

Tuesday, 5 August 2014  
at 6.00 pm



# Planning Committee

Present:-

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

## **36 Minutes of the meeting held on 8 July 2014.**

The minutes of the meeting held on the 8 July were approved and the Chairman was authorised to sign the as them as a correct record.

## **37 Apologies for absence.**

There were none.

## **38 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 47, St Thomas A Becket School, Kings Drive as a Member of East Sussex County Council Planning committee and did not take part in the discussion or vote thereon.

Councillor Ungar declared that with regard to minute 39, 2 Upwick Road, he had previously reached a view in relation this application and considered himself as being pre-determined with regard to it. He therefore withdrew from the room whilst the application was considered.

## **39 2 Upwick Road. Application ID: 140868.**

Application for approval of details reserved by condition No.10 (details of steps) of permission - **OLD TOWN.**

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

This application is reported to Planning Committee at the request of the Chair so that the decision can be made in the public forum of Planning Committee.

The application relates to the issues controlled via planning condition attached to scheme granted planning permission on appeal.

Members may recall that a suite of information relating to matters controlled via planning condition was reported to Planning Committee in May 2014, this application sits alongside the information already agreed

and outlines the alterations to the access to the property No 2 Upwick Road.

The details as submitted were considered sufficient to meet access and safety issues for all users of this development site. Following discussions with the occupier of 2 Upwick Road, revised drawings had been received. The revised drawings indicated that the access stairs will rise/fall facing Upwick Road rather than the application site.

Mr Cline addressed the committee in objection stating that he was concerned regarding the accuracy of the drawings, the size of the stairs and protection from vehicle strike.

The Senior Specialist Advisor (Planning) advised that the drawings were scaled and measurable and that with regards to Building Control safety issues had been met.

The committee requested that the Senior Specialist Advisor (Planning) discuss the possibility of delineation markings for pedestrians on the site with the developer.

NB: Councillor Ungar withdrew from the room whilst this item was considered.

**RESOLVED: (By 6 votes with 1 abstention)** That permission be granted.

**40 12 Manvers Road. Application ID: 140857 (LDP).**

Proposed loft conversion including hip to gable enlargement together with rear dormer - **OLD TOWN.**

The applicant sought a Certificate of Lawfulness for the alteration of the roof space through the creation of a Hip to Gable extension to the Southern roof slope (closest to the shared boundary with 10 Manvers Road) and in addition the creation of a rear dormer in the rear roof slope elevation running almost the entire width of the property. No neighbour consultations were undertaken as the application had to be determined on points of law.

**RESOLVED: (By 7 votes with 1 abstention)** That a Lawful Development Certificate be issued for this proposal.

**Informative:**

For the avoidance of doubt the certificate has been issued in accordance with the details shown on the following plans received on 24 June 2014:

Drawing No.: 227000.05 – Rev A

**41 14 Manvers Road. Application ID: 140858 (LDP).**

Proposed loft conversion including hip to gable enlargement together with rear dormer - **OLD TOWN.**

The applicant sought a Certificate of Lawfulness for the alteration of the roof space through the creation of a Hip to Gable extension to the Southern roof slope (closest to the shared boundary with 10 Manvers Road) and in addition the creation of a rear dormer in the rear roof slope elevation running almost the entire width of the property. No neighbour consultations were undertaken as the application had to be determined on points of law.

**RESOLVED: (By 7 votes with 1 abstention)** That a Lawful Development Certificate be issued for this proposal.

**Informative:**

For the avoidance of doubt the certificate has been issued in accordance with the details shown on the following plans received on 24 June 2014:

Drawing No.: 227000.05 – Rev A

**42 16 Lushington Lane. Application ID: 140801 (PPP).**

Demolition of garages and erection of a pair of semi-detached dwellings – **MEADS**. Seven letters of objection had been received.

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

The Specialist Advisor (Planning Policy) raised no objections.

At their meeting on 15 July 2014 the Conservation Area Advisory Group raised no objection in principle but requested alterations to the fenestration of the front elevation to be more in keeping the adjacent properties.

Highways ESCC made no response to the consultation.

**RESOLVED: (Unanimous)** That permission be granted subject to the following conditions: 1) Time for commencement 2) Approved drawings 3) Notwithstanding approved drawings revised window design to front elevation to be submitted 4) Notwithstanding approved drawings the windows to the rear elevation at first floor level shall be a minimum of 1.8m from internal floor level 5) Prior to commencement of development, including demolition the submission of a construction method statement 6) Removal of permitted development rights, no new windows or doors to be inserted to rear or side elevations, no roof extensions or rooflights 7) Bin enclosure to remain for storage of bins at all times 8) Standard hours of construction 9) Prior to commencement of development completion of Unilateral Undertaking to secure payment of commuted sum. 10) prior to commencement submission of materials, proposed roof material shall be real slate tiles.

**Informative:**

Completion of Unilateral Undertaking standard informative.

**43 25 St Annes Road. Application ID: 140833.**

The conversion of the existing building with rear extension to provide 11 no. residential flats together with landscaping waste and cycle storage. The proposals include the removal of existing rear external escape gantry and a single storey ground floor side addition – **UPPERTON**. Two letters of objection had been received.

The committee were advised that the application was a re-submission of a previous scheme which was refused at planning committee on 7<sup>th</sup> January 2014 as it was considered the proposed extension would have an intrusive and overbearing impact on the adjacent property. The decision was appealed by the Applicant and subsequently dismissed solely on the grounds that there was no provision to secure the affordable housing contribution required. The Applicant had since entered into a unilateral undertaking with the Council to secure the payment of the commuted sum towards off site affordable housing (£18, 482.28) to come into operation should consent be granted.

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

The observations of the Specialist Advisor (Conservation) and the Specialist Advisor (Arboriculture) were summarised within the report.

Stephen Lloyd, MP, addressed the committee in support of the application stating that Twin was a leading language school in Eastbourne, looking to expand their school and accommodation offer.

**RESOLVED: (Unanimous)** That permission be granted subject to the following conditions: 1) Time limit 2) In accordance with approved plans 3) The materials used in the construction of the rear extension shall match the host building 4) Submission of materials used in construction of bike and bin store 5) Implementation of a programme of archaeological work 6) Archaeological site investigation and post investigation assessment 7) Submission of a method statement outlining the protection of the mature Lime (Identified as T5 in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment dated 15 October 2012) during the construction process 8) Protection of existing trees – provision of fencing 9) no flues, pipes etc. shall be installed on the front elevation 10) Hours of building operations.

**Informative:**

Pre-commencement conditions.

**44 Congress Theatre, Carlisle Road. Application ID: 140821 and 140822.**

**140821** - Restoration of glazed front façade and short side returns (not including ground floor other than cathodic protection of pilotis) with additional repairs to east elevation and projecting roof canopy (south facing) – **MEADS**.

**140822** - Restoration of glazed front façade and short side returns (not including ground floor other than cathodic protection of pilotis) with additional repairs to east elevation and projecting roof canopy (south facing) – **MEADS**.

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

At their meeting on 15 July 2014 the Conservation Advisory Group raised no objections. The Group welcomed the scheme and the opportunity to improve the building as well as repair it, and agreed that the quality of materials and workmanship would be critical to its restoration.

The observations of the Theatres Trust, the Specialist Advisor (Planning Policy), the Conservation Consultant and East Sussex County Highways were summarised within the report.

English Heritage had worked closely with the applicant in the preparation of these applications, and responded that the application was supported by a robust suite of documents outlining the heritage significance of the development. Notwithstanding this and in consultation with the applicant they had requested additional work was undertaken to illustrate the significance of the building in the wider Devonshire Park Complex.

**RESOLVED A (140821):** That subject to referral to the Government Office (English Heritage representatives) and that no objections are received from this referral process then Planning Committee authorises the Senior Specialist Advisor (Planning) to **Grant Planning Permission** subject to conditions (along with additional conditions that may be recommended by English Heritage): 1) Time Limit 2) Approved Drawings Prior to any approved development commencing details of the external materials supplied covering:-

- Method of cleaning and repair of split concrete panels
- Samples of replacement split concrete panels in the event of irreparable damage on breaking out transoms and mullions
- Samples of pre-cast concrete panels (above pilotis and at second floor level) to match as closely as possible a (cleaned) sample of the original panel in colour, texture, aggregate type and profile
- Method of fixing of all replacement concrete and slate panels
- Sample of slate cladding to match as closely as possible existing in colour and appearance
- Samples of sealants
- Samples of agreed finish to secondary mullions and transoms (subject to justification for the change as set out above)
- Pigment analysis of existing glazing and samples of replacement glazing to match
- The anodised aluminium
- The colour of the window frames
- The appearance and materials of the parapet wall capping

The details as approved shall be implemented at the site and be retained as such thereafter.

4) Prior to any work commencing on the works hereby approved a detailed mock-up showing the way the aluminium transoms and columns connect

together with the window frame and glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details as approved shall be implemented at the site and retained as such thereafter 5) Prior to its installation at the site the location of the control and monitoring cabinet of the cathodic system shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details as approved shall be implemented at the site and be retained as such thereafter 6) Prior to their installation at the site/building all cable runs for the cathodic protection system (whether in concealed or exposed locations) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details as approved shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and be retained as such thereafter 7) Prior to their installation the location and details of the cover sealant to the cathodic protection on the ground floor decorative columns to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details as approved shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and be retained as such thereafter 8) Notwithstanding the Advertisement Regulations (which allows for certain types of advertisement to be erected without the need for a formal approval regime) any new advertisement located on the external fabric of the building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include the method of fixing to the building and the method of illumination 9) That no demolition, site clearance or building operations shall take place except between the hours of 8.00 a.m. and 6.00 p.m. on Mondays to Fridays and 8.00 a.m. and 1.00 p.m. on Saturdays and that no works in connection with the development shall take place unless previously been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

**RESOLVED B (140822):** That subject to referral to the Government Office (English Heritage representatives) and no objections are received from this referral process then Planning Committee authorises the Senior Specialist Advisor (planning) to issue **Listed Building Consent** subject to conditions listed below (along with additional conditions that may be recommended by English Heritage): 1) Time Limit 2) Approved Drawings 3) Prior to any approved development commencing details of the external materials supplied covering:-

- Method of cleaning and repair of split concrete panels
- Samples of replacement split concrete panels in the event of irreparable damage on breaking out transoms and mullions
- Samples of pre-cast concrete panels (above pilotis and at second floor level) to match as closely as possible a (cleaned) sample of the original panel in colour, texture, aggregate type and profile
- Method of fixing of all replacement concrete and slate panels
- Sample of slate cladding to match as closely as possible existing in colour and appearance
- Samples of sealants
- Samples of agreed finish to secondary mullions and transoms (subject to justification for the change as set out above)
- Pigment analysis of existing glazing and samples of replacement glazing to match
- The anodised aluminium
- The colour of the window frames
- The appearance and materials of the parapet wall capping

The details as approved shall be implemented at the site and be retained as such thereafter 4) Prior to any work commencing on the works hereby approved a detailed mock-up showing the way the aluminium transoms and columns connect together with the window frame and glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details as approved shall be implemented at the site and retained as such thereafter 5) Prior to its installation at the site the location of the control and monitoring cabinet of the cathodic system shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details as approved shall be implemented at the site and be retained as such thereafter 6) Prior to their installation at the site/building all cable runs for the cathodic protection system (whether in concealed or exposed locations) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details as approved shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and be retained as such thereafter 7) Prior to their installation the location and details of the cover sealant to the cathodic protection on the ground floor decorative columns to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details as approved shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and be retained as such thereafter 8) Notwithstanding the Advertisement Regulations (which allows for certain types of advertisement to be erected without the need for a formal approval regime) any new advertisement located on the external fabric of the building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include the method of fixing to the building and the method of illumination 9) That no demolition, site clearance or building operations shall take place except between the hours of 8.00 a.m. and 6.00 p.m. on Mondays to Fridays and 8.00 a.m. and 1.00 p.m. on Saturdays and that no works in connection with the development shall take place unless previously been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

**45 Land adjacent to 29 Filder Close. Application ID: 140559 (PPP).**

Proposed new end of terrace two storey dwelling to extend the existing terrace, situated in the existing garden adjoining 29 Filder Close and with associated parking – **ST ANTHONYS**. 17 letters of objection had been received.

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

The observations of the Housing Services Manager, the Specialist Advisor (Planning Policy), the Specialist Advisor (Arboriculture) and East Sussex County Highways division were summarised within the report.

Councillor Tutt, Leader of the Council and Ward Councillor, addressed the committee in objection stating that the houses had originally been built with an open plan feel and that this scheme would adversely affect that design, the proposal would be an overdevelopment of the site and remove the open amenity of the land. In addition the area was prone to surface level flooding, which would be exacerbated by further development. Councillor Tutt also stated that parking was an issue in the vicinity and that as a blind corner access and egress to Filder Close would become dangerous.

Councillor Mattock, Ward Councillor, addressed the committee in objection stating that this was a tiny triangular site which if developed would be detrimental to the open plan estate, Councillor Mattock reiterated Councillor Tutt's concerns regarding increased surface level flooding should the site be developed.

**RESOLVED: (Unanimous)** That permission be refused on the grounds that 1) the siting and layout of the development, the proposal fails to respect the character and appearance of the surrounding residential area, and conflicts with the pattern and building line of existing development within Filder Close, affecting the open plan character of the existing neighbourhood 2) the design and position of the dwelling would result in an inappropriate and unneighbourly form of development that would be likely to have a negative impact upon the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of No29 Filder Close by reason of loss of light and overbearing relationship 3) the proposed private amenity space proposed is considered not to be in a usable configuration and as such is likely to result in a poor living environment for the likely occupiers of this new dwelling.

Informative:

As outlined within the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), in order for development to be supported it must first comply with local plans. The proposal does not accord with policy UHT1, UHT4, HO2, HO20 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan (Saved policies, 2007), B1, B2, D5 & C6 D10A of the Eastbourne Core Strategy Local Plan and on this basis has been refused.

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, is considered to be written representations.

**46 Gildredge Free School, Compton Place Road. Application ID: 140798.**

Erection of three-court sports hall – **UPPERTON.**

Members were reminded that this application was reported to Planning Committee in July 2014, and that at this committee revised drawings were tabled and Committee authorised a further round of consultation to seek the views/comments from interested third parties.

This consultation had concluded as save for one representation requesting to address committee no further representations had been received.

Members also informally requested through officers that samples including colour staining of the timber and or a sample panel be submitted so that its true impacts can/could be assessed. Sample materials in both aluminium and timber had been provided and were available for examination by the committee.



Amendments to the scheme had now been received showing the building to be partially clad in a proprietary timber cladding system.

The cladding was to be formed by Western Red Cedar which was to be treated to maintain its deep orange colour as previously requested by the committee. Following some discussion about the materials and treatment the contractor was asked to clarify the longevity of each of the materials. Mr Keefe, contractor, advised that the aluminium would have a 25yr guarantee whilst the timber would have a 15yr guarantee and would require additional maintenance during the 15yr period. The committee discussed the merits of both materials and decided that the untreated Western Red Cedar would be the most appropriate material, given that it would require less maintenance and was the most sustainable material. The committee also agreed that once the Cedar had weathered it would appear softer 'to the eye' and blend well with its surroundings.

Planning conditions had been recommended requiring the colour details of the exterior cladding and that this cladding should be fully installed prior to the sports hall being first occupied.

**RESOLVED: (By 7 votes with 1 abstention)** That permission be granted subject to the following conditions: 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of permission 2) The proposed development shall be carried out in strict accordance with drawings

Proposed Brise Soleil details

EX18074 SKETCH 3B received 11/07/2014

EX18074 SKETCH 5B received 11/07/2014

EX18074 SKETCH 4 received 11/07/2014

EX18074 SKETCH 2B received 11/07/2014

EX18074 SKETCH 1A received 11/07/2014

EX18074 SKETCH 5B received 11/07/2014

07859-A-L-(00)-X-0273-Rev C Received 10/06/2014

07859-A-L-(00)-X-0285-Rev D Received 10/06/2014

07859-A-L-(00)-X-0251-Rev E Received 10/06/2014

07859-A-L-(00)-X-0284-Rev C Received 10/06/2014

3) The exterior finishes of the timber cladding system hereby approved shall be formed in/by unstained/untreated Red Cedar. The details hereby approved shall be implemented at the site and retained as such thereafter  
4) The sports hall shall not be brought into beneficial use until such time as the cladding system has been erected/completed in full in accordance with the approved details.

**47 St Thomas A Beckett RC Infant School, 3 Tutts Barn Lane.  
Application ID: 140737 (PPP).**

Provision of a double mobile classroom unit to the south-west of the main building for a temporary period until August 2020 – **UPPERTON.**

Members were reminded that the application was reported to Planning Committee meeting on 8 July 2014 and Members were 'minded' to refuse planning permission due to a number of issues relating to the siting, scale and form of the development and the number of pupils.

This application fell to Eastbourne Borough Council to determine and officers had tried to secure amendments to the scheme to mitigate the concerns raised by members. The applicants had not been able to accede to any changes to the scheme and state that this was the one and only location within the site where the mobile classroom could be accommodated.

The applicant had confirmed that the additional school roll would be increased by 30 pupils and the second classroom space would be utilised by existing classes from within the school.

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

**NB:** Councillor Taylor did not take part in this item.

Members were advised that Mr S Hambrook from East Sussex County Council Children's Services was in attendance to answer member's questions. The committee discussed various aspects of the application including the sound-proofing of the proposed classroom, ventilation, class size, traffic pollution, parking and highway access; given the busy main road, disruption during 'dropping off' and 'picking up' times, and two new proposed large developments near the school, the development of a Traffic Plan, and monitoring of the air quality in and around the application site. The committee asked that Environmental Health be consulted regarding methods of monitoring particulates at the application site.

Mr Hambrook advised the committee that the classroom complied with Government guidelines and had additional facilities such as toilets and storage. The need for the temporary unit was based on the increase in numbers of children entering the education system. The temporary solution was part of a longer term assessment and forecasting of need throughout Eastbourne and it was essential that school places were in the most suitable location according to demographics. Traffic and parking would be a major consideration. The need for a double unit was to enable joint working for teachers and teaching assistants according to ability requirements and one-to-one teaching if necessary. The unit would be sound-proofed and air flow would be managed with windows on both sides of the building. There were no windows facing the main road. The Highways Division worked closely with schools across the County to develop suitable Traffic Plans which were the responsibility of the schools. Staff did try and encourage the use of other modes of transport.

#### **48 East Sussex County Council Highways Minor Plan Application Guidance.**

The committee considered the report of the Senior Specialist Advisor (Planning) informing members of the changes in the way East Sussex County Council Highways would be respond to planning application consultations.

In response to Section 16 1 (d) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010, East Sussex

County Council, as Local Highway Authority, had resolved that it did not intend to make representations to Local Planning Authorities on new or existing residential developments comprising 5 dwellings or less which were accessed off a C class road highway that was subject to a 30mph speed limit, or off an unclassified highway, as defined in the Standing Advice.

This approach had been rolled out across all East Sussex authorities.

The application of the threshold and terms in which East Sussex County Council (ESCC) Highways would be consulted were summarised within the report.

In the main the standing advice sought to clarify the main issues that arose in the evaluation/determination of this level of application. The topic areas covered in the standing advice were:-

- Visibility
- Turning
- Parking
- Pedestrian/cycle movements
- New or altered access arrangements

The Standing Advice document also included a suite of standard reasons for refusal and also recommended planning conditions.

Members were aware that the majority of the applications determined by Eastbourne Borough Council (approx. 90%) were of a minor/non-significant form and were determined using officer delegated powers in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee.

Notwithstanding this standing advice, colleagues from ESCC had commented that they would continue to look at all applications where EBC were looking to recommend that the application should be refused on highways grounds to see if in their specialist opinion a refusal could be substantiated/supported.

#### **NOTED.**

#### **49 Summary of Performance of Planning Services - Quarter 1 (April - June 2014).**

The committee considered the report of the Senior Specialist Advisor (Planning) which provided a summary of performance in relation to key areas of the Development Management Services for the first quarter (April - June) 2014.

Given the many varied types of planning application received Central Government required that all Councils report the performance in a consistent and coherent manner. Therefore the many varied applications were grouped together into three broad categories Major, Minor and Others. Applications falling into each category were outlined within the report.

In analysing the performance for the processing of these differing types of application the Government allow 13 weeks for the processing Major

applications and 8 weeks for processing the Minor and Other categories. The figures detailed within the report highlighted the development control performance figures against these categories for the calendar year 2013 and the first quarter of 2014 (April – June).

In addition the report also included information about the recent appeal decisions. Members were requested to note that any decision made to refuse an application opened the potential for an appeal by the applicant to the Planning Inspectorate.

As members were aware the majority of the applications received were granted planning permission, however for those that were refused and challenged through to an appeal it was considered important to analyse the appeal decisions in order to determine and evaluate whether lessons needed to be learnt, or interpretations needed to be given different weight at the decision making stage. In addition the evaluation of the appeal decisions would also go some way to indicate the robustness and the correct application of the current and emerging policy context at both a local and national level.

Members were reminded that along with all Councils performance had to be reported to Central Government and where authorities were deemed to be underperforming then they would be placed in 'special measures'. There were two criteria against which Councils would be assessed. It was therefore important to keep abreast of all decisions with regard to maintaining performance above the 'special measure' thresholds as detailed within the report.

Officers considered that in granting planning permission for 94% of all applications received, planning services of Eastbourne Borough Council had supported/stimulated the local economy and had also helped to meet the aspirations of the applicants. Only where there were substantive material planning considerations was an application refused.

The assessment of the performance of planning services showed that the team were performing at or over the National PI threshold and that there were at this time special measure issues. Eastbourne may not trigger the special measures threshold for Government intervention due to the number of major applications received. Notwithstanding this for the first six months of 2014 Eastbourne had one major application going through to an appeal decision and this was overturned resulting in 100% of cases being overturned.

With regards to appeals, all applications that were refused had the potential to be appealed by the applicant. The Council for the first 6 months of the calendar year (up until the end of June) had received 7 appeals; some of these appeals had not yet been decided, but all appeals that had been received were evaluated within the report.

Appendix 1 to the report included further application data by ward and also the number /type of pre application requests received.

Councillor Jenkins requested a further breakdown of the decisions with specific reference to the level of decision (Delegated/Planning Committee) and further analysis of refused applications at Planning Committee. It was confirmed this would be included in the next performance report.

**NOTED.**

**50 Tree Preservation Order No. 166 (2014) - Land at 26 Saffrons Park, Eastbourne.**

The Committee considered the report of the Senior Head of Development and Lawyer to the Council which sought confirmation of a tree preservation order. On 9th April, 2014, the Senior Specialist Adviser (Arboriculture) exercised his delegated powers by authorising the making of a provisional tree preservation order on one Sycamore, one Yew and one Scots Pine on the above land.

Objections have been received from the owners and residents of five properties in Saffrons Park. The objections were detailed within the report. The Council's response to the issues raised were summarised within the report and it was recommended that the Order be confirmed, without modification, on the grounds that the trees made a significant contribution to the visual amenity of the area

**RESOLVED:** That the Eastbourne Borough Council Tree Preservation Order (Land at 26 Saffrons Park, Eastbourne, East Sussex) No. 166 (2014) be confirmed without modification.

**51 South Downs National Park Authority Planning Applications.**

There were none.

The meeting closed at 8.40 pm

**Councillor Ungar (Chairman)**