

Tuesday, 2 June 2015
at 6.00 pm



Planning Committee

Present:-

Members: Councillor Murray (Chairman) Councillor Sabri (Deputy-Chairman)
Councillors Jenkins, Miah, Murdoch, Salisbury, Taylor and Ungar

1 Minutes of the meeting held on 21 April 2015.

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 April 2015 were submitted and approved and the Chairman was authorised to sign them as an accurate record.

2 Apologies for absence.

There were none.

3 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 Ungar declared a personal and prejudicial interest in minute 20, Cavendish School, having objected to the original application. Councillor Ungar addressed the committee from the floor and then withdrew from the room whilst the item was considered.

Councillor Taylor declared a personal interest in minute 20, Cavendish School as a member of East Sussex County Council Planning committee. Councillor Taylor remained in the room whilst the application was considered but did not take part in the discussion or vote thereon.

Councillor Murdoch declared a personal interest in minute 5, 21-22 and 25 Edison Road as the application site was adjacent to his place of worship, however, he did not consider this would affect his deliberation of the application.

Councillor Taylor also declared a personal interest in minute 4, 7-9 Neville Avenue as the owner of a residential care home, however, he did not consider this would affect his deliberation of the application.

4 Continuation of the Meeting.

In accordance with Part 4, Rules of Procedure of the Council's Constitution the committee agreed to extend the meeting to 11.00pm. The motion was proposed by Councillor Ungar and seconded by Councillor Murdoch.

RESOLVED: (Unanimously) That the hours of business for the Planning committee on 2 June 2015 be extended to 11.00pm.

5 7-9 Neville Avenue. Application ID: 150357 (PPP).

Two storey extension at side and rear to provide nine additional en-suite bedrooms, and internal alterations to provide improved circulation, an additional lounge and en-suite facilities - **HAMPDEN PARK**. Four letters of objection had been received.

The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report. The observations of the Specialist Advisor (Arboriculture), the Environment Agency and East Sussex County Council Highways Department were summarised within the report.

An additional statement supplied by the applicant, was reported to the committee, providing further justification for their proposal and summarised as follows:

- It is one of the top care homes in Eastbourne
- The ambition is to provide more in depth and wider care provision for existing and prospective residents
- Improved care (specialist bedrooms)
- En-suite facilities provide improved respect and personal dignity
- Larger rooms were capable of providing ever-increasing demand for specialist equipment and aids
- Improved access - full bed lift would allow bed bound residents access throughout the home
- Improved quality of life (full access to all existing specialist care and recreational areas and equipment
- The proposal would help to support the viability of the business and thereby give job security and security to residents
- Once fully established 3 additional jobs would be created

Mr Talbot addressed the committee in objection stating that there would be no garden or open space left at the site, the development would be an overdevelopment and would dominate the street scene.

Mr Franks, Agent, addressed the committee in response stating that the design had been remodelled to blend with the surrounding properties and had taken residents' concerns into consideration. The Care home provided much needed specialist services to Eastbourne residents and the expansion was required to continue to provide the best care possible.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) 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 this permission 2) The use hereby permitted shall not commence until the existing access has been stopped up and the kerb and footway reinstated in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by the Director of Economy Transport and Environment 3) The new access shall be in the position shown on the submitted plan [number: SK11 rev:F and laid out and constructed in accordance with the attached HT407 form/diagram and all works undertaken shall be executed and completed by the applicant to the

satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of development 4) The development shall not be occupied until parking areas have been provided in accordance with the approved plans and the areas shall thereafter be retained for that use and shall not be used other than for the parking of motor vehicles 5) The development shall not be occupied until cycle parking areas have been provided in accordance with details which have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority and the areas shall thereafter be retained for that use and shall not be used other than for the parking of cycles 6) All existing trees shall be retained, unless shown on the approved drawings as being removed. All trees on and immediately adjoining the site shall be protected from damage as a result of works on the site, to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. This should be in accordance with its Supplementary Planning Guidance and relevant British Standards (BS 5837: 2012) for the duration of the works on site. In the event that trees become damaged or otherwise defective within five years following the contractual practical completion of the development, the Local Planning Authority shall be notified as soon as reasonably practicable and remedial action agreed and implemented 7) Tree Protection: fencing. A design of the tree protection to be approved by the Borough council's specialist Advisor in Arboriculture 8) Prior to the demolition of the bin store details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include:-

- A. A method statement on the demolition of the existing bin store to prevent damage to the existing trees on site.
- B. Agree the location of site office, method statement for construction access routes and material storage areas before commencement of construction and demolition.

9) At no time shall there be any burning/bonfires anywhere at the site 10) The detailed landscaping plans to be submitted pursuant shall include a plan at not less than 1:200 scale, showing the position of any trees proposed to be retained with root protection areas plotted, and the positions and routes of all proposed and existing pipes, drains, sewers, and public services, including gas, electricity, telephone and water. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order, 1995 (or of any Order revoking and re-enacting or amending that Order with or without modification), no services shall be dug or laid into the ground other than in accordance with the approved details 11) No retained tree shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree be topped or lopped other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority. Any topping or lopping approved shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 3998:2010. No equipment, machinery or materials shall be brought on to the site for the purpose of the development, until a scheme showing the exact position of protective fencing to enclose all retained trees at the edge of the required root protection area in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design, demolition and construction, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and; the protective fencing has been erected in accordance with the approved details. This fencing shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made, without the prior written consent of the Local

Planning Authority. In this condition retained tree means an existing tree which is to be retained in accordance with the approved plans and particulars; and paragraphs (a) and (b) above shall have effect until the expiration of five years from the first occupation or the completion of the development, whichever is the later 12) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings no 13) No additional windows, doors or other means of opening shall be inserted into any first floor elevation without the writing consent of the Local Planning Department.

6 21-22 and 25 Edison Road. Application ID: 150072 (PPP).

Demolition of existing unit and replacement with new high bay warehouse, loading bay area, plant room and associated offices – **HAMPDEN PARK.**

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

The observations of the Specialist Advisors for Economic Development, Planning Policy, Arboriculture, the East Sussex County Council Archaeologist and Highways Department were summarised within the report.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That permission be granted subject to a S106 agreement covering local employment initiatives and travel plan monitoring fee and the following conditions: 1) Time 2) Approved Plans 3) External materials 4) Hard and soft landscaping 5) Changing and welfare facilities for Cyclists 6) Refuse Facilities 7) Exterior lighting details 8) Limitation to hours of Loading or Unloading 9) Demolition and construction times 10) Construction method statement 11) Construction plant and machinery shall be parked/stored clear of the public highway 12) Traffic management scheme 13) Archaeological programme 14) Results of Investigation 15) Foundation design 16) In accordance with BREEAM.

Informative:

The applicant is advised to contact the local gas provider due to the close proximity to the site of a gas governor.

It is expected that the *written scheme of investigation* would confirm the action to be taken and accord with the relevant portions of the East Sussex County Council document *Recommended Standard Conditions for Archaeological Fieldwork, Recording and Post – Excavation in East Sussex (Development Control) (2008) including Annexe B.*

7 29 Filder Close. Application ID: 150365 (HHH).

Erection of 2 storey side extension (Amended description) – **ST ANTHONYS.** Five objections had been received. A further objection had been received, commenting on the external design, appearance and layout, highways safety and parking, impact on the environment and parking problems.

The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report. The observations of the East Sussex County Council Highway Department, and Councillor Tutt, Leader of the Council, were summarised within the report.

Mrs Shadbolt-Smith addressed the committee in objection stating that the site enjoyed an open aspect and any development at this site would alter the current view, the proposal was also of an inappropriate design. Further concerns were expressed regarding the flooding and soak-away at the application site.

Councillor Tutt, Leader of the Council, addressed the committee in objection stating that the previous reasons for refusal were still relevant and expressed concern about the drainage and flood table.

An additional condition had been recommended regarding the finished floor level.

RESOLVED: (By 5 votes to 3) That permission be refused on the grounds that by reason of the setting and layout of the development, the proposal fails to respect the character and appearance of the surrounding residential area, and conflicts with the pattern of existing development within Filder Close, affecting the open plan character of the existing neighbourhood not in accordance with Policy D10a of the Eastbourne Core Strategy Local Plan and Policies UHT1 and UHT4 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan (Saved Policies) 2007.

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.

8 52 Upper Kings Drive. Application ID: 150280.

Demolition of part of existing garage and erection of a two storey extension at the side – **RATTON**. One letter of objection and one letter of support had been received.

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

Mr Clapperton addressed the committee in objection stating that no consideration had been given to the maintenance of his property in the positioning of the proposed extension, the distance from the boundary of his property and the impact of the build process.

Mr Rakliff, Applicant, addressed the committee in response stating that he was making use of the available space, with a steel frame construction removing the impact of the build process on the neighbouring property and minimising disruption to his neighbour.

RESOLVED: (By 6 votes to 1 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings submitted on 11th March 2015:

- DWG 1, Pro. G/F Plan
- DWG 2, Pro. F/F Plan
- DWG 3, Pro. Front Elev.
- DWG 4, Pro. Rear Elev.
- DWG 5, Pro. Section A:A
- DWG 6, Pro. Side Elev.
- DWG 9, Site Location and Block Plans

3) The external finishes of the development hereby permitted shall match in material, colour, style, bonding and texture those of the existing building 4) The first floor rear window of the addition shall not be glazed otherwise than with obscured glass and thereafter permanently retained as such 5) Notwithstanding the details shown on the plans hereby approved and for the avoidance of doubt no part of the extension shall encroach onto the plot/property/airspace of the adjacent plot/property No 54 Upper Kings Drive.

9 93 Royal Parade. Application ID: 150208 (PPP).

Retrospective application for Change of Use from Guesthouse (Class C1) to HMO (Sui Generis Class) with 6 bedrooms (with en-suite bathrooms) to accommodate up to 12 people – **DEVONSHIRE**. 23 letters of objection had been received.

The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report. The observations of Councillor Wallis, the Tourism Manager, Specialist Advisors for Planning Policy and Conservation, the Eastbourne Hotels' Association and East Sussex County Council Highways Department were summarised within the report. The County Archaeologist and Eastbourne Society made no comment.

The applicant had supplied a further statement within which they outlined that their previous business tenant vacated the property at very short notice resulting in an alternative use being sought by the owners in order to maintain their income and finance the debt on the property.

Mr Godfrey addressed the committee in objection stating that the proposal didn't comply with the Council's policies and that it would exacerbate the existing parking issues and expressed concern for the size of the bedrooms.

Councillor Wallis, Ward Councillor, addressed the committee in objection stating that the development was inappropriate in a key tourist accommodation area. Councillor Wallis also expressed concerns regarding the economic case provided to support the change of use.

Mr Vander, Agent, addressed the committee in response stating that objections were based on perception and that the property had run as an HMO without complaint for the last seven months. The tenants were thoroughly vetted to minimise concern and impact for neighbours, and the property was being appropriately maintained.

The committee expressed their concerns regarding the change of use, and stated that Eastbourne needed to retain guesthouse accommodation for visitors. Members also expressed concern regarding the size of the accommodation offered.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That permission be refused and enforcement action be authorised to secure cessation of the unlawful use on the grounds that 1) The proposal seeks approval for the retention of an House in Multiple Occupation with the defined Tourist Accommodation Zone and as such is considered to be contrary to Policy HO14 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan (saved policies) 2007 2) The proposal seeks to create living accommodation for up to 12 residents and it is considered that the property is inappropriate for this intensity of conversion, and as such would have an adverse effect on the amenity of the area generally, and the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of the neighbouring properties in particular, by reason of increased in activity, noise and general disturbance and would conflict with policies B2 of the Eastbourne Core Strategy Local Plan 2013, Policies HO9 and HO14 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan (Saved Policies) 2007 and paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework 3) The proposal does not provide for adequate parking facilities within the site which would result in additional congestion on the public highway causing interference with the free flow and safety of traffic on the B2106 Royal Parade and surrounding streets 4) The proposal, given the poor standard/quality of accommodation, is likely to create an unacceptable living environment for the future tenants/occupiers of this building/use, and would therefore conflict with policies B2 of the Eastbourne Core Strategy Local Plan 2013 and Policies HO9 and HO14 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan (Saved Policies) 2007 and paragraph 17 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.

10 153 Victoria Drive. Application ID: 150092.

Conversion of first floor residential accommodation to form 1 one-bedroom flat and 2 two-bedroom flats with access from the rear – **OLD TOWN**. Two general comments had been received.

The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report. The observations of the East Sussex County Council Highway Department were summarised within the report. The Specialist Advisor (Environmental Health) made no comment.

The committee expressed concern regarding the extraction units / plant and their proximity to the proposed flats.

NB: Councillor Taylor was not available for the officer's presentation on this application and therefore did not take part in the discussion on this item.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That the application be deferred pending further information and clarification regarding the proximity of extraction units / plant to the proposed flats.

11 153 Victoria Drive. Application ID: 150342.

Demolition of existing garage and erection of one four-bedroom dwelling with one parking space – **OLD TOWN**. Two further letters of support were reported at the meeting. A further two letters of objection were also reported raising concerns regarding the external design, appearance and layout, residential amenity and highway and parking safety.

The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report. The observations of the Specialist Advisor (Planning Policy) and East Sussex County Council Highway Department were summarised within the report. The Specialist Advisor (Arboriculture) made no comment.

RESOLVED: (By 5 votes to 4 (on the Chairman's casting vote)) That permission be granted subject to the following conditions: 1) The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings no:

- 14E3A.LO.002 Rev 01
 - 14EA3.LO.100 Rev 01
 - 14EA3.LO.101 Rev 00
 - 14EA3.LO.102 Rev 01
 - 14EA3.LO.200 Rev 01
 - 14EA3.LO.201 Rev 01
 - 14EA3.LO.300 Rev 01 submitted on 24th April 2015.
- 3) The hard surface within the front garden of the property hereby approved shall be made of porous materials and retained thereafter or provision shall be made and retained thereafter to direct run-off water from the hard surface to a permeable or porous area or surface within the curtilage of the property so that surface water does not run off the site onto and across the public footpath/highway 4) The dwelling house hereby approved shall not be occupied until full details of the means of enclosure/boundary treatments to be constructed on all boundaries of the plot/site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority 5) No development shall commence until fences for the protection of trees to be retained to the front of the site have been erected in accordance with British Standard 5837 (2005). The fences shall be retained until the completion of the development and no vehicles, plant or materials shall be driven or placed within the areas enclosed by such fences 6) The external materials (facing brick and roof tiles) to the property hereby approved shall match those used in the adjacent property No 1 Beechy Avenue 7) 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.

12 183a Langney Road. Application ID: 141346 (PPP).

Demolition of 3 vacant retail units and construction of 9 no. one and two bed apartments – **DEVONSHIRE**. One objection had been received.

The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report. The observations of Councillor Steve Wallis, the Specialist Advisor (Economic Development), the Environment Agency, East Sussex County Council Highway Department and the Eastbourne Design Review Panel (DRP) were summarised within the report.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That permission be granted subject to the following conditions: 1) Time Limits 2) Approved Plans 3) Materials 4) Construction method Statement to include demotion and construction times 5) Privacy screens to the upper level terrace 6) provision of bike & bin store before first occupation of units 7) Hard and soft landscaping 8) In accordance with the submitted FRA

13 199 Seaside. Application ID: 150424.

Erection of first floor rear extension and single storey rear extension to side of rear projection. (Amended description) – **DEVONSHIRE**. A number of objections had been received.

Ms Maddison addressed the committee in objection stating that there would be a loss of light to habitable rooms, noise pollution, overlooking and a loss of privacy. The proposal would potentially undermine the footings to neighbouring properties and would be out of keeping with the surrounding area.

Ms Elliott, Applicant, addressed the committee in response stating that there would be no further loss of light as the properties were already closely situated. The Planning Department had not raised the same concerns as objectors. Ms Elliott also stated that the rear of the properties were not identical and that therefore the extension would not be out of keeping.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That permission be refused on the grounds that 1) the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (7 – Good Design) states that development should be ‘visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping’. This is echoed by Eastbourne Borough Council Core Strategy Local Plan Policies B2 (Creating Sustainable Neighbourhoods) and B10A (Design) which state that development should be “attractive, well-designed contributing to a high quality local environment that makes a positive contribution to the appearance of the townscape; in doing this all developments should deliver a ‘sense of place’ that is distinctive”. 2) The size, design and appearance of the two storey extension would be incongruous to the terrace of which the site is a part, and unbalance it as a whole as viewed by surrounding properties with a view of the rear of the site 3) Eastbourne Borough Plan Saved Policy HO20 (Residential Amenity) states that “proposals will be refused unless they can demonstrate that they do not cause unacceptable ... overshadowing and/or loss of light.” The two storey extension will block the currently available direct sunlight to the dining room and kitchen of no.201 Seaside.

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.

14 Beach adjacent to 3 and 4 Lower Parade, Grand Parade. Application ID: 150276 (PPP).

Extension of timber decked area to beach to be used in conjunction with existing Cafe Express and Belissimo Express cafes – **DEVONSHIRE**. Three representations had been received.

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

The observations of the Tourism Manager, Specialist Advisors for Environmental Health, Conservation and Engineering and the Eastbourne Hospitality Association were summarised within the report. The Estate Manager made no comment.

Members were advised that the revised scheme reported to Planning committee increased the extent of separation between the two areas of decking.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That permission be granted subject to the following conditions: 1) Commencement within three years 2) Development in accordance with the approved plans 3) Submission of details of foundations 4) No mains electrical/gas/water connection through promenade

15 Beach Huts, Royal Parade. Application ID: 150265 (PPP).

Erection of two terraces of 10 standard beach huts along the seafront adjacent to Fort Fun car park – **DEVONSHIRE**. A representation regarding parking spaces and waste disposal was reported at the meeting.

The committee was advised that the hardstanding area had been removed from the application.

The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report. The observations of the Specialist Advisor (Engineering), the Environment Agency and County Ecologist were summarised within the report. The committee was advised that the Specialist Advisor (Economic Development) supported the application.

RESOLVED: (By 7 votes to 1) That permission be granted subject to the following conditions: 1) Commencement within 3 years 2) Development in accordance with the approved plans.

16 Eastbourne Pier. Application ID: 150285.

Installation of rides and stalls upon the decking at the location of the former Blue Room at Eastbourne Pier for a temporary period of at least 18 months prior to redevelopment. (Amended description) – **DEVONSHIRE**. One objection had been received. Five further objections and two general

observations were reported at the meeting and were summarised as follows:

- Noise, disturbance, fumes, anti-social behaviour from the rides. If approved would encourage other similar operators to use the seafront.
- No details of opening hours.
- Additional traffic and parking along seafront which was already congested.
- Why delay in reinstating blue room. The Pier must be reinstated to its original state at the end of 18 months.
- Reinstatement of Pier not just for the benefit of local residents but for Eastbourne, Eastbourne's tourist industry as a whole and as a legacy to future generations.
- Out of keeping with the character and appearance of the conservation area and listed buildings, detrimental to the character, integrity and historic interest of the Eastbourne Seafront.
- Would be an eyesore similar to Brighton Pier.
- Eastbourne is unique in not having such fairground rides on the pier and were totally inappropriate.
- Can foresee a situation where proposal could be of a permanent nature.
- Proposal requires flexibility as to change of rides etc. and there was therefore no guarantee as to what would be retained.
- The rides were not consistent either with the aesthetic and architectural style of the pier.
- Will have adverse economic impact on other similar businesses in the area such as Fort Fun.

The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report. The observations of the Specialist Advisors for Planning Policy and Conservation were summarised within the report.

At their meeting on 2 June 2015 the Conservation Area Advisory Group considered that the proposal's impact on the character of the pier was not acceptable in principle, however would not object to a temporary period of six months. The Group raised serious concerns regarding the lack of detail in the applicant's proposal and their long term plans. If permission was granted, the Group recommended that a planning condition be imposed that required the prior approval of each ride.

The committee was advised that Historic England raised no objection subject to the proposed conditions in the short term, whilst the reinstatement of the Blue Room was progressed.

Mrs Scoufarides addressed the committee in objection stating that the proposal was detrimental to the character and appearance of Eastbourne seafront. There would be increased noise pollution, rubbish and traffic congestion. Mrs Scoufarides also highlighted that the hours of operation had not been included in the application.

The committee raised concerns about the temporary nature of the application, the hours of operation, the type of amusements, the lack of control of the use of available space and the potential resulting restrictions for pedestrians.

The Senior Specialist Advisor (Planning) advised that a S.106 agreement could be sought to restrict operational hours and length of permission.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That permission be refused on the grounds that the proposal fails to preserve or enhance the special historic interest, integrity and architectural merit of the Grade II* listed pier and its immediate setting within the historic seafront together with an adverse impact on the setting of surrounding listed buildings, to the detriment of this site in particular and surrounding area in general. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies UHT17 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2007, Policy D10 of the Eastbourne Core Strategy Local Plan 2013 and paragraphs 131 to 136 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative:

In the light of this decision and in accordance with paragraph 136 of the NPPF, the applicant is encouraged to take all reasonable steps to progress the reinstatement of the Blue Room building with a replacement building and should contact the Council without undue delay to facilitate the development.

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.

17 Flat 1 Castle Mount, 40 Carlisle Road. Application ID: 150344 (PPP).

Replacement of ground floor window on rear elevation with a door and window set – **MEADS**. Six objections had been received.

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

The Specialist Advisor (Conservation) had no objections to this proposal and their comments were summarised within the report.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That permission be granted subject to the following conditions: 1) Time Limit 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings received on 29 March 2015:

916-01 A - Change window at rear for door - Elevation Proposed
 Site Location Plan, Block Plan

3) The external finishes of the development hereby permitted shall match in material, colour, style, bonding and texture those of the existing building, as outlined under section 10. Materials of the submitted application form.

18 Heatherleigh Hotel 63-66 Royal Parade. Application ID: 141521 (PPP).

Proposed change of use from redundant hotel into 12no. holiday flats and 16no. residential flats including demolition of 4no. garages at rear, alterations to remaining three garages to form secure cycle storage and

refuse storage, together with the formation of parking spaces. Removal of front sun lounge – **DEVONSHIRE**. Five letters of objection and one letter of support had been received.

The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report. The observations of the Estate Manager, the Tourism Manager, Southern Water, the Environment Agency, Eastbourne Hotels' Association, the County Archaeologist and East Sussex County Council Highways Department were summarised within the report.

The committee was advised that an independent report had been commissioned by the Council in order to determine and evaluate the content of the applicants' evidence that had accompanied their application. The main points from this report were summarised as follows:

- That it was uneconomic for the building to remain fully in hotel use.
- The cost of the refurbishment outweighed the likely capital value of the building once it had been refurbished. This had been evidenced by comparisons with a number of trading hotels in differing areas of the town which also provided a range of offers (sea view/spa facilities etc.)
- Given the room layout and the costs of the refurbishment it was unlikely post refurbishment to achieve rating greater than 2/3 star and thereby would not deliver a satisfactory rate of return on the investment.
- The poor performance of the hotel prior to its closure and the recent failure to achieve a sale of the building were both symptomatic of the buildings inadequacies in the continued hotel use

RESOLVED: (By 6 votes to 2) That permission be granted subject to a S106 covering local employment initiatives, the delivery of affordable housing and controls over the timing of the delivery of the refurbishment of the hotel/guest house, the S106 should express that no more than 5 of the residential units hereby approved shall be sold/occupied until such time as the retained hotel/guest house had been fully refurbished in accordance with the following conditions: 1) Time Limit 2) In accordance with the approved drawings 3) Details, including Samples, of a Good Quality of Materials to be used on external elements of the proposed development, where required, to be submitted to the satisfaction of the Council 4) Controls over Construction and Demolition Times 5) Making good after demolition of conservatory and garages 6) Tree Planting and Landscaping 7) Boundary Treatment 8) Refuse enclosure 9) Vehicle and bicycle parking to be provided and retained, in accordance with the approved plans 10) Surface and Foul Water Drainage Arrangements 11) Hard Surfacing Details 12) Details of any external lighting required 13) Controls to ensure retention of tourist let uses 14) Control to limit the occupancy of the open residential units until such time as the holiday accommodation has been refurbished and is trading.

19 Perrywinkles, 1b Lower Parade, Grand Parade. Application ID: 150195.

Provision of decking area on the beach for Periwinkles seafood outlet adjacent to the lower promenade together with the removal of 2 sections of railings to facilitate access to the deck. (Amended description) – **DEVONSHIRE**. One objection had been received.

The observations of the Specialist Advisors for Conservation and Engineering, the Environment Agency and County Ecologist were summarised within the report.

The Estate Manager and Specialist Advisor (Economic Development) made no comment.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That permission be granted subject to the following conditions: 1) Commencement within 3 years 2) Development in accordance with the approved plans 3) Submission of details of foundations 4) Submission of details of balustrading.

20 Site 8, Sovereign Harbour. Application ID: 141469 (RMT).

Reserved matters (Access, Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale) application relating to condition 1 of outline application Reference:131002 for the development of site 8 at Sovereign Harbour for up to 8 dwellings, open space and berth holder facilities and related discharge in respect of site 8 of the following conditions: condition 1 (reserved matters), condition 4 (within 2 years), condition 172 (harbour wall maintenance) conditions 9 & 192 (restriction of residential units, condition 177 (estate road layout), condition 191 (public spaces) – **SOVEREIGN.**

The committee was advised that this application had been deferred from the Planning committee in February 2015 in order to seek revisions (amended drawings) to the design of the 'public open space' element within the scheme.

The agents for the application had submitted revised details for the area of 'public open space' and had also provided commentary on a number of other issues discussed at the February 2015 Planning committee which were summarised within the report.

The representations that had been received in each round of consultation were detailed within the report.

East Sussex County Council Highways Department had commented that vehicle and cycle parking had been considered and access to the site was sufficient. The observations of the Sovereign Harbour Residents Association were summarised within the report.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That permission be granted subject to the following reserved matters conditions: 1) Time limit 2) In accordance with the approved plans 3) No development shall commence before details of the boundary treatment (including privacy screens) for the building plots hereby approved are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority 4) Prior to its installation at the site details of the location, design and appearance of any external plant and machinery associated with the dwellings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details as approved shall be implemented at the site be retained as such thereafter.

21 Cavendish School, Eldon Road. Application ID: 150534 (CCC).

East Sussex County Council Re-Consultation to Cavendish School – **OLD TOWN.**

The committee was advised that since the application was last considered by the Planning Committee in November 2014 the applicant had carried out further traffic analysis including survey work in Eldon Road, Willingdon Road and Cobbold Avenue. The amendments to the scheme were detailed within the report.

It was accepted and acknowledged that there was an identified need for this accommodation within Eastbourne and it was accepted that East Sussex County Council had undertaken a thorough audit of available/potential sites to meet/mitigate this need. It was considered that this site was the only one available and deliverable within the time frames required.

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

An additional response to officers' questions was provided by the applicants and reported at the meeting. The questions related to:

- The internal roadway, its potential to cause loss of amenity to the houses that abut the site, and how this impact would be mitigated.
- Further clarity over on the location and extent of the proposed cycle storage was sought.
- During pick up and drop off times how one-way access would be retained.
- Further detailed drawings for a pedestrian controlled crossing outside of the school in Eldon Road were requested.
- The controls that were being imposed over the non-school use of the MUGA
- Clarification regarding the use of floodlights.

Mr Askew, Chairman of the Board of Governors, addressed the committee in support stating that there had already been an uptake for the reception class with over 800 Facebook followers in support of the proposals. The new school would provide better facilities for all students. The traffic issues had been resolved by relocating the entrance.

Mr Hambrook, East Sussex County Council, addressed the committee stating that there was a need for additional school places, with an increase in school age children in the vicinity of the school. The previous highways concerns had been addressed with the 'kiss and drop' being relocated on-site and the travel plan indicated that less than 50% of school children would arrive by car. Screening would be provided for properties adjoining the site.

Councillor Ungar, Ward Councillor, addressed the committee in objection stating that the proposal was an overdevelopment which was of poor architectural merit. Councillor Ungar felt that the site was already fully utilised, with additional school places required in other areas of the town. Concern was also expressed regarding the potential for flood lighting at the

MUGA, access from Cobbold Avenue, the increase in traffic in the vicinity of the school and access to the disabled parking provided on-site.

The committee expressed concern regarding the loss of open space, current traffic issues and the impact of additional traffic in the surrounding area and safety issues for the pupils with increased traffic at the site. The committee felt that whilst the new scheme was an improvement the traffic issues were just being transferred from Eldon Road to Cobbold Avenue.

The committee requested that consideration be given to the addition of a pelican crossing and reduction in the speed limit in Eldon Road. The Chairman requested that the frontage of the school fabric be softened by using a mixture of building materials. The Senior Specialist Advisor (Planning) agreed to report the committee's comments to East Sussex County Council and agreed to update the Chairman on the outcome of the application following its consideration by the East Sussex County Council's Planning committee.

NB: Councillor Taylor withdrew from the room whilst this application was considered. Councillor Ungar addressed the committee from the floor and withdrew from the room whilst the item was considered.

RESOLVED: That East Sussex County Council be advised that Eastbourne Borough Council did not object in principle to the provision of additional school places at the site but retained areas of concern in relation to highway capacity, highway safety and design and appearance of the building and requested that East Sussex County Council use their best endeavours to provide a Pelican Crossing (or similar) in Eldon Road and also introduce of a 20MPH speed limit on the roads in and around the school.

22 Summary of the Performance of the Planning Service - Qtr 4 (Jan - Mar) 2014/15.

This item was deferred until the next meeting of the Planning Committee on 7 July 2015.

23 South Downs National Park Authority Planning Applications.

None reported.

The meeting closed at 10.56 pm

Councillor Murray (Chairman)