

Tuesday, 24 April 2018
at 6.00 pm



Planning Committee

Present

Members: Councillor Jim Murray (Chairman) Councillor Janet Coles (Deputy-Chairman) Councillors Sammy Choudhury, Md. Harun Miah, Colin Murdoch, Margaret Robinson, Barry Taylor and Paul Metcalfe (as substitute for Gordon Jenkins)

124 Minutes of the meeting held on 27 March 2018.

The minutes of the meeting held on 27 March 2018 were submitted and approved and the Chair was authorised to sign them as an accurate record.

125 Apologies for absence.

An apology for absence was reported from Councillor Jenkins.

126 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 Murray declared a personal and prejudicial interest in minute 127, 2 Clifford Avenue as a friend of the applicant's family. Councillor Murray withdrew from the room whilst the item was considered and did not vote thereon.

127 2 Clifford Avenue. Application ID: 180170.

Raising of roof ridge height and two dormers and one rooflight on the rear elevation – **OLD TOWN.**

The following further information was reported during the meeting; One objection not previously raised was reported as follows: 'our sons window in his bedroom will be affected by the exceptional height of the build and the addition of the protruding dormer. As these will stick out beyond his window and this is the only window/ source of light in this room'

In response and for clarification the committee was advised that 2 Clifford Avenue and the first floor window of number 4 Clifford Avenue were 4.9m apart. The rear elevation of number 4 was back from the rear elevation of number 2 by approx. 2.5m. Due to the combination of the orientation of the properties, distance between the properties and that the dormer would be above the height of the windows at number 4 and set in from the edge of the roof line by 0.8m there would be minimal and insignificant loss of light which was unlikely to cause a significant impact of loss of light.

The committee was advised that a petition had been signed by 22 surrounding households of which were 32 individuals requesting that the committee refuse the application.

Mr Vogels addressed the committee in objection stating that the roof would be too high and would result in a loss of light and overshadowing. He also stated that he would suffer a loss of privacy and the development would be out of keeping with the surrounding area.

Mr Chalinor, agent for the applicant, addressed the committee in response stating that there was no uniformity in the street scene and that the design of the dormer windows would lessen the opportunity for overlooking.

The committee discussed the application and agreed that the scheme would be an overdevelopment.

NB: Councillor Murray withdrew from the room whilst this item was considered.

RESOLVED: (By 4 votes to 3) That permission be refused on the grounds that:

The proposed development by reason of its scale, mass and design would be unsympathetic and detrimental to the character and appearance of the site in particular and the wider area in general resulting in an unsympathetic form of development, detrimental to the visual appearance and wider range views of the site as well as giving rise to an overbearing and unneighbourly form of development contrary to Policies B2, HO20 and D10a of the Eastbourne Core Strategy 2013 and Policy UHT2 Eastbourne Borough Plan Saved Policies 2001 – 2011.

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.

128 Kempston, 3 Granville Road. Application ID: 180040.

Demolition of existing building and redevelopment to provide x16 residential apartments (Use Class C3) (x8 net additional), new vehicle access on Granville Road and car parking – **MEADS.**

The committee was advised that Stephen Lloyd MP objected to the application for the following reasons:

1) The property listed for demolition was a fine example of a Victorian house and retained many of its original features. 2) Eastbourne needed affordable housing and it appeared that the property owners had deliberately run down the property over the years and failed to make much of an effort to rent out the remaining empty flats in the block. This was inappropriate and frankly did not fill Mr Lloyd MP with confidence at this company's future plans. Bulldozing this structure and replacing it under the aegis of their current planning application did not include any element of affordable housing, all of which the current block offered. 3) The building

had an important historical footprint; it was a military hospital in World War 1. In this year the 100th commemoration of the Great War, it would be wrong to demolish a building which maintained a living history link with the important time in our nation's journey. 4) Mr Lloyd MP believed that were this planning application be granted, it could encourage other property developers to neglect similar period buildings with an agenda to dismantle them. This would undermine the high quality aspect of the area, resulting in a further deterioration of an area of High Townscape Value.

It was also reported that the Specialist Advisor for Conservation objected to the application for the following reasons:

Although not originally the subject of a conservation consultation due to its non-protected location, the application's consideration by CAAG and significant public interest invited commentary on my part and he made the following points.

1) 3 Granville Road was a sizeable Victorian villa that clearly evidenced a number of features that typified and helped define the character and appearance of this area, which in turn formed part of the broader, distinctive town- planned vision for Eastbourne developed for the 7th Duke of Devonshire. 2) As such, this attractive and carefully detailed property made a positive contribution to its well- established and verdant residential community, which underpinned the local designation as an area of High Townscape value. 3) The absence of additional specific heritage protection for the property was unfortunate, although it appeared from documentary evidence submitted by a local resident that positive consideration was given to extending the College Conservation Area to encompass the area occupied by this property in the mid- 1980s. This was never actioned, however. As indicated at Conservation Area Advisory Group on 2 April 2018, an opportunity to reassess the situation would arise over the coming months as the Council were currently planning to undertake an appraisal of an Eastbourne conservation area during the 2018-19 cycle, and it was felt appropriate that this effort was focused on reviewing College or Meads Conservation Areas, thereby allowing for the issue of small pockets of non-coverage such as this to be reviewed afresh. 4) A number of substantial individual properties in the immediate area had been demolished over the course of the last 40 years. These had generally been replaced by apartment blocks in a range of broadly 'contemporary' styles, the effect of which had been to slowly alter, and erode, the traditional character and appearance of the area. This application also envisaged the replacement of a single dwelling, admittedly now internally sub-divided into a number of rented apartments, benefitting from generous outdoor space with another copycat block, with existing garden areas given over for parking spaces. This loss of green space was a cause for concern. 5) The design for the new block was broadly similar to a number of other developments locally, and did not invite any great excitement or commendation in architectural terms. Indeed, the design was not especially innovative, or of its time, and certainly did not use its distinctive and distinguished setting as an architectural inspiration, opting instead for a rather nondescript built form. The overall sense was one of a missed opportunity even in its own terms. In conclusion the Specialist Advisor for Conservation stated that he strongly believed that the proposed demolition of 3 Granville Road and its replacement by an apartment block of the kind envisaged is an inappropriate development for its setting and would have an adverse effect on the area in which it was situated.

Finally, the Specialist Advisor for Planning reported that the Victorian Society objected to the application for the following reasons:

1) Kempston was a handsome red-brick villa which occupied a prominent plot at the corner of Granville and Blackwater Roads. It was a finely detailed building, with many of its original features intact. 2) The building played an important role in defining the character of the immediate area, and especially the view along Blackwater Road which currently presented an almost complete prospect of handsome Victorian Villas. 3) Not only would the proposals result in the total loss of the non-designated heritage asset, but they would also significantly erode the predominantly Victorian character of the local area. There were already modern developments on two of the adjacent corner plots; far from setting a precedent these developments made it even more important that further erosion of local character was resisted.

Ms Hodge addressed the committee in objection stating that the property was in an area of High Townscape Value. She stated that the development would have a detrimental impact on Blackwater Road.

Councillor Smart, Ward Councillor, addressed the committee in objection stating that the property should be included in the forthcoming Conservation Area review.

Ms Nagy, agent for the applicant, addressed the committee in response stating that the property was in need of considerable repair, but was not of such significance to warrant listing. She also stated that there were many different styles of properties within the vicinity of this proposed development.

The committee discussed the proposals and agreed that it would be an overdevelopment of the site which would be out of keeping with the surrounding area.

The committee also requested that should the applicant wish to appeal, such an appeal should be in the form of an informal hearing so as to allow all interested parties the opportunity to raise their concerns.

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

- 1) The proposed demolition would result in the loss of this Victoria Villa within an Area of High Townscape Value, detrimental to the character and appearance of the area contrary to saved policy UHT16 of the Borough Plan 2007, D10 of the Core Strategy Local Plan 2013 and section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
- 2) The proposal, by virtue of the height, footprint, bulk and scale and detailed design and materials is an over development of the plot which does not respect the character and appearance of the Area of High Townscape Value nor the pattern of development in the area, contrary to saved policy UHY1, UHT4, UHT5 and UHT16 of the Borough Plan 2007, Policies D10 and D10a of the Core Strategy Local Plan 2013 and Section 7 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, was considered to be an informal hearing.

129 33 Netherfield Avenue. Application ID: 180003.

Proposed erection of porch to the front elevation and a raised platform to the rear with steps leading down to new patio area – **ST ANTHONYS.**

The committee was advised that given the fence works that had been implemented and to date all neighbours wished to withdraw their objections to the proposal. In terms of overlooking the neighbours now supported the scheme.

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 approved drawings submitted on 02 January 2018:

- Drawing No. DWG 11a – Site Plan & Block Plan
- Drawing No. DWG 1 – Pro G/F Plan
- Drawing No. DWG 2 – Pro G/F & Pro Rear Elev
- Drawing No. DWG 3 – Pro Front Elev
- Drawing No. DWG 4 – Pro Side Elev & Ex Side Elev
- Drawing No. DWG 5 – Pro Side Elev & Ex Side Elev

- 3) The external finishes of the development hereby permitted shall match in material, colour, style, bonding and texture those of the existing building.
- 4) Notwithstanding the plans hereby approved, all water run-off from the new roof, platform/steps and raised rear patio shall be dealt with using rainwater goods installed at the host property and no surface water shall be discharged onto any adjoining property, not shall the rainwater goods or downpipes encroach on the neighbouring property and thereafter shall be retained as such.

130 Arundel Court, 20 Arundel Road. Application ID: 171376.

Outline Planning Permission (Access, Appearance, Layout and Scale) for proposed demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 19 flats together with parking spaces – **UPPERTON.**

The committee was advised that further comments from the Specialist Advisor for Arboriculture, following the submission of Arboriculture Method Statement and Arboricultural Impact Assessment, had been received. It was still not considered that the footprint of the building could safely accommodate the tree and its vulnerable rooting system. The proposed layout placed parts of the front elevation slightly forward of the outermost limit of the original building. This directly encroached in to the root protection zone (RPA) of the protected Beech tree. The nearby road (and underground services) and the building itself would have significantly constrained the volume of soil available to the tree's rooting system. This in

turn meant that any incursion in to the RPA would result in a disproportionate loss of the rooting system which would have a detrimental impact on the long-term health of the tree. Taking into consideration the excavation required to construct the foundations, the process of which would inevitably encroach further in to the RPA, and the need for scaffolding which would require further pruning back of the canopy, the cumulative effects of this would accrue to inflict significant damage on both the below and above ground parts of the tree.

Mr Smith addressed the committee in objection stating that parking would be an issue for the local residents and that the scale of the proposal was too large for the site.

Mr Sampson, agent for the applicant addressed the committee in response stating that the applicant had addressed the objections made and that site was not viable for affordable housing. Any overlooking issues could be addressed with obscure glazing.

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

- 1) The proposed development fails to meet the requirements of the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document 2017 by providing no on site affordable housing or a commuted sum payment contrary to Policy D5 of the Core Strategy Local Plan
- 2) By virtue of the proposed footprint, the close proximity to either side boundary of the site and the height of the proposed building and the location of windows providing direct overlooking the development would be an overbearing and unneighbourly form of development detrimental to the amenity of adjacent properties (residential care home and residential flats) contrary to the Core Planning Principles of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Policy B2 of the Core Strategy Local Plan 2013 and Saved Policy HO20 of the Borough Plan 2007.
- 3) By virtue of the lack of outlook and light to front elevation flats by virtue of the location of the TPO tree, and the small size of 6 of the units (30% of the proposed units) the scheme is considered to provide substandard accommodation detrimental to the amenity of future occupiers contrary to the Core Planning Principles of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and Policy B2 of the Core Strategy Local Plan 2013.
- 4) The development would have a significant detrimental impact on the long term health of the protected beech tree; the loss of the protected tree and the general loss of trees and soft landscaping to the site is detrimental to the character and appearance of the area contrary to Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, D10a of the Core Strategy Local Plan and Saved Policy UHT4 and UHT5 of the Borough Plan 2007.
- 5) The overall layout and scale of the development is considered unacceptable in terms of the size of the plot, by virtue of the height, footprint, siting within the site detailed design bulk and scale and the loss of the green openness of the rear garden by virtue of the scale of the development the proposal is therefore contrary to Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Policy D10a of the Core Strategy Local Plan 2013 and Saved Policies UHT1, UHT and UHT5 of the Borough Plan 2007.

6) By virtue of the lack of mechanism in place to secure the works to widen and improve the access the access is considered inadequate to serve the proposed development resulting in severe highways impacts and impacts on the safety of pedestrians contrary to Paragraph 32 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.

131 192 Seaside and 2a Hoad Road. Application ID: 170960.

Proposed demolition of existing buildings and erection of 6no. 2bed houses, 1no. 1bed bungalow, 1no. 1bed flat, 1no. 2bed flat and 1no. retail unit. Revised Site Layout Plan with no car parking spaces proposed.

This application relates to site of 192 Seaside and 2a Hoad Road –
DEVONSHIRE.

The committee was advised that following Parking survey received on 11 April 2018, East Sussex Highways had amended their consultation response as follows:

The submitted parking survey satisfactorily demonstrated the parking capacity in the area was sufficient, allaying the previous concerns the Highway Authority had. As such, they did not wish to restrict grant of consent subject to the inclusion of conditions. Conditions to be set in relation to provision of cycle parking spaces prior to occupation, existing vehicular accesses off of A259 Seaside and Hoad Road to be physically closed prior to occupation and submission of construction method statement prior to any works taking place.

Policy TR2 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan stated that development proposals should provide for the travel demands they create and should be met by a balanced provision for access by public transport, cycling and walking.

Additionally, Policy D8 of the Core Strategy recognised the importance of high quality transport networks and sought to reduce the town's dependency on the private car. The proposed development therefore complied with policy and as such should not be refused on the basis that this was a parking free scheme.

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

- 1) Timeframe
- 2) Drawings
- 3) Surface water drainage/SUDS scheme design
- 4) Proof of compliance with SUDS layout
- 5) Construction Method Statement to include Demolition statement, Asbestos investigation, construction times and habitat mitigation
- 6) Flood Risk Assessment
- 7) Hard/Soft Landscaping

- 8) Boundary treatments
- 9) Waste/Recycling.
- 10) PD windows
- 11) PD extensions

Informative:

The applicant's attention is drawn to the need for an agreement to be made in relation to any party walls. This not a matter covered under this planning permission.

A formal application for connection to the public sewerage system is required in order to service this development. To initiate a sewer capacity check to identify the appropriate connection point for the development, please contact Southern Water, Sparrowgrove House, Otterbourne, Hampshire, SO21 2SW (Tel: 0330 303 0119) or www.southernwater.co.uk.

132 South Downs National Park Authority Planning Applications.

There were none.

The meeting closed at 7.55 pm

Councillor Jim Murray (Chairman)