

Eastbourne Borough Council Planning Committee

Minutes of meeting held in Court Room at Eastbourne Town Hall, Grove Road, BN21 4UG on 29 May 2018 at 6.00 pm

Present:-

Councillor Jim Murray (Chair) Councillors Sammy Choudhury, Paul Metcalfe, Md. Harun Miah, Colin Murdoch, Margaret Robinson, Barry Taylor and Pat Hearn (Reserve) (as substitute for Janet Coles)

Officers in Attendance:

Leigh Palmer (Senior Specialist Advisor, Planning)
Joanne Stone (Lawyer)

Also in attendance:

Katie Maxwell (Committee Officer)

1 Minutes of the meeting held on 24 April 2018.

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 April 2018 were submitted and approved, subject to the inclusion of the word 'prejudicial' under minute 126; Councillor Murray's declaration regarding 2 Clifford Avenue, and the Chair was authorised to sign them as an accurate record.

2 Apologies for absence.

An apology for absence was reported from Councillor Coles.

3 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 Metcalfe MBE, declared a personal interest in minute 6 as he knew the objector in so far as he was the former owner of the objectors property. Councillor Metcalfe MBE was of the opinion that he did not have a prejudicial interest in the matter and remained in the room and voted thereon.

4 16 Woodland Avenue. Application ID: 180355.

Application for extensions to side, rear, conversion of garage, internal alterations. Along with provision of temporary elevation to South-West of the

property. Alterations to the terrace/patio area to South-East (rear) of the property – **RATTON**.

Following submission of the officer report, the committee was updated by way of the addendum report, that that the applicant had proposed amended plans to re-instate a front boundary wall and as such it was considered that there were now no longer highway or pedestrian safety issues and the street scene would not be affected by the scheme. In addition amended details had been received amending the proposed rear patio area. The scheme now pulled the patio away from the existing common boundary and graduated the garden down to the existing level.

This should not increase the overlooking above that which and therefore the application was recommend to be approved subject to conditions.

The committee discussed the proposal and were in support of the amendments, subject to the front boundary wall being re-instated to its original height.

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

1. Time Limit
2. Subject to Approved plans
3. Obscurity of the privacy screen serving the balcony must be a minimum of level 4 obscurity
4. Details of and timing of construction of front boundary wall.

5 35 Clarence Road. Application ID: 180330 (PPP).

Proposed Single storey extension to front elevation – **DEVONSHIRE**.

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

1. Time Limit
2. Approved Plans
3. Matching
4. Flat roof not to be an amenity space
5. Water run-off from roof
6. Extension shall not to be used as independent residential unit of accommodation.

6 Langney Shopping Centre, 64 Kingfisher Drive. Application ID: 180257.

Proposed installation of an office, maintenance bays, car washing canopy and car cleaning facilities within the car park area of Langney Shopping Centre for use by P1 Pit Stop. Services to include tyre replacement, vehicle valeting and detailing – **LANGNEY**.

Mr Kifford addressed the committee in objection stating that the proposals would result in noise pollution, increased traffic and that the building was not suitable for this location. Mr Kifford also suggested that the facility should not be open on a Sunday.

The committee discussed the application and felt that whilst the car wash would be acceptable, the tyre replacement would be better suited to a more 'industrial' location. Members discussed the perception of increased noise and were advised due to its surroundings and proximity to a busy road network, the proposed building and associated usage would not be a supportable reason for refusal. The Committee agreed that the design of the building in both size and design was out of keeping with the surrounding area.

RESOLVED: (By 5 votes to 2 with 1 abstention) That permission be refused on the grounds that:

1. The proposed development by reason of its design, layout and appearance would result in a form of development that would be incongruous and discordant with the prevailing pattern of development in the area and as such fails to maintain local distinctiveness. The scheme is found to be discordant with Policies Policy D10a of the Council's Core Strategy.

2. The proposed development would be considered to introduce an 'industrial activity' within this prime retail location and such may have an adverse impact upon the retail function, supporting car parking and thereby have the potential to impact upon the long term viability of this District Centre. The scheme is found to be discordant with Policy C8 and D4 of the Eastbourne Borough 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

7 Savoy Court Hotel, 11-15 Cavendish Place. Application ID: 180352 (PPP), 180353 (LBC).

At its meeting on 22 May 2018 the Group welcomed this application, which it is felt will enhance the specific buildings involved and the broader conservation area setting. The group wish to retain the candy-striped canopies and would hope the external decoration scheme became an exemplar for future restoration projects in the immediate area.

The committee was advised that amended plans had been received and now confirmed that all new windows and doors were to be timber framed and painted white and that the striped canopy decoration would be retained.

An East Sussex County Council Highways consultation response had been received with no objection subject to the imposition of conditions. The committee was updated by way of the addendum report as follows:

Trip Generation

The applicant had not provided trip generation analysis in their application. Having undertaken my own analysis using the TRICS database, the estimated number of trips for the existing hotel use is 60 trips per day, whilst the estimated trips for the proposed 15 flats is 27 trips per day. As such, it was considered that there would not be an increase in trips in the local area due to this development.

Car Parking

The applicant was not providing on-street parking, nor does there appear to be scope to provide this. The trip generation analysis suggests that the existing hotel usage would have a higher on-street parking demand than the proposed usage.

The 'Transport Statement' submitted stated that two loading bays would be removed following the development and that the removal of these bays would provide an additional six parking spaces on-street. The applicant should provide detail on these bays and the removal of these loading bays should be secured by condition.

Cycle Provision

ESCC welcomed the provision of cycle parking at the development. Cycle parking was shown to be provided to the rear of the development in wooden sheds. It should be demonstrated that 15 cycle spaces would be provided as a minimum, in line with ESCC standards (1 space per flat). Considering the development was proposed to be car-free, the cycle parking provision should be higher than the minimum set out in the guidance.

The spaces provided should be shown on a plan submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. The plans should clearly show how many cycles could be accommodated and show the spaces could be easily accessed. This should be secured by condition.

Refuse Collection

The applicant was proposing to retain the existing servicing arrangements, presumably via the back alley adjoining Cavendish Place. The applicant should provide a Servicing Management Plan, which should be secured by condition. The Council's waste management team should satisfy themselves that the agreed approach within that Servicing Management Plan is acceptable. The plan should be in line with the ESCC 'Good Practice Guide for Property Developers: Refuse and Recycling storage at new residential development within the Eastbourne, Hastings Wealden and Rother Council Areas' where possible.

Construction

Given the town centre location of the site, and the potential for construction vehicles to impact the flow of traffic and pedestrian safety in the surrounding highway network, a Construction Traffic Management Plan should be provided, with details to be agreed.

Affordable Housing

The applicant had submitted an Affordable Housing Statement in support of their application. This advised they had discussions with registered social landlords in terms of the on-site delivery of affordable housing but no interest was made.

The site was situated within a low value area, therefore in terms of ESCC Affordable Housing Policy, 30% of units should be 'affordable'. This equated to 4.5 units. The proposal was for each building to comprise of 5 flats. Therefore a whole building would not be made available for on-site affordable housing. As such, as given the constraints of the site, being listed, it was not considered that on site affordable housing was achievable. Therefore in accordance with the Affordable Housing Policy if the outcome was that on site affordable housing was not achievable an order of preference was provided within the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance 2017 the last of which was a commuted sum in lieu of on-site provision. However, as the development provided 1 and 2 bed flats within a low value area, the Affordable Housing SPD provided no liability on the basis that the site would not be viable.

Therefore it was considered that the Affordable Housing Policy had been met by the submission of the Affordable Housing Statement and as such the recommendation contained within the report could be amended to remove the requirement for a S106 agreement to secure the Affordable Housing.

It was also considered that the Local Labour obligations could adequately be dealt with by condition.

RESOLVED (A) 180352: (By 5 votes to 3) That permission be refused on the grounds that by virtue of the small size, the proposed flats would provide substandard accommodation for future occupiers; and given the number of flats proposed (no. bedroom/occupation) the development would constitute an overdevelopment of the site detrimental to the amenity of the future occupiers and existing surrounding occupiers contrary to the core principles of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, and Policy B2 of the Core Strategy Local Plan 2013.

RESOLVED (B) 180353 (LB): (By 5 votes to 3) That Listed Building consent be refused on the grounds that By virtue of the amount of flats proposed, and the internal alterations required to provide such number (bedroom/occupancy) the development would harm the character and appearance of the Listed Building contrary to section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, D10 of the Core Strategy Local Plan 2013, and Saved Policy UHT17 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.

8 South Downs National Park Authority Planning Applications.

There were none.

The meeting ended at 7.25 pm

Councillor Jim Murray (Chair)