

Tuesday, 27 October 2015
at 6.00 pm



Planning Committee

Present:-

Members: Councillor Murray (Chairman) Councillor Sabri (Deputy-Chairman)
Councillors Jenkins, Murdoch, Taylor, Ungar and Hearn (as
substitute for Miah)

82 Minutes of the meeting held on 29 September 2015.

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 September 2015 were submitted and approved and the Chairman was authorised to sign them as an accurate record.

83 Apologies for absence.

Councillor Salisbury.

84 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.

None reported.

85 3 Selwyn Road. Application ID: 150800.

Demolition of lean to extension, conservatory and garage and erection of new bungalow together with associated off-street parking – **UPPERTON**. Nine objections had been received.

The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report. The observations of East Sussex County Council Highways department were also summarised.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That permission be granted subject to the following conditions: 1) Time limit 2) Approved Drawings 3) Boundary treatments 4) Carpark to be laid in accordance prior to occupation 5) All Permitted development rights removed 6) Demolition and Construction times 08:00 to 18:00 Mon – Fri, 08:00 – 13:00 Sat and not at all on Sundays Bank and public holidays 7) Prior to commencing the construction of the new dwelling hereby approved details of the making good the newly exposed flank wall of the retained property shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details as approved shall be implemented at the site prior to the practical completion of the dwelling hereby approved.

86 29 Bedfordwell Road. Application ID: 150443.

Outline application (with appearance, landscaping and scale reserved) for demolition of existing hostel and erection of 6 x 3 bedroomed flats - consideration of access and layout only – **UPPERTON**. Three objections had been received.

The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report. The observations of the East Sussex County Council Highways department were also summarised.

Members discussed the application and raised concerns regarding the parking in and around the site.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That permission be refused on the grounds that 1) It is considered that the proposed number and size of units cannot be accommodated on the site without constituting over development by virtue of the size and layout of the building and therefore resulting in a visually intrusive development contrary to policy D10A of the Core Strategy Local Plan and Saved Policies UHT1 and UHT4 of the Borough Plan 2007 2) As submitted, the proposal does not provide for adequate parking facilities within the site which would result in additional congestion on the public highway causing further interference with the free flow and safety of traffic and would therefore be contrary ESCC parking guidance.

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.

87 51 Woodgate Road. Application ID: 150192 (HHH).

Proposed part single and part two storey extension at rear together with associated patio and steps – **ST ANTHONYS**. Two objections had been received. One further letter of support was reported stating that there were no issues with the planning build and that the plans were fully supported.

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

Mrs Knight addressed the committee in objection stating that the second storey of the extension would result in a loss of light and overlooking to her property.

Mr Thompson, the applicant addressed the committee in response stating that the extension was similar to neighbouring properties and had been designed to be more in keeping with the surrounding area. He also stated that any impact on daylight would only be felt at the end of the day during the winter months.

RESOLVED: (By 6 votes with 1 abstention) That permission be granted subject to the following conditions: 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin 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 following drawings.

- 202000.02 Revision D – Proposed plans (Received by EBC on 25 August 2015)

3) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no window, dormer window, roof light or door other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed without planning permission obtained from the Local Planning Authority to any elevation or roof slope of the approved extension.

88 Aldi - Former Cosmetica Site, Faraday Close. Application ID: 150872.

Application to vary condition 6 (Hours of Delivery) of planning permission granted 31 March 2015 for the erection of a foodstore together with associated car parking and landscaping (Ref: 140958) to allow deliveries between the hours of 0500 and 2300 Monday to Sunday – **HAMPDEN PARK**. Six objections had been received.

The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report. The observations of the Specialist Advisor Environmental Health were also summarised.

Members were advised that additional information had been submitted by Aldi as follows;

Firstly, for completeness and avoidance of doubt, ALDI never proposed delivery hours of 07.00 – 21.00 Monday to Saturday or 10.00 – 18.00 on Sundays. The noise report submitted with the original application confirmed that deliveries to the store – even on a 24hr basis – would not result in a negative impact on local amenity and the original application was made on this. The condition relating to delivery hours was attached to the original consent by the Environmental Health Officer. There was no discussion / negotiation with ALDI and the findings of the original noise report did not appear to have been considered at that time, when recommending that the store be subject of a delivery restriction of 07.00 – 21.00 Monday to Saturday and 10.00 – 18.00 on Sundays. Nevertheless, ALDI had not taken the decision to amend those hours lightly. Every effort was taken to try and design a logistics plan around the consented hours, but this was simply not possible. The application was accompanied by a fully accredited noise survey, prepared in accordance with relevant British Standards and with clear empirical evidence, which confirmed that deliveries, even on a 24hr basis, would not result in a negative impact on residential amenity. However, notwithstanding and without prejudice, ALDI had worked proactively with officers throughout the statutory process and had agreed a position of a new delivery window of 05.00 – 23.00.

Members discussed the proposed changes and felt that amended hours of 6am to 11pm - Monday to Saturday and 8am to 11pm on Sundays would be more appropriate and suitable in a residential area. Following a brief adjournment and discussion with the applicant this was confirmed as acceptable.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That permission be granted to 1) Approve variation to condition to allow deliveries between the hours of 0600 and 2300 Monday to Saturday and 0800am to 2300 on Sunday 2) Issue a new notice with the inclusion of an additional condition stating that the if the applicant chooses to implement their extended delivery times that this shall only be done in accordance with the applicants noise report 3) That the applicant be advised that the notice will not be issued until a modification to the S106 connected to 140958 has been completed to the satisfaction of all parties.

89 Morrisons, 1 Hargreaves Road. Application ID: 150790.

Application for variation of condition 8 (Time restriction on loading and unloading) following planning permission dated 17 August 2011 for the development of a Morrisons foodstore and petrol station (Ref: EB/2011/0050) to allow the loading or unloading of goods or materials between the hours of 05:00 and 23:00 - **HAMPDEN PARK**.

The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report. The observations of the Specialist Advisor Environmental Health were also summarised.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That the variation of the condition be granted.

90 7 Upperton Road, Churchill Retirement Living. Application ID: 150803 (PPP).

Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to form circa 61 one and two bed sheltered apartments for the elderly including communal facilities, access, car parking and landscaping - **UPPERTON**. 10 objections had been received.

The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report. The observations of the Housing Services Manager, the Specialist Advisors for Planning Policy and Strategy and Commissioning - Regeneration, the East Sussex County Council Lead Local Flood Authority (ESCC SUDS) and Adult Social Care were also summarised.

Members were advised that additional information supplied by the applicant outlined that the scheme would be constructed from Upperton Road via a new layby and crane.

The committee was advised that East Sussex County Highways department had responded as follows:

This application was for the redevelopment of a site that was previously a car showroom and workshop into a 61 room sheltered accommodation apartment block. A Transport Assessment (TA) had been submitted as part of the application and its contents and conclusions were acceptable. The sites central location puts it well within acceptable walking distance of public transport facilities (bus & rail) as well as the shops and services associated with the town centre location. This would limit the need of

residents and visitors to travel by car. A total of 21 parking spaces were proposed. The ESCC Parking guidelines suggested that one space should be provided per two – four units. 21 spaces was approximately one space per three units and therefore acceptable. There was also sufficient space to turn within the site. The TA included a comparison of the number of vehicle trips the previous use and proposed use would create. The proposed use was shown to produce fewer trips than the previous use. A comparison had been carried out using the TRICS database and obtained almost the same result. As there was a reduction in trips the proposal would have a lesser impact on the highway network than previously existed. Currently the site had vehicle accesses in both Upperton Road and Southfields Road. The proposal would remove the access from Upperton Road, apart from for pedestrians and retain the current access in Southfields Road. The continued use of the Southfields Road access was acceptable. The removal of a vehicle access from Upperton Road A2270 was considered a positive step as potential disruption to traffic flow would be removed. Utilising Upperton Road for the pedestrian access was also a positive step as the footways and crossings facilities between the site and the town centre were better than via Southfield Road. It was noted that there was concern regarding the construction phase and the resultant large vehicle using Southfields Road. A proposal had been submitted showing a layby arrangement which could be implemented in Upperton Road which would limit the level of site traffic which would need to use Southfields Road. This proposal was acceptable in principle but details would need to be agreed. This could be controlled through the site traffic management plan which would also control site vehicle routing, etc. The suggested layout would make use of part of the footway for a loading bay. This would need to be strengthened to accommodate the vehicle loading. The footway would need to be reinstated at the end of the construction of the building. The vehicle movements would need to be controlled by a qualified banksman and the details of the pedestrian footway would need to be finalised and agreed. Concern was raised with the proposal for just a white line to demarcate the loading bay/footway. A barrier/hoarding line would seem more appropriate to segregate pedestrians from the site. The impact of this development on the highway network would be minimal and therefore the Highways department did not wish to restrict grant of consent subject to the inclusion of a number of additional conditions.

Mr Robertson addressed the committee, stating that he was in favour of the development, however he did have some concerns regarding the building stage and the delivery of plant and the parking availability for site staff.

Mr King, agent for the applicant, addressed the committee in response stating that a Site Manager would be available at all times. The Southfields Road access would only be required initially for the delivery of plant for no more than two days and workers would be required to use pay and display parking within the town.

RESOLVED: (By 5 votes to 2) That subject to a S106 agreement covering 'Local Labour Initiatives' and 'age of resident restriction' permission be granted subject to the following conditions: 1) Time Limit 2) Accordance with approved drawings 3) Prior to their installation all external materials submitted and approved 4) Prior to their installation all boundary treatments submitted and approved 5) Prior to first occupation

refuse/recycling shall be made available to residents along with a statement for the presentation of bins on collection day 6) Prior to the first occupation buggy store shall be made available to residents 7) Prior to the first occupation the car park shall be laid out in accordance with the details 8) Demolition/construction method statement 9) No plant machinery to be used outside of the following times 08:00 – 18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 13:00 Saturdays and not at all on Bank or public holidays 10) Prior to commencement other than demolition hard and soft landscaping submitted and approved 11) Prior to construction of the proposed development, a drainage survey is undertaken to determine the existing surface water discharge location (s). Details of the drainage survey should be submitted to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority 12) The surface water management proposals formulated for the detailed design stage should be supported by detailed hydraulic calculations. These calculations should take into account the connectivity of the different drainage features. They should show a 'like for like' discharge rate between the existing and proposed scenarios during the 1 in 1, 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 (plus an allowance for climate change) rainfall events. If it is not practical to limit the runoff volume to the existing, the excess volume during a 6 hours 1 in 100 years storm should be discharged at a rate of 2 l/s/ha 13) A maintenance and management plan for the entire drainage system should be submitted to and agreed by the local planning authority before any construction commences on the site. This plan should clearly state who will be responsible for managing all aspects of the surface water drainage system. The appropriate authority for the maintenance needs to be satisfied with the submitted details 14) Prior to the construction on site , other than demolition a contaminated land assessment and associated remedial strategy is to be submitted and agreed 15) The building shall not be occupied until details of all exterior lighting have (including security lighting) have been submitted and approved 16) Before the development hereby permitted is commenced full details of all proposed extract flues, ventilation systems and meter boxes shall be submitted to and approved 17) The development shall not be occupied until a means of access for pedestrians from Upperton Road has been constructed in accordance with the approved plans 18) The development shall not be occupied until the existing accesses from Upperton Road shown on the approved plan has been stopped up and the kerb and footway reinstated in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by the Director of Communities, Economy and Transport. These works will need to be licenced by ESCC prior to commencement 19) Prior to demolition works commencing on site a Traffic Management Scheme, including details of the loading lay by in Upperton Road shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. This shall include the size of vehicles, routing of vehicles and hours of operation. (Given the busy nature of the approach roads the hours of delivery/ collection should avoid peak traffic flow times) 20) During any form of earthworks and/or excavations that are carried out as part of the development, suitable vehicle wheel washing equipment should be provided within the site, to the approval of the Planning Authority, to prevent contamination and damage to the adjacent roads 21) 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.

91 The Hawthorns, 4 Carew Road. Application ID: 150742 (PPP).

Alterations to create enclosed vestibule/wind break to front entrance below existing canopy roof, erect external lift shaft and alterations to rear entrance to create draught lobby – **UPPERTON**. Five objections and one letter of observation had been received.

The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report. The committee was advised that the Specialist Advisor for Environmental Health was satisfied that there would be no noise issues for surrounding properties and therefore had no objections to the application.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) 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 following approved drawings submitted on 16 July 2015:

DWG. NO.: AL(0)PL01 Rev A - Proposed Site Plan
DWG. NO.: AL(0)PL02 Rev A - Proposed Ground Floor Plan
DWG. NO.: AL(0)PL03 Rev A - Proposed First Floor Plan
DWG. NO.: AL(0)PL04 Rev A - Proposed Second Floor Plan
DWG. NO.: AL(0)PL05 Rev A - Proposed Third Floor Plan
DWG. NO.: AL(0)PL06 Rev A - Proposed Elevations
Lift Requirement Statement July 2015

3) The external finishes of the development hereby permitted shall match in material, colour, style, bonding and texture those detailed within the drawings hereby approved 4) 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 5) The operational requirements of the lift hereby approved shall be implemented and operated in accordance with the Lift Requirement Statement July 2015 submitted with the application.

92 1 Stuart Avenue. Application ID: 150738.

Erection of a three-bedroom, detached, two storey dwelling house with vehicular access from Baldwin Avenue – **OLD TOWN**. Two objections had been received.

The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report. The observations of the Specialist Advisor for Arboriculture, the County Archaeologist and East Sussex County Highways department were also summarised.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That permission be granted subject to the following conditions: 1) Time for commencement 2) Reserved matters 3)

Approved Drawings 4) Removal of permitted development rights for windows, doors, dormers and rooflights 5) The two rear facing first floor windows serving the bathroom and en-suite bathroom shall not be glazed otherwise than with obscured glass 6) No development shall take place until the developer has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work 7) The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the archaeological site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed.

Informative:

- 1) The proximity of the proposed development to the neighbouring group of Ash trees in the adjacent playing field may lead to blocked gutters to the new dwelling unless suitable gutter guards are installed. Once the proposed development has been completed the owner of the trees will have a legal requirement to negate any legal nuisance caused by the trees such as direct damage to the roof tiles etc. This requirement may have an impact on the owner regarding ongoing maintenance where at present they have no obligation to prune them.
- 2) Please apply to ESCC for a licence to install a vehicle crossover.

93 51 Upperton Lane. Application ID: 150694

Demolition of existing building and flint boundary wall. Rebuilding of flint wall and erection of a two storey dwellinghouse with parking space – **UPPERTON.**

The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report. The observations of East Sussex County Council Highways department and the Specialist Advisors for Planning Policy and Conservation were also summarised. 14 objections had been received.

At its meetings on 25 August 2015 and 6 October 2015 the Conservation Area Advisory Group raised objections to the principle of a residential property in what was historically a service lane and considered it unacceptable and out of character with the surrounding conservation area. It was felt that approval could set a precedent for further residential development and the resulting cumulative impact would negatively affect the existing character of the area. Specifically, objections were raised to the mass, scale and design which had little reference to the historic architectural character and appearance of the immediate and surrounding area.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That permission be refused on the grounds that the proposed development would result in an undesirable form of backland development in an unsuitable location, which would by reason of its scale, siting and design, result in a cramped, visually dominant and intrusive form of development that would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area and would be detrimental to the amenities of adjoining residential occupiers through loss of privacy and outlook. As such, it would conflict with policies UHT1, UHT4, UHT15 and HO20 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001-2011, policies B2, C2, D1, D10

and D10A of the Eastbourne Core Strategy Local Plan, and paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative:

For the avoidance of doubt, the following plans are refused:

AMENDMENT TO PLANNING APPLICATION 150694 Page 2 of 4 dated 30/9/15

AMENDMENT TO PLANNING APPLICATION 150694 Page 3 of 4 dated 30/9/15

AMENDMENT TO PLANNING APPLICATION 150694 Page 4 of 4 dated 30/9/15

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.

94 Moira House (Menage). Application ID: 150594.

Installation of ménage on existing playing field – **MEADS**. 13 objections and 11 emails of support had been received.

The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report. The observations of the Specialist Advisors for Arboriculture, Open Spaces, Planning Policy and Conservation and East Sussex County Council Highways department were also summarised.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That permission be granted subject to the following conditions: 1) Commencement within three years 2) Compliance with approved plans 3) Submission of details of drainage/services 4) Submission of details of site office, storage area for materials, and access route 5) Provision of traffic signs 6) Restriction of route for horses in and out of the site 7) Restriction on times the manege is used 8) Hours of construction 9) Provision of beech hedge 10) No external illumination.

95 Moira House (Stable block). Application ID: 150585 (PPP).

Erection of a stable block adjacent to rear boundary to facilitate equine activities for students – **MEADS**. Nine objections and nine emails and letters of support had been received.

The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report. The observations of the Specialist Advisors for Arboriculture, Downland, Planning Policy, Conservation, and East Sussex County Council Highways department were summarised within the report.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That permission be granted subject to the following conditions: 1) Commencement within three years 2) Compliance with approved plans 3) Tree protection measures 4) Submission of details of site office, storage area for materials, and access route 5) Submission of details of routes for services and external lighting 6) No burning on site 7) Submission of details of excavations/foundations/drains 8) Submission of samples of materials 9) Provision of rubberised surface to route adjacent to Castle Mount 10) Restriction of size of vehicles accessing the site 11)

Provision of traffic signs 12) Restriction of route for horses in and out of the site 13) Replacement trees to those that are to be lost (4 in total) Soft Landscaping 14) No development shall take place until revised details have been submitted showing an access and turning area from the existing tarmac driveway to the stable building which excludes the root protection area of G14 and provides a no-dig solution in the root protection areas of T19, T20, T21 and T22. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and permanently retained as such thereafter.

Informative

The applicant should contact Natural England regarding consent to access the bridleways from the school.

96 Site 7b, Pacific Drive. Application ID: 150796.

Application for approval of reserved matters (Access, Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale) and related discharge of conditions 2 (part), 3(part), 4(part), 9(part), 134, 136, 139, 140, 141, 149, 150, 154, 159, 160, 161, 162 and 168 of outline planning permission dated 2 December 2014 (Ref:131002) for the development of 70 residential units (Use Class C3), Public Open Space and Access at Sites 7b and 7c, Pacific Drive, Sovereign Harbour, Eastbourne – **SOVEREIGN**. 11 objections had been received.

The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report. The observations of Specialist Advisors for Arboriculture and Planning Policy, the Health and Safety Executive and East Sussex County Council Highways department were also summarised.

The committee were advised that Wealden District Council raised no objections to the application.

One further objection was reported covering the following:

- Increase in traffic
- Increase in number of people, overcrowding the area.
- Visually intrusive development
- Health and safety in case of emergency the only main road could become blocked

Comments had also been received from Sovereign Harbour Residents Association covering the following:

- Comments in relation to the original SPD and the requirement for the provision of a community centre and requesting a condition that works could not commence until the community centre was above ground.
- They welcomed the 'home zone' concept which would create a pedestrian and child friendly environment.
- Queried the impact if the emergency access was to be used by cyclists/motorcyclists, and requested that the access was pedestrian only.
- The public open space should be dog-free and cycling through this space should not be permitted.

- The concept of the design, landscaping and traffic movement on this site was to be applauded.

Officers comments to representations were summarised:

Emergency Access and Cyclists - If a barrier was installed to prevent cyclists/motorcyclists using the access this would also prevent any pedestrian access. A condition was suggested regarding the construction detail of the access, providing details of the means of restriction. Details should also be requested in relation to the construction of the car parking area and the bin/bicycle storage.

As with other areas of Public Open Space within the Borough it was not normal practice to restrict use of public open spaces for cyclists or dog owners. Barriers at the entrances to the open space were proposed to slow cyclists and/or make them dismount.

The delivery of the community centre was controlled by the requirements of the S106 and was not linked to the occupation or commencement of building of the residential units.

The contents of the SPD were guidance only to inform any applications coming forward, the development was driven by the outline permission and the S106. Works were ongoing to seek delivery of the community centre, as there was no link between the commencement of development in relation to site 7 and the community centre it would be considered unreasonable in planning terms to impose and conditions as requested by the Sovereign Harbour Residents Association.

Mr Newman addressed the committee in objection stating that he had concerns regarding the access path near the rear of his property and that any levelling on the site may undermine the gardens that back onto the site.

Mr and Mrs Weeks, Sovereign Harbour Residents Association, addressed the committee reiterating the comments reported to Members earlier in the meeting.

Councillor Blakebrough, Ward Councillor, addressed the committee regarding the safety issues relating to cycling / pedestrian access through the site.

County Councillor Elkin, Sovereign Division, addressed the committee stating that the development would enhance the harbour, however, Councillor Elkin did raise concerns regarding agreement to develop the Community Centre prior to any further housing development as agreed in the Sovereign Harbour SPD (Supplementary Planning Document).

Marie Nagy, Agent for the applicant, addressed the committee in response stating that the design followed agreed parameters. The Community Centre was not linked to this development and should therefore not impact on any permission. Ms Nagy also stated that should the committee refuse the application there would be a delay in the delivery of public open space. With regard to the emergency access route, access needed to be provided

for all users and consideration had been given as to how they would be directed through the site.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That permission be granted for the reserved matters application and discharge of the following appropriate conditions:
 1) Prior to the commencement of development the design of the emergency access shown on the approved drawing from Pevensy Bay Road, along with a method statement for its construction shall be submitted to and approved by Southern Gas Network details of the agreement shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority
 2) Requirement for the emergency access route to be constructed and operational prior to first occupation of the site
 3) SUDs condition in relation to hydraulic calculations, taking into account the connectivity of the different drainage features
 4) Submission of a maintenance and management plan for the drainage system.

Informative:

Seek HSE approval prior to commencement of work.

Southern Gas Network Informative

Should any work be contemplated it is essential that you comply with the restrictions detailed below and in the document SGN/SP/SSW22 (available from SGN) in order to protect our plant and equipment and for the safety of your own operatives.

1) No mechanical excavation is allowed within 3 metres either side of pipeline
 2) No plant or storage of equipment shall be made within any easement strip
 3) If any metallic pipes or cables are being laid in proximity to gas pipelines then interference testing will be required, the cost of which to be borne by the promoter of the works. A minimum clearance of 600mm is required
 4) All precautions stated in publication SGN/SP/SSW22 (Safe Working in the Vicinity of High Pressure Gas Pipelines) shall be fully complied with in all respects. Acceptance of SSW22 shall be acknowledged by the responsible site person signing and returning the form Appendix A (back page) to the SGN representative contacted in (7)
 5) No thrust boring shall take place within three metres of the pipeline
 6) All planting within the easement strip should comply with "Notes for Guidance on Tree Proximity"
 7) Before commencing work on site you must contact our Pipeline Maintenance Section on 0141 4184093 at least three days before work commences. A Southern Gas Networks representative will then contact you to arrange to visit site. Details of working near to high-pressure gas pipelines can then be discussed
 8) Pipeline sections that are planned and agreed by SGN to be permanently covered (i.e. by road surface) will require a coating survey. SGN will repair any indicated coating defects free of charge. The survey costs will be borne by the promoter of the works. Prior to any surface cover cathodic protection coupons and reference cells will require installation at no cost to SGN
 9) This pipeline is cathodically protected and as such has test cables located in surface boxes, were these to be lost through this work we would look to you for remedial action at no cost to SGN
 10) Intrusive construction methods will require an agreed method statement prior to work starting
 11) The minimum proximity between the high pressure gas pipeline and any wind turbine should be 1.5 times the fixed mast height excluding the turbine of the wind turbine. If you are planning to construct a wind turbine closer than this, then you must

contact SGN immediately 12) Any extended period of SGN site supervision may incur charges to you. These will be charged based on visiting times, materials and occurrences. You will be informed when these come into effect and be invoiced direct 13) Any piling or boreholes within 15 metres of the pipeline may require vibration monitoring. No piling or bore holing must take place within 3 metres of the pipeline 14) Please ensure these conditions, together with any relevant drawings are forwarded for use by the construction personnel of your works.

97 Woods Cottages, Langney Rise. Application ID: 150757.

This application was withdrawn.

98 44-48 East Dean Road. Application ID: 150499 (PPP).

Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a three-storey 58 bed care home (use class C2) – **OLD TOWN**. 16 objections had been received.

The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report. The observations of the Environment Agency, the Specialist Advisors for Arboriculture, Economic Development, Environmental Health, Planning Policy, East Sussex County Council Highways department and Southern Water were also summarised.

RESOLVED: (By 6 votes with 1 abstention) That permission be refused on the grounds that the proposed building, by reason of its size, height, bulk and orientation, when assessed against the approved scheme would have an overbearing impact on adjoining residential occupiers as a result of its elevated position in close proximity to the boundaries. It would therefore fail to comply with policies B2 and C4 of the Eastbourne Core Strategy Local Plan 2013, policies UHT1, UHT2, HO9 and HO20 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan (Saved Policies) 2007 and policies 56 to 58 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.

99 South Downs National Park Authority Planning Applications.

Members were advised that an application had been received to install an ANPR and wind turbine on Black Robin Farm. The committee agreed with the Officer's view that the application would be visually intrusive and inappropriate in the suggested location. The committee did appreciate the requirement for the cameras and requested that an alternative location be sought.

NOTED.

The meeting closed at 9.56 pm

Councillor Murray (Chairman)