

Planning Committee

Minutes of meeting held in Court Room at Eastbourne Town Hall, Grove Road, BN21 4UG on 25 February 2020 at 6.00 pm

Present:

Councillor Jim Murray (Chair)

Councillors Sammy Choudhury (Reserve), Peter Diplock (Deputy-Chair), Jane Lamb, Robin Maxted, Paul Metcalfe and Candy Vaughan

Officers in attendance:

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

85 Minutes of the meeting held on 21 January 2020

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 January 2020 were submitted and approved as a correct record, and the Chair was authorised to sign them.

86 Apologies for absence and notification of substitute members

An apology was reported from Councillor Barry Taylor. Councillor Sammy Choudhury was the appointed substitute for Councillor Harun Miah.

87 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 Paul Metcalfe MBE declared a Personal Interest in minute 92, Wood Winton, 63a Silverdale Road, as he knew the architect but was not a close associate and also a Personal Interest in minute 91, Land adjacent to Broadwater Way, as a family member would wish to access specialist schooling in the area in the future.

88 Urgent items of business.

There were none.

89 Right to address the meeting/order of business.

The business of the meeting proceeded in accordance with the agenda.

90 59-63 Summerdown Road ID 190794

Planning permission for the demolition of existing Pentlow Nursing Home, partial demolition of adjacent Summerdown Nursing Home at 59 Summerdown Road. Construction of new 62 no. bed Nursing Home, including relocated entrance/exit on Summerdown Road. Formation of new off-street parking within the 59 Summerdown Road site and reinstating planting, landscaping and external works – **OLD TOWN**.

Mr Strange addressed the Committee on behalf of local residents and expressed a number of concerns. In particular regarding the scale and size of the development, access, parking, loss of light and privacy, and the increased footprint to facilitate 62 bedrooms.

Rebecca Madell, Heritage Champion, spoke in objection to the application stating the application failed to meet Policies UHT1, UHT2, UHT4 and HO20 of the Core Strategic Plan. Referring to the comments from the Design Review Panel, she said they found the proposal cramped and it would be oppressive if built. She said the four storey building would cause loss of light, and severe overlooking issues on three sides of the building. She felt the development was too big, was in the wrong location and there were other more suitable sites in the Borough.

Councillor Ungar, East Sussex County Councillor, spoke in objection regarding the lack of a light survey, size of the building, potential for an increase in traffic and lack of information contained in the plans. He urged the Committee to reject the application.

Simon Franks, Agent, spoke in support of the application stating that many care homes had closed and the replacement care home would provide much needed accommodation for residents in Eastbourne. Purchased in 2007, he said the nursing home had recently been decommissioned as it was no longer suitable and was uneconomically viable, but that a replacement provision was vital. The proposed care home would offer 62 ensuite bedrooms, and a communal area, and would provide 75 full time jobs for local staff.

In discussing the application, the Committee was of a mixed opinion. Councillors felt there was a need for modern care home facilities in Eastbourne and noted that the applicant had revised the application in light of concerns raised by the Committee when the application was previously refused. Some felt that the application had not improved in relation to scale or provision of parking.

A motion to approve the application, proposed by Councillor Murray and seconded by Councillor Vaughan was lost (3 votes to 4).

Councillor Diplock proposed a motion to refuse the application. This was seconded by Councillor Metcalfe, and was carried.

RESOLVED (by 4 votes to 3 votes): That permission be refused for the following reason:

The proposal by reason of its scale, design and relationship to the boundaries of the site is considered to result in an over dominant and unneighbourly form of development that fails to harmonise and build on local distinctiveness. It is considered therefore that the proposal would cause visual harm to the local street scene and have a material impact upon residential amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of the neighbouring properties. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the saved policies UHT1, UHT4, NE28 and HO20 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan and Policy D10a of the Eastbourne Core Strategy.

Informative: If the applicant chooses to amend the scheme to mitigate the impacts of the proposal then it is considered that a true two storey frontage building with single storey wings may be a more approval form of development for the site.

91 Land adjacent to Broadwater Way, Broadwater Way ID: 190812

Planning permission for the creation of new Special Educational Needs school, including part single / part two storey main school building, car parking and external play areas, landscaping and refuse storage area – **HAMPDEN PARK**.

Amendments to the report were noted in the Addendum.

Mr Scott-Ralphs, CEO of St. Wilfrid's Hospice, stated that he did not object to the new school, but raised concerns at the potential increase of vehicles using the shared access road during peak periods and loss of overspill parking. If the access road was widened, he said this would help improve traffic flow and enable cars to pass and to park. He also raised concerns regarding potential noise disturbance issues which should be addressed before the start of the build.

Remo Palladino, CEO of Southfield Trust, spoke in support of the application, stating that there was a demand for special need schools in East Sussex. Centrally located, he said the school would reduce travelling time, would be near to the hospital for medical support, and near to the college for students to access further education, and would create 100 new jobs.

Steve Giles, Motion Transport Planning (Transport Consultants for the scheme), confirmed there would be parking for 82 cars with additional drop off bays for 25 vehicles. The set back school meant there would be no blockages if vehicles arrived early and there would be space inside the site for vehicles to queue. He felt that widening the access road would not resolve the problems, but that double yellow lines on the access road would create a safer route into the site. He said the works were compliant with East Sussex Highways standards.

Councillor Whippy, Lead Cabinet Member for Disabilities and Community Safety spoke in support of the application stating that there were not enough school places for children with complex medical needs; the school was financially viable, it would create 100 jobs and was ideally located to reduce travelling distances for parents.

Members welcomed the application for the school, but recognised there was potential for noise disturbance, traffic and parking issues. To mitigate the issues, Members suggested using an alternative access point or widening the verge at the existing entrance to the Hospice and School to create an extended layby. Officers advised that these had been considered, but were not viable due to the loss of habitat / trees and would not be supported by the Ecologist. Although widening the road would encourage cars to pass, it might encourage speeding. Parking bays for dropping off and picking up children would be provided in front of the school and this would be marshalled to stop blockages occurring. Overflow parking would have to be by a private agreement and noise disturbance could be alleviated with an acoustic fence prior to any construction on the site. Concern was also expressed regarding impact on an archaeological dig that was taking place; officers advised the land would be checked before building work commenced.

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 and the Addendum, and subject to an additional condition for an acoustic fence to be installed before development commences.

92 Wood Winton, 63a Silverdale Road ID: 190861

Reserved matters application for 6 dwellings approved by outline permission 181206 appeal reference APP/T1410/W/19/3229204 requesting consideration of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale - **MEADS**.

The Reserved matters for consideration were the access and landscaping arrangements; site layout and scale and appearance.

Mr Doel (neighbour) addressed the Committee in objection, raising concerns regarding cramped accommodation, overlooking, overdevelopment, inadequate access for service vehicles, lack of garden space and car parking, and risk of surface water flooding.

Mr Scard, Chair of Meads Community Association, referred to the increased scale of development and limited outside space.

Councillor Smart, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee from the public gallery in objection to the application due to its increase in scale. He also highlighted that the Lead Local Flood Authority had objected to the scheme due to the lack of information provided.

Members were informed that houses No.2 to No.6 would increase from 48 square metres to 63 square metres and house No.1 would increase from 75 square metres to 109 square metres. It was confirmed that surface water drainage was regulated by Condition 7 and this would involve the installation of an alleviation tank that should be approved by the Local Planning Authority and Highways Authority before development commenced. Furthermore, the size of the gardens complied with minimum standards; the access road was able to accommodate two-way traffic and the proposed number of parking spaces was in accordance with East Sussex County Council's guidance for Parking at New Residential Developments. Officers advised that the scale of development was indicative only, so there was some flexibility for the applicant to amend the application.

The Committee welcomed the addition of family homes, but expressed its concern at the scale of the development, the increase in floor area, addition of bedrooms in the roof space, lack of garden space, and questioned the need for the car ports.

Councillor Lamb proposed a motion to defer the application. This was seconded by Councillor Diplock.

RESOLVED (Unanimous): That permission be deferred to enable officers to liaise with the applicant to seek to reduce the scale and footprint of the proposed dwellings. On receipt of the revised drawings then the application be reported back to the Planning Committee for determination.

93 60 Avard Crescent ID: 200037

Planning permission for a proposed rear extension - **RATTON**.

Members were informed that this application had been brought to Committee as the applicant is an employee of Eastbourne Borough Council.

Amendments to the report were noted in the Addendum.

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

RESOLVED (Unanimous): That permission be approved as set out in the report and the Addendum.

94 Appeal Summary (Verbal Update)

There were none.

The meeting ended at 8.25 pm

Councillor Jim Murray (Chair)