

Tuesday, 23 January 2018
at 6.00 pm



Planning Committee

Present:-

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

83 Minutes of the meeting held on 12 December 2017.

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 December 2017 were submitted and approved and the Chairman was authorised to sign them as an accurate record.

84 Apologies for absence.

There were none.

85 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 Taylor, for reasons of transparency, declared an interest in minute 90, 26 Denton Road. Councillor Taylor did not feel this would affect his judgment on this application.

86 2 Burrow Down. Application ID: 171388.

Proposed in-fill ground floor extension and porch to front elevation and first floor extension to cover the entire ground floor footprint along with associated alterations and new proposed driveway. (Revised application following refusal of PC 170902) – **OLD TOWN.**

Ms Winton addressed the committee in objection stating that the scheme would be an overdevelopment and over dominant in the street scene. She also stated that parking would be an issue in and around the property.

Councillor Ungar, Ward Councillor, Cabinet Member and local resident, addressed the committee in objection stating that the scheme was a poor design and not sympathetic to the surrounding properties.

(NB: Councillor Ungar left the room immediately after addressing the committee so as not to appear having influence on the committee's deliberations).

RESOLVED: (By 5 votes to 2 with 1 abstention) That permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Time
- 2) For the avoidance of doubt this application promotes extensions to the existing property and does not sanction the demolition of the existing property and rebuild, this should for the content of a further application.
- 3) No permitted development rights to loft space
- 4) Obscure glazing to all rear first floor windows
- 5) Removal of permitted development rights for windows on first floor rear elevation
- 6) The location of the high pressure gas main must be located prior to commencement of works by electronic detection or hand excavation supervised by an SGN representative
- 7) No mechanical excavations are permitted within 3m of the SGN's pipework at any time
- 8) External materials to be approved

87 3 Brand Road. Application ID: 171322.

Mr Pickup, agent for the objectors, addressed the committee in objection stating that the extension would impact upon his clients property in terms of lose sunlight, overbearing nature, and the extension would affect the street scene.

Mr Naish, applicant, addressed the committee in response stating that the scheme would be in keeping with the surrounding and where possible, he would use materials from two small out buildings which were being demolished within his property to match existing. He also stated that the scheme had been designed so as not to overlook the neighbouring property.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Time limit
- 2) Approved plans
- 3) No PD for windows and dormers within the extension approved
- 4) Ancillary use
- 5) Surface water run off

88 8 Auckland Quay. Application ID: 171438.

Proposed rear extension, rear & front facing dormer alterations, front porch infill and stair window alterations. Internal alterations – **SOVEREIGN**.

Members were advised that a request for a deferral pending a site visit had been made by an objector.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That this application be deferred pending and official site visit.

89 8 Chiswick Place. Application ID: 171283.

To demolish existing single garage, move rear garden boundary within site and erect a 2 storey 2 bed detached dwelling – **MEADS**.

Mr Cumming addressed the committee in objection stating that the scheme would be overbearing and out of keeping with the surrounding area.

Ms Prenton, agent for the applicant, addressed the committee in response stating that scheme had been commended by the Conservation Area Advisory Group and that the proposal ran along the northern boundary so would not cause a loss of light.

The committee was advised that Wealden District Council objected to the application on the grounds of the potential impacts upon the Lewes Down, Pevensey Levels and Ashdown Forest.

This objection had been reviewed as part of the consideration of this application and it was recommended that with confidence Eastbourne Borough Council had screened out the requirements for an 'Appropriate Assessment' due to no significant effects of the development, either alone, or in combination with other plans and programmes.

The agent had submitted a letter of support outlining the comments received and the reasons why they felt planning permission should be granted. The agent addressed the committee on those points.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That permission be refused on the grounds that;

- 1) Because of its siting, bulk and mass the development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the Town Centre and Seafront Conservation Area and the setting of the group of buildings at 1 to 8 Chiswick Place by way of impact on the vista and views into the Conservation Area from Blackwater Road. This is contrary to paragraphs 53-68 of the NPPF, paragraph 7 policy D10 and D10A of our Core Strategy (Adopted 2013) and policy UHT1, UHT4 and UHT15 of our Borough Plan (saved policies) 2007.
- 2) By virtue of the height and length of the property the proposal would result in an unneighbourly and overbearing form of development on No.7 Chiswick Place, and by virtue of the close proximity to the rear elevation of No.8 would be overbearing and unneighbourly resulting in a loss of outlook from the rear elevation of this property. This would fail to protect the amenity of existing and future residents and is contrary to paragraph 17 of the NPPF, policy B2 of our Core Strategy (adopted 2013) and policy H020 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.

Single storey rear & side extension to provide 10 additional bedrooms & ancillary space for special needs care housing purposes. Addition of a new internal passenger lift and internal refurbishments to suit the new layout. The rear extension will be located within the existing garden at a lower level to the existing ground floor. Provision of new parking spaces for visitors and staff within the front garden. Demolition of the existing garage structure and associated hard- landscaping – **MEADS**.

Mr Coomber addressed the committee in objection stating that the scheme was out of keeping.

Councillor Smart, Ward Councillor, addressed the committee in objection stating that the scheme was out of character and overdevelopment.

Mr Barnard addressed the committee in response stating that the scheme was sunken into the rear garden of the property and well screened.

The committee was advised that the proposal had been amended to decrease the projection of the rear extension to the northern boundary adjacent 24 Denton Road. The proposed veranda had been removed which reduced the projection of the extension by 2m.

The access and parking layout had also been amended following concerns raised by the Conservation Area Advisory Group. The secondary access to the south was proposed to be retained as was. This was too narrow for vehicular traffic so it would be pedestrian access only. This would mean the front boundary wall could be retained along with the grass verge.

RESOLVED: (By 7 votes to 1) That permission be granted subject to the following conditions

- 1) Time for commencement
- 2) Approved drawings
- 3) Materials shall be as stated on the approved drawings unless agreed otherwise.
- 4) Details of landscaping to the front forecourt prior to the occupation of the development.
- 5) Car parking to be laid out prior to occupation
- 6) Construction traffic management plan
- 7) Construction of the development shall not commence until details of the proposed means of foul and surface water disposal have been submitted, if the green roof is not implemented then an alternative means of surface water disposable needs to be submitted for approval.
- 8) SUDS details/proof of implementation

Informative

- 1) Southern water informative - surcharging
- 2) Southern water informative – Application to the public sewer

91 Bar Coda 125 Langney Road. Application ID: 170928.

Demolition of existing Coda bar Class A4 and erection of a 4 storey building to provide 10 residential apartments with associated secure parking, cycle storage, refuse and recycling storage, amenity space and external landscaping – **DEVONSHIRE.**

Mr Grunton, agent for the applicant, addressed the committee stating that this was a high quality development which had been amended to resolve the previous objections of Southern Water.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Time
- 2) Drawings
- 3) Construction Method Statement – temporary buildings etc.
- 4) Hours of demolition/construction
- 5) Car parking
- 6) Secure and covered cycle parking
- 7) Vehicle turning space in accordance with plans
- 8) Construction Management Plan
- 9) Submitted Travel Plan shall be implemented prior to occupation
- 10) Visibility splays to be provided prior to occupation and retained thereafter
- 11) Programme of archaeological works to be submitted prior to development and a written record of findings to be submitted within 3 months of completion of archaeological works
- 12) No bonfires
- 13) No contaminated materials to be brought on site
- 14) Hard and soft landscaping
- 15) local labour initiatives

Informative:

- 1) Southern water - connection to sewer

92 Heatherleigh Hotel, Application ID: 171333.

Re-Application for removal of condition 13 following grant of planning permission (141521) to allow for the creation of 24 residential flats – **DEVONSHIRE.**

Mr Reid, EHA, addressed the committee in support of the application stating that the hotel market had changed considerably, and that it was important to bring this building back into use.

Councillor Holt, Ward Councillor, addressed the committee in support stating that this hotel had not been in use for over eight years and that there was an urgent need for more homes in Eastbourne.

Mr Aggarwal, applicant, addressed the committee stating that the hotel had been closed for a considerable period and therefore the hotel provision had been lost some time ago.

RESOLVED: (By 5 votes to 3) That permission be granted subject to negotiation on amendments to the Section 106 agreement, delegated to the

Senior Specialist Advisor for Planning and in consultation with Chair and 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
- 4) external elements of the proposed development, where required, to be submitted to the satisfaction of the Council.
- 5) Controls over construction and demolition times.
- 6) Making good after demolition of conservatory and garages.
- 7) Tree planting and landscaping.
- 8) Boundary treatment.
- 9) Refuse enclosure.
- 10) Vehicle and bicycle parking to be provided and retained, in accordance with the approved plans,
- 11) Surface and foul water drainage arrangements.
- 12) Hard surfacing details.
- 13) Details of any external lighting required.

93 Former Police Station, Grove Road. Application ID: 171819.

Proposed refurbishment and extension of former Police Station, with roof extension to existing building and 5 storey side/rear extension to create 50 flats in total.

Mr Thom addressed the committee in objection stating that the proposed travel plan would not mitigate the parking issues this scheme would create.

Mr Leach addressed the committee in objection stating that the scheme was contrary to policy and would be over dominant and result in overlooking.

Councillor Smart, Meads Ward Councillor, addressed the committee in objection stating that parking in the area had already reached saturation point and he also objected to the bulk, height and loss of light.

Mr Moshin, agent for the applicant, addressed the committee in response stating that the scheme would regenerate the site, and provide much needed accommodation.

A motion to refuse the application, proposed by Councillor Taylor and seconded by Councillor Jenkins was lost three votes to five.

RESOLVED (A): (By 5 votes to 3) For: Councillors Choudhury, Coles, Miah, Murray and Robinson. Against: Councillors Jenkins, Murdoch and Taylor) That permission be granted subject to a S.106 agreement covering Local Employment Initiatives, Affordable Housing Provisions and Highway Issues and the following conditions:

- 1) Time for commencement.
- 2) Approved Drawings.
- 3) Submission of sample of materials to mansard roof, fourth floor extension and rear new build.

- 4) Details of proposed windows to be submitted prior to works commencing.
- 5) Southern Water surface water drainage condition.
- 6) Southern Water foul water drainage condition.
- 7) Archaeology condition for written scheme of investigation.
- 8) Cycle storage to be provided in accordance with approved plans prior to occupation of first unit
- 9) Bin storage to be provided in accordance with approved plans prior to occupation of first unit
- 10) SUDS details
- 11) SUDS proof of implementation
- 12) Submission of Construction Traffic Management Plan (to covers issues like contractor parking – site compound – welfare facilities – days and hours of delivery – route of construction/demolition vehicles to from the site)

RESOLVED (B): That should there be a delay in processing the S.106 agreement (more than 8 weeks from the date of this resolution and without any commitment to extend the time) then the application be refused for the lack of infrastructure.

94 Minster House York Road. Application ID: 171170.

Insertion/enlargement of windows to North-West, North-East and South-East elevations. Patio doors to North-West elevation, leading to Yard formed by erection of 1.8m close-boarded fence. Installation of smoke ventilation roof light above existing stair core.

Ms Georgeson addressed the committee in objection stating that the windows should be sealed and opaque glass.

Councillor Ballard, Ward Councillor, addressed the committee in objection stating that the scheme would result in overlooking and a loss of privacy.

Mr Langley, agent for the applicant, addressed the committee in response stating that the scheme had been redesigned to comply with some of the objections and there was no chance of overlooking as the windows were high level.

Councillors requested that the condition for obscure glazing also include the fixing shut of windows to Bath Road and York Road.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Time for commencement
- 2) Approved drawings
- 3) Obscure glazing and fixed shut windows to Bath Road and York Road

95 Minster House, York Road. Application ID: 171171.

Loft conversion/extension to form new dwelling, including dormer constructions and roof terraces to front and rear. Additional roof terrace to front at Third Floor level. Front elevation amended to remove part pitched

roof and replaced with flat roof, with amended window configuration. Tower removed on front elevation – **MEADS**.

Councillor Ballard, Ward Councillor, addressed the committee in objection stating that the scheme was out of keeping with the surrounding area.

Mr Langley, agent for the applicant, addressed the committee in response stating that the building was well hidden and would not be visible.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That permission be refused on the grounds that:

- 1) Given the height and context of the existing building the roof slopes are visible from wider viewpoints.
- 2) The design of the rear dormer is large and visually bulky on the roof slope which by virtue of the height of the building and context of the site is visible in wider views therefore the development is unsympathetic and detrimental to character and appearance of the host building and its wider setting; and, the terrace and dormers to the front roof slope will visually clutter the roof slope, and are an unsympathetic form of development, detrimental to the visual appearance and wider range views of the host building contrary to Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Policy D10a of the Core Strategy Local Plan 2013, and saved policies UHT1, UHT4 and UHT16 of the Borough Plan 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.

96 South Downs National Park Authority Planning Applications.

There were none.

97 Appeal Decisions.

- 1) 2 Tamarak Close. The Inspector dismissed the appeal.
- 2) 21 Derwent Road (includes costs decision). An award of costs was refused.
- 3) Store to the rear of 315 Seaside. The Inspector allowed the appeal.

The meeting closed at 9.35 pm

Councillor Murray (Chair)