 21 Roselands – Appeal Dismissed 03.07.19.
- Savoy Court Hotel, 11-15 Cavendish Place – Appeal Allowed 08.07.19.
- Langley Shopping Centre, 64 Kingfisher Drive – Appeal Allowed 27.06.19.

The meeting ended at 7.38 pm

Councillor Jim Murray (Chair)