

Tuesday, 18 October 2016
at 6.00 pm



Planning Committee

Present:-

Members: Councillor Murray (Chairman) Councillors Choudhury, Jenkins, Miah, Murdoch, Robinson and Taylor

67 Minutes of the meeting held on 20 September 2016.

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 September 2016 were submitted and approved and the Chairman was authorised to sign them as an accurate record.

68 Apologies for absence.

Councillor Sabri.

69 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.

There were none.

70 2 Fort Lane. Application ID: 160794.

Development of nine residential units and 11 car parking spaces, located on two adjacent sites in Fort Lane: SITE A - Unit 2, located on East side of Fort Lane & SITE B - located to rear of 2 - 6 Myrtle Road, West side of Fort Lane, comprising: 5 x 2 bed terraced houses (Site B); 2 x 2 bed houses (Site A); 1 x 1 bed flat (Site B); 1 x 2 bed flat (Site B). AMENDED PLANS – **DEVONSHIRE.**

Mrs Weeks addressed the committee in objection stating that the area was already densely populated. The industrial units had only been occupied during week days meaning the residents had a relatively peaceful weekend. Mrs Weeks was also concerned about the under provision of parking for the proposed development and the potential loss of light to the north facing gardens adjacent to the site.

Mr Neesham, agent, addressed the committee in response stating that the development had been designed with neighbours' concerns in mind. Housing of this type was much needed in this location and it was hoped that the development would reduce the potential for antisocial behaviour in the vicinity.

The committee discussed the application and agreed that the parking provision was not suitable for the number of houses proposed. Whilst some Members liked the design and layout, the majority felt that there were too many houses for the size of the site.

RESOLVED: (By 4 votes to 3) That permission be refused on the grounds that: 1) The scheme by reason of the number of units proposed, their layout-design and relationship to the boundaries of the site/neighbouring properties is such that it would result in an unneighbourly and overbearing form of development that would result in material loss of residential amenity. This would fail to protect the residential and environmental amenity of existing and future residents and is therefore contrary to policies B2 of our Core Strategy (adopted 2013) and policy H020 of our Borough Plan (saved policies) adopted 2007. 2) The scheme by reason of the off-street parking density/ratio is such that it is likely that the parking will be displaced into the surrounding streets. This indiscriminate car parking in an area of parking stress would give rise to highway and pedestrian safety issues. This would fail to meet the objectives of policy B2 of our core strategy and policy TR2 of our Borough Plan (saved policies) adopted 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.

71 5 Wessex Place. Application ID: 160825.

Part demolition of office building and construction of 3 two storey residential dwellinghouses (revised drawings) – **OLD TOWN.**

A motion to refuse the application based on the lack of parking provision was proposed by Councillor Jenkins but not seconded.

RESOLVED: (By 6 votes to 1) That permission be granted subject to the following conditions: 1) Time 2) Drawings 3) Rainwater goods to be kept within site 4) Samples of materials 5) Details of bin store 6) Details of cycle storage 7) Details of fence 8) No PD to west elevation (doors and windows) 9) No PD Extensions 10) No PD Roof extensions dormers 11) External lighting.

72 Rear of 48 St Leonards Road. Application ID: 160538.

New build three storey residential accommodation consisting of 11 dwellings and 11 car parking spaces – **UPPERTON.**

The committee discussed the application and felt that the additional storey proposed was an overdevelopment. Members requested that Officers contact the applicant to discuss the previously suggested amendments to the scheme, such as a mansard roof.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That permission be refused on the grounds that 1) The proposal by reason of full site coverage, its scale, mass and appearance are such that the development would result in an overdevelopment of the site, have an unneighbourly and overbearing relationship with the occupiers of the neighbouring properties and fails to harmonise with the prevailing pattern of development in this part of

Commercial Road. The development is considered therefore to be contrary to policies UHT1 & UHT4 of the Eastbourne Local Plan and policy D10A of the Eastbourne Core Strategy. 2) It is acknowledged that the applicants are proposing an off-site financial contribution towards the schemes affordable housing provision. There is no statement with the submission outlining how this accords with Policy D5 of The Eastbourne Core Strategy. In addition the application is not accompanied by a S106 Legal Agreement to cover infrastructure provision (affordable housing). Without such documentation/agreement the development is deemed to make an unacceptable contribution to local infrastructure. 3) The proposed ground floor layout is such that there is insufficient space/capacity for waste and recycling facilities. The lack of space may lead to difficulty in accessing/serving the proposed bin enclosure as well as the potential for additional bins to be located within the undercroft parking area which may impact upon the available parking and may also lead to additional bins located to the front of the site which would be harmful to the local townscape character of the site and surrounding area. The proposal would be contrary to UHT4 of the Eastbourne Local Plan.

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.

73 South Downs National Park Authority Planning Applications.

There were none.

74 Appeal Decisions.

The following appeal decisions were received after publication of the agenda and reported at the meeting:

91 Parkway Eastbourne – The appeal related to amendments to a tree preservation order. The appeal was dismissed as there was no evidence to justify the reduction or loss of the tree.

29 Bedfordwell Road - Outline application for the demolition of the existing building and the erection of a three storey building containing six flats. The appeal was allowed.

12 Honeysuckle Close - Single storey side extension. The appeal was dismissed.

4 Pevensey Road - Conversion of Taxi office/wine bar to 3 flats. The appeal was allowed and costs were awarded against the Council. The Inspector concluded that the issues of noise impact could be dealt with via conditions and that the proposed changes would not impact upon the character and appearance of the area.

The meeting closed at 7.15 pm

Councillor Murray (Chairman)