

Tuesday, 24 March 2015  
at 6.00 pm



# Planning Committee

Present:-

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

## **145 Minutes of the meeting held on 3 March 2015.**

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 March 2015 were submitted and approved and the Chairman was authorised to sign them as an accurate record.

## **146 Apologies for absence.**

An apology for absence was reported from Councillor Harris.

## **147 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 Jenkins declared a personal interest in minute 150 Harford Battersby House as members of his family lived in the premises directly related to the application site and withdrew from the room whilst this application was considered.

## **148 10 Saffrons Park. Application ID: 150076.**

Demolish part of existing conservatory to side and rear. Replace with single storey extension to side and rear on the same footprint as existing conservatory – **MEADS**. One letter of objection had been received.

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

The committee was advised that Core Strategy Policy D10 Design was considered relevant to the determination of this application.

**RESOLVED: (Unanimous)** That permission be granted subject to the following conditions: 1) Time Limit 2) Approved 3) Matching Materials.

## **149 72 Sancroft Road. Application ID: 141520.**

This item was withdrawn.

## **150 Harford Battersby House. Application ID: 141605.**

Change of use of car park at the rear of Harford Battersby House to a public pay and display car park, involving the demolition of the existing garages – **MEADS**. Six objections had been received.

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

The observations of the East Sussex County Highways Authority and the Specialist Advisor (Conservation) were summarised within the report.

At its meeting on 17 February 2015, the Conservation Area Advisory Group expressed some reservations regarding the commercial nature of the development at the rear of this residential property and the intensification of the use which could have an impact on the character of the conservation area.

NB: Councillor Jenkins withdrew from the room whilst this application was considered.

**RESOLVED: (Unanimous)** That permission be refused on the grounds that the proposed development would have an adverse impact on residential amenity and the character and appearance of the conservation area as a result of noise, disturbance, intensity of use and the paraphernalia associated with the operation of a pay and display car park. It would therefore conflict with policies B2, C1, D1, D8 and D10 of the Eastbourne Core Strategy Local Plan 2013, policy TC15 of the Town Centre Local Plan 2013 and policies UHT1, UHT4, UHT15, HO20, TR2, TR6 and TR11 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan Saved Policies 2007, and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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.

**151 16 Beach Road. Application ID: 141613.**

Change of use from Class D2 to Class D1 (non-residential institution). No external changes proposed – **DEVONSHIRE**. Three objections had been received.

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

The Specialist Advisor (Planning Policy) raised no objection.

The committee was advised that a response had been received from East Sussex County Highways Department stating that 'No objections to the proposal as the proposed use was likely to have less highways impacts than the lawful use. Taken from the TRICS highways database I can confirm the following:- The use as a church would result in a far lower number of trips throughout the day (55) when compared to a pub use (there isn't a direct comparison for the current use) which would create in the region of 140 trips. The parking demand is therefore likely to be similar or lower than currently'.

**RESOLVED: (Unanimous)** That permission be granted subject to the following conditions: 1) Time limit 2) Strict accordance with approved drawings 3) Hours of use (08.30 – 22.00 Monday to Sunday) 4) No noise audible outside of the building.

**152 Land to the rear of 2-8 Queens Crescent. Application ID: 150070.**

Demolition of 10 lock-up garages and erection of 6 x terraced 2bedroomed houses together with access drive and ancillary parking – **ST ANTHONYS**. Four objections had been received.

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

The Specialist Advisor (Planning Policy) and East Sussex County Highways department raised no objection to the proposals.

Mr Wooller addressed the committee in objection stating that he did not object to the development in principle, however the proposal for six dwellings represented an overdevelopment that would impinge on his privacy resulting in overlooking into his garden and that the scheme would create additional parking pressures in the surrounding area.

The committee agreed that the proposal was an overdevelopment. Members were concerned with the narrow access road and potential dangers to vehicles and pedestrians accessing the site.

**RESOLVED: (Unanimous)** That permission be refused on the grounds that 1) the proposal by reason of its design/location and appearance would result in an overdevelopment and unneighbourly form of development that would be out of character with the prevailing pattern of development in the area and also result in a material loss of amenity through direct overlooking 2) the use of the site for 6 dwelling houses would give rise to an increase in vehicle movements at and within the vicinity of the site and may lead to an increase in indiscriminate on street parking 3) there had been no commitment to secure/honour the development's Community Infrastructure Levy requirements and as such the proposal was considered to have an adverse impact upon the delivery of local/regional infrastructure.

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.

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

None reported.

The meeting closed at 7.00 pm

**Councillor Ungar (Chairman)**