

Tuesday, 15 November 2016  
at 6.00 pm



## Planning Committee

Present:-

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

---

### **75 Minutes of the meeting held on 18 October 2016.**

The minutes of the meeting held on 18 October 2016 were submitted and approved and the Chairman was authorised to sign them as an accurate record.

### **76 Apologies for absence.**

Councillor Murdoch.

### **77 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.

### **78 2-4 Moy Avenue. Application ID: 160929.**

Proposed refurbishment and extension to existing telephone exchange building and the construction of two part three, part four storey buildings to the rear to provide a total of 95 one and two bedroom flats, with 91 on site car parking spaces – **ST ANTHONYS**. 36 objections and one letter of support had been received.

South East Water raised no objection to the application in principle. They had requested, by way of additional conditions, further information regarding the impact on surface and ground water quality with a hydrogeological risk assessment for the site, and phase 2 site investigations to identify historic contamination details of piling methods on the site.

The lead local flood authority raised no objection in principle and requested by way of condition, information relating to the SUD system.

An additional condition relating to access to the flat roofs on the blocks of flats for emergency and maintenance only was also suggested.

Ms Clarke addressed the committee in objection stating that there were too many units proposed for the site and that the development was out of keeping with the surrounding area. The increased traffic would increase the

danger for pedestrians and the access/egress had a restricted view. Ms Clarke also stated that the proposed extension would be too high, resulting in overlooking and a loss of light and privacy to the surrounding properties.

Ms Mason addressed the committee in objection stating that the development was excessive in size and number of units proposed. There would be an increase in parking and other traffic issues, with the access being too close to a 'blind' corner. Ms Mason also stated that the scheme would result in overlooking and loss of light for neighbouring properties.

Councillor Tutt, Ward Councillor, addressed the committee in objection stating that the scheme would be an overdevelopment. The increased traffic would exacerbate the existing parking and pedestrian safety issues. Councillor Tutt stated that the residents were in support of the redevelopment of the site, with a scheme sympathetic to the neighbouring residents and current issues as stated.

Mr Mohsin, Architect, addressed the committee in response stating that the scheme had been designed in consultation with the Council's Planning department with the aim of regenerating a dilapidated area. Mr Mohsin also advised that a consultation exercise had been carried out with residents to address their concerns with regarding to overlooking and loss of light. Amenity space had been provided within the site, and the redevelopment of the existing building reduced the impact of demolition activities.

The committee discussed the application, and whilst they agreed with the redevelopment of the site in principle, it was felt that the proposed scheme was an overdevelopment and out of keeping with the surrounding properties.

NB: Councillor Taylor requested a named vote.

**RESOLVED: (By 5 votes to 1 with 2 abstentions.** For: Councillors Choudhury, Miah, Murray, Robinson and Sabri. Against: Councillor Taylor. Abstentions: Councillors Ballard and Jenkins). That permission be refused on the grounds that 1) By virtue of the scale of development, the number of units, the height, bulk and mass of the proposed buildings on the site (blocks 2 and 3) the proposal is considered an unneighbourly over development of the site with an overbearing relationship, detrimental to the amenity of the occupiers of surrounding residential properties by way of loss of light, outlook, privacy from overlooking to properties and their rear gardens contrary to saved policy HO20 of the Borough Plan 2007, Policy B2 of the Core Strategy Local Plan 2013 and paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012. 2) By virtue of the height, scale, bulk and mass of the proposed buildings the development is out of character with the prevailing pattern of development in the surrounding area contrary to saved policies UHT1 and UHT2 of the Borough Plan 2007, policy D10a of the Core Strategy Local Plan 2013 and paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

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.

## **79 Update on Housing Delivery.**

The committee considered the report of the Director of Regeneration and Planning providing Members with an update on housing delivery and the current position in relation to the Five Year Housing Land Supply.

Members noted that the Core Strategy planned for the delivery of 5,022 net additional dwellings between 2006 and 2027. As of the end of the second quarter 2016/2017 (30 September 2016), a total of 2,451 units had been delivered. This left 2,571 units to be delivered until the end of the plan period, at an annual average of 245 units per year.

In the second quarter of 2016/17, a total of **38** new dwellings were completed. Of those 38 completed units, 27 units were at the Meadows View development on Kings Drive. The remaining 11 new dwellings were provided across five other development sites. Housing completions over the quarter had been low, with a total of 78 units for the first half of 2016/17.

Since the adoption of the Core Strategy 2013/14 and the target of 240 units per year, a trend of under-delivery had been identified over the last two years. The delivery target was only exceeded three times in 14 quarters, with the average annual target only exceeded once.

At the end of quarter two of 2016/17, there were **689** net additional dwellings with permission that had yet to commence across **93** sites and included:

- 142 units at Sovereign Harbour
- 102 units at Bedfordwell Road Depot
- 61 units at the former Caffyns site on Upperton Road
- 36 units at 2-4 Moy Avenue
- 35 units at St Anne's House, St Anne's Road

At the end of the second quarter of 2016/17, there were **160** units under construction across **35** development sites and included:

- 30 remaining units at Meadows View, Kings Drive
- 16 units at 27 St Leonards Road
- 9 units at Koala on King Edwards Parade

The committee was advised that the annual requirement over the remaining plan period was 245 units per year, and therefore the five year requirement

was 1,225 units. The additional 5% buffer equated to an additional 61 units, making the Five Year Housing Land Supply requirement for Eastbourne **1,286** units.

The current assessment of the Five Year Housing Land Supply identified that as of 30 September 2016, Eastbourne had a supply of housing land equivalent to 849 units. This meant that Eastbourne currently had a **3.47 year** supply of housing land (or 66% of the Five Year Housing Land Supply requirement).

Members were advised that as a Five Year Housing Land Supply could not be demonstrated, current policies could not be relied on to justify reasons for refusal. This would therefore mean there was a significant risk that future planning refusals for residential developments would be overturned at appeal.

As the under delivery of housing continued, and with the low rate of sites being granted permission, it would mean it would be very difficult for a Five Year Housing Land Supply to be identified in the near future.

All sites built were removed from the Five Year Housing Land Supply and additional sites needed to be granted permission to replace them. Evidence suggested that only 78% of units granted were eventually built.

Housing delivery could be boosted through the identification of new sites with housing potential, which may in turn encourage landowners to submit applications, and address wider issues that may have prevented sites coming forward. The process for identifying sites was underway through the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment due to be completed in April 2017.

**RESOLVED:** That the report be noted.

## **80 Appeal Decisions.**

1. 48 Rockhurst Drive. The appeal was allowed by the Inspector.
2. 55 Friday Street. The appeal was dismissed by the Inspector.
3. 182 – 184 Seaside. The appeal was allowed by the Inspector.

## **81 South Downs National Park Authority Planning Applications.**

There were none.

The meeting closed at 7.17 pm

**Councillor Murray (Chairman)**