

Tuesday, 20 September  
2016  
at 6.00 pm



## Planning Committee

Present:-

**Members:** Councillor Murray (Chairman) and Councillors Ballard (as substitute for Jenkins), Choudhury, Hearn (as substitute for Sabri), Miah, Murdoch, Robinson and Taylor

### 58 Minutes of the meeting held on 30 August 2016.

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 August were submitted and approved and the Chairman was authorised to sign them as a correct record.

### 59 Apologies for absence.

Apologies for absence were reported from Councillors Jenkins and Sabri.

### 60 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 declared.

### 61 65 Moy Avenue. Application ID: 160677

Proposed erection of raised decking 1.1m above ground level projecting 3m from the rear of the existing ground floor rear extension – **ST ANTHONYS**. One letter of support and one of objection had been received from the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

The application was deferred from the meeting held on 30 August 2016 to enable the applicant to attend and address the Committee.

Mr Smeeton, applicant, addressed the Committee and produced an impact report for the Committee's consideration, that analysed the proposal's impact on outlook and sunlight into the garden and lounge window of 67 Moy Avenue. He believed that the current proposal, advice on which had been sought from officers at the pre-application phase, would not have a significant impact on their neighbour's amenity.

**RESOLVED: (By 7 votes to 1)** That permission be refused on the grounds that (1) The cumulative effect of the privacy screen together with the existing extension results in a bulk of development that would be overbearing to and detrimentally affect the amenity of occupiers the neighbouring property No.67 Moy Avenue contrary to Policy B2 of the Core Strategy Local Plan and Saved Policy H020 of the Borough Plan 2007; (2) By virtue of the visual bulk and scale of development the proposed terrace

will not make a positive contribution to the property and the scale and massing, when considered cumulatively with the existing extension, are not appropriate or sympathetic to the setting or relationship to adjoining properties contrary to policy D10a of the Core Strategy Local Plan 2013.

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.

## **62 Eastbourne Pier, Grand Parade. Application ID: 160872**

Retrospective Listed Building Consent for the following works to Eastbourne Pier; Painting Lion detailing on 49no. lamp posts (primer undercoat layer and gold metallic outer layer); Painting 13 Domes and Pinnacles (primer undercoat layer and gold metallic outer layer) – **DEVONSHIRE**. 38 letters of support and 27 objections had been received from members of the public.

The item was considered by the Conservation Area Advisory Group at its meeting on 23 August 2016. The Group stated that although it was regrettable that the applicant did not seek listed building consent prior to commencement of works, in general the work undertaken had not harmed the historic character of the grade 2\* listed Pier and they supported its retention. The Group objected to any further painting of the building, including the fish scaled domes in the centre of the Pier.

The Committee was advised that informative (1) had been revised to reflect that following publication of the report, the applicant had now repainted the roof of the waterside bar white in line with guidance from Eastbourne Borough Council and Historic England.

Mrs Madell, the Council's Heritage Champion and representative of the Meads Community Association addressed the Committee in objection to the application. She strongly objected and recommended that the Committee order the applicant to remove the gold paint and reinstate the zinc roof. She made reference to the Eastbourne Borough Plan and policies UHT3, UHT4, UHT9, UHT 15, UHT17 that would support refusal of the application.

Mr Gulzar, applicant, addressed the Committee and made reference to the 38 letters of support compared to 27 letters of objection, the view of Historic England and that the proposal had been recommended for approval.

**RESOLVED: (By 5 votes to 3)** That Listed building consent be granted subject to a condition which specifies precisely which works are approved as a result of the decision as follows (1) This listed building consent hereby authorises the retention of the following works that have been undertaken at Eastbourne Pier as of 20<sup>th</sup> September 2016: (a) Painting of 49 ornamental lions on lampposts; (b) Painting of 13 domes.

Informatives:

The following informatives have been attached to the decision notice:

- (1) As per the email exchange between Manasdeep Singh and Neil Holdsworth dated 31<sup>st</sup> August 2016, this listed building consent does not authorise the retention of the gold paint on the roof of the waterside bar at the rear of the pier. It is noted that as of the date of this decision, this had now been repainted white.
- (2) The two remaining domes in the centre of the pier which are clad in fish scale zinc must be retained in that condition and not altered without obtaining listed building consent.
- (3) The applicant is advised that any further painting of the pier may require listed building consent. The applicant is advised to approach the Council for advice prior to proceeding with any further works.

**63 Land to the West of Larkspur Drive. Application ID: 160908**

Outline planning permission (access, appearance, layout and scale) for erection of up to 9 no. dwellings including potential for hard and soft landscaping and car parking – **LANGNEY**. Seven letters of objection were reported from local residents.

Consultation with the Specialist Advisor (Planning Policy), CIL Consultations, Southern Water, Environment Agency, County Archaeologist, County Ecologist and Highways ESCC were detailed in the report.

Councillor Shuttleworth, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee in objection to the application and supported the officer recommendation detailed in the report.

**RESOLVED: (Unanimous)** That permission be refused on the grounds that the proposed development is situated within the boundary of Eastbourne Park and outside the built up area boundary and the design and appearance of the proposed dwellings/buildings is not of sufficient quality to offset the harm by way of an in principle policy objection to the development. It is therefore considered contrary to policy D11 of the Core Strategy Local Plan 2013 and paragraph 55 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.

**64 17-18 Lushington Lane. Application ID: 160751**

Proposed demolition of existing garages and erection of a three storey building with 6 No. two bedroom flats with private courtyard gardens to the rear serving the ground floor flats – **MEADS**. Six letters of objection were reported from local residents.

The Conservation Area Advisory Group at its meeting on 23 August 2016 raised no objections to the proposed development.

An additional condition was recommended by officers to ensure the appearance of the development was consistent with others in the vicinity of the development.

**RESOLVED: (Unanimous)** That permission be granted subject to the following conditions: (1) Commencement with 3 years; (2) Development in accordance with approved plans; (3) Hours of operation; (4) Details of waste storage; (5) Details of cycle parking; (6) Details of materials. (7) Details must be provided of the windows, doors and rainwater goods to be used in the development hereby approved. This must be submitted to and approved in writing under the terms of this condition and work must not be started on any relevant parts of the development until approved. The works shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Informative:

An informative has been attached to the decision notice advising the applicant of the need to submit a DOC application.

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

There were none.

**66 Appeal Decisions.**

There were none.

The meeting closed at 7.19 pm

**Councillor Murray (Chairman)**