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Planning Committee

Present:-
Members:  Councillor Ungar (Chairman); Councillors Hearn, Jenkins, Miah, Murray, Murdoch, Taylor and Stanley (as substitute for Harris).

(An apology for absence was reported from Councillor Harris)

111 Minutes of the meeting held on 22 April 2014.

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 April 2014 were submitted and approved and the Chairman was authorised to sign them as a correct record.

112 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.

Item 117 – St Andrews School – 72 Meads Street – Councillor Taylor declared a personal interest on the basis that family members attended the school. This was not deemed to be prejudicial and he remained in the room and voted thereon.

Item 119 – 2 Upwick Road – Councillor Ungar stated that he had predetermined the issue and therefore withdrew from the room whilst this item was considered.

113 32-34 Eshton Road. Application ID: 140177 (PPP).

Proposed single storey rear extension, together with an increase in the number of children from 48 to 56 at any one time – DEVONSHIRE. The County Archaeological Advisor and Environmental Health raised no objections to the proposal. Four letters of objection were reported from local residents. A letter of support from the resident of 30 Eshton Road was reported at the meeting.

The Highway Manager reported that the application was unlikely to lead to a severe impact on the operation of the highway around the site on the basis of a number of site visits and the traffic survey submitted. The Committee was advised that the published National Planning Policy Framework states that a development can only be refused on transport grounds where the impact is severe.

The Committee raised concerns regarding the increase in the number of children proposed and made reference to the application for the same increase which was dismissed on appeal in January 2014. Although the Committee noted the extended hours of operation of the nursery granted in
2013, it was considered that the impact on parking could still be significant. Concerns were also raised regarding the loss of outdoor space proposed.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That permission be refused on the grounds that 1) The proposed increase in the number of children from 48 to 56 at any one time would be capable of adding significantly to the demand for parking, to congestion and to potentially unsafe parking and other manoeuvres at already busy times of day; 2) The proposed extension would result in the loss of usable play space for the children, to the detriment of the amenities of the users of the nursery.

114 113 St Philips Avenue. Application ID: 140305 (HHH).

Two storey rear extension and alterations – ST. ANTHONYS. The County Archaeologist raised no objections to the proposal. Two letters of objection were reported from local residents. Two further letters of objection were reported at the meeting. Mrs Viney addressed the Committee on behalf of local resident Mrs Harker and raised concerns regarding loss of light and direct overlooking causing loss of privacy.

The applicant, Ms K Hadington responded and outlined the amendments made to the application to minimise the impact on neighbouring properties. The Committee was advised that the scheme now included the demolition of the existing garages.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That permission be granted subject to conditions: 1) Time for commencement; 2) In accordance with approved drawings; 3) Standard demolition and construction time condition; 4) Use of matching materials; 5) The proposed high level windows in the flank elevation facing 115 St Philips Avenue shall be recessed to provide external reveals and shall only be glazed in semi-obscure glass, and shall be fitted with restrictors so that they are incapable of being opened more than 200mm; 6) The proposed new window (shown on the approved plan as serving the dressing room on the first floor) in the flank elevation facing 111 St Philips Avenue shall only be glazed in semi-obscure glass and incapable of being opened.

115 Eastbourne College, Marlborough House, Old Wish Road, Application ID: 140194 (PPP) 140196 (LBC) 140397 (PPP).

a) 140194 - demolition of existing buildings and the redevelopment of the site to provide the following development: (i) Sports facilities consisting of a sports hall, swimming pool, squash courts, fitness suite, multi-purpose studio and changing facilities; (ii) 31 classrooms (net increase of 7); (iii) School shop; and (iv) Dining hall (b) 140196 - creation of a new access through the listed wall facing College Road and closing of existing access (c) 140397 - location of 12 temporary classrooms across the College campus to accommodate students during the construction period – MEADS.

The Conservation Area Advisory Group at its meeting on 1 April 2014 welcomed the detailed consultation undertaken by the applicants to address previous concerns raised. It considered the project to be imaginative,
forward looking and one that would have a positive impact on the surrounding conservation area.

The Council’s Specialist Advisors for Planning Policy and Economic Development raised no objections to the proposal. East Sussex County Council’s Highways, Archaeologist and Ecologist and Southern Water raised no objections subject to a number of conditions. English Heritage raised no objections to the demolition or the concept of a contemporary design at the site, provided that it respects the historic context. The Council’s Specialist Advisor for Arboriculture requested an additional condition in relation to the application for temporary buildings to prevent damage to any trees on site 1 adjacent to Grassington Road which are subject to a Tree Preservation Order.

A letter of support was reported from Mr S Lloyd MP stating that the development will be a major additional asset to the College and requesting that through the construction phase the contractors be encouraged to offer local apprenticeships. The Committee was advised that the applicant had agreed to a Unilateral Undertaking in relation to employment initiatives.

A letter of support was reported from Mr N Howell, Planning Advisor to the Eastbourne Society supporting the contemporary design and scale of the proposal which is considered imaginative, impressive and respectful to the Conservation Area.

The Committee was advised that a Fire Consultant has been instructed as part of the project and the scheme will be fully compliant with the Building Regulations in terms of fire safety.

The Chairman reported on the comments of support received from Councillors Ansell and Elkin.

Mr Forbes-Wastie a local resident addressed the Committee in support of the proposal which will provide excellent facilities for both the school and Eastbourne. Mr H Drake from the Devonshire Park Hotel welcomed the proposal which will complement and improve the area and blend well with the existing buildings and the Devonshire Park development.

**RESOLVED: (Unanimous) (1)** That planning permission and relevant demolition in a conservation area be granted in respect of 140194 subject to the completion of a Unilateral Undertaking relating to employment initiatives and to conditions: 1) Time for commencement; 2) Approval of drawings; 3) Submission of all external materials; 4) The demolition and construction shall be carried out in accordance with biodiversity statement; 5) To avoid disturbance to nesting birds, any demolition of buildings or removal of scrub/trees that could provide nesting habitat should be carried out outside the breeding season (generally March to August); 6) No development shall take place until the developer has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work; 7) The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the archaeological site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed; 8) The development shall not be occupied until the existing access shown on the approved plans to be blocked up has been stopped up and the kerb & footway reinstated; 9) The new access shall be
in the position shown on the submitted plan; 10) The development shall not be occupied until a turning space for vehicles has been provided; 11) Prior to demolition works commencing on site a Traffic Management Scheme shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority; 12) Provision of wheel washing facilities; 13) The development shall not be occupied until disabled parking area has been provided in accordance with the approved plans; 14) Prior to the commencement of development the developer must advise the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with Southern Water) of the measure which will be undertaken to divert the public sewers; 15) All existing trees, shrubs and other natural features not scheduled for removal shall be fully safeguarded during the course of the site works; 16) No bonfires or burning of materials shall take place within 6 metres of the furthest extent of the spread of the canopy of T4 and T5; 17) Details of works and impacts on trees T4 and T5; 18) The soil levels within the root spread of T4 and T5 of the applicants tree report (Ref: BM-1041tr) to be retained shall not be raised or lowered; 19) No works or development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape proposals have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority; 20) Details of tree planting; 21) Any such trees that are removed, die or become, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously damaged or defective within five years of planting shall be replaced; 22) Standard construction time condition; 23) Demolition method statement; 24) Standard unknown contamination condition; 25) Details of temporary structures or hoardings; 26) The terrace shall not be used other than between the hours of 0700 and 2200 on any day.

That an Informative be attached to the decision notice advising the applicant as follows:

1) Your attention is specifically drawn to the conditions above marked ++. These conditions require the submission of details, information, drawings, etc. to the Local Planning Authority PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF ANY DEVELOPMENT ON THE SITE and or PRIOR TO OCCUPATION OF THE BUILDING. Failure to observe these requirements will result in a contravention of the terms of the permission and the Local Planning Authority may take appropriate enforcement action to secure compliance. You are advised that sufficient time for the Authority to consider the details needs to be given when submitting an application to discharge conditions. A period of between five and twelve weeks should be allowed. A fee of £97 is payable for each submission to discharge conditions.

2) The applicant/developer should enter into a formal agreement with Southern Water to provide the necessary sewerage infrastructure required to service this development. Please contact Southern Water, Southern House, Sparrowgrove Otterbourne, Hampshire SO21 2SW (Tel: 03303030119) or www.southernwater.co.uk.

(3) That Listed Building Consent be granted in respect of 140196 subject to conditions 1) Time for commencement; 2) Approval of drawings; 3) Materials to match the existing.

(4) That planning permission be granted in respect of 140397 subject to conditions 1) Time for commencement; 2) Approval of drawings; 3) The
temporary buildings hereby permitted shall be removed and the land restored to its former condition on or before 31 December 2017; 4) That a method statement to be submitted prior to commencement of development hereby permitted in relation to site 1 adjacent to Grassington Road; and thereafter the construction/installation of the temporary buildings shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved method statement. The statement should give due consideration to all trees on the site; (i) detailing access and installation of the classrooms in order to prevent damage to trees; (ii) the location of any site office, access routes, ground protection and material storage areas before commencement of construction to prevent damage to trees; (iii) details of proposed and existing functional services below ground (e.g. drainage, power communication cables and pipelines) indicating positioning to ensure any new services are installed in a location to avoid damage to the trees; and (iv) details of any tree protection fencing or hoarding to the root protection areas of the trees if necessary.

Reason: To ensure that trees, shrubs and other natural features to be retained are adequately protected from damage to health and stability throughout the construction period in the interests of amenity.

116 Land at the Corner of Firle Road and, Beltring Terrace. Application ID: 140119 (OSR)

Outline application (for access, appearance, layout and scale) for demolition of house and garage at 60 Firle Road and garage at 13 Beltring Terrace and the erection of 4 no.1 bedroom apartments and 1 no. 2 bedroom house (with landscaping reserved) – DEVONSHIRE.

The Council’s Planning Policy Manager raised objections on the grounds that the proposal is considered to create undue harm to the character of the area and residential amenity.

The Environment Agency recommended that in areas at risk of flooding consideration be given to the incorporation into the design and construction of the development of flood resilient and resistant measures. The Local Highway Manager raised no objections to the proposal.

Seventeen letters of objection were reported from local residents. Residents of Beltring Terrace, Ms A Suffolk and Mr Nolan addressed the Committee against the proposal. Concerns were raised regarding the impact of the development on the character of the surrounding area, parking, an increased risk of flooding and the close proximity of the development which may prevent the ability to maintain the neighbouring property.

The applicant, Mr Dowding responded and stated that the scheme had been amended to address the concerns raised. He considered that the development would enhance the area and advised that no objections had been raised by the Local Highway Manager in terms of parking.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That permission be refused on the grounds that by reason of the scale and layout of proposed development and the detailed design and appearance of the proposed buildings the proposals are
inconsistent with the character and appearance of the surrounding residential area and are therefore contrary to saved policies.

In coming to this decision to refuse permission, the Local Planning Authority have had regard to the requirement to negotiate both positively and pro-actively with the applicant, in line with the guidance at paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework. However, the planning constraints leading to this refusal of permission, namely the proposed over development of the site and the detailed design of the proposed buildings, do not appear capable of resolution without major revision to the proposal.

Appeal: Should the applicant appeal the decision the appropriate action to be followed, taking into account the criteria set by the Planning Inspectorate, is considered to be written representations.

117 St Andrews School, 72 Meads Street. Application ID: 140288 (PPP).

Erection of a new sports hall (including changing facilities. WCs, office, storage and dance studio) located on existing playing field – MEADS.

A number of local residents raised objections to the proposal on highway grounds in terms of parking and congestion. A public consultation had been held at the pre-application stage following which a number of modifications had been made to the scheme.

The Design Review Panel had considered the scheme and a number of requested amendments had been made. The Conservation Area Advisory Group at its meeting 1 April 2014 raised no objections in principle to the provision of a sports hall, and considered that it would be an improvement to the facilities. Some concerns remained regarding the overall height and the design. The County Archaeological Advisor, Highways and the Environment Agency raised no objections to the proposal subject to conditions.

The Council’s Specialist Advisor for Design and Conservation advised that any building should respond to the topography and character of the conservation area to which it is sited. The Council’s Specialist Advisor for Planning Policy raised no objections to the proposal. The Council’s Specialist Tree Advisor raised no objections subject to conditions to safeguard existing trees during construction.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That permission be granted subject to the completion of a Unilateral undertaking relating to employment initiatives and to conditions 1) Time for commencement; 2) In accordance with approved plans; 3) Scheme for the implementation of archaeological works; 4) Use shall not be brought into use until the site investigation and post archaeological investigation assessment has been supplied; 5) Unsuspected contamination is encountered; 6) Foul and surface water disposal; 7) Tree protection; 8) Samples of external materials; 9) Construction method statement (including information over excavated spoil and routing and location for its disposal; 10) Access way details location and external...
finishing; 11) Car parking layout including disabled parking spaces; 12) Service trenches details; 13) Site office/site compound; 14) Wheel washing facilities.

118 The Parkfield, Lindfield Road. Application ID: 140359 (NMC) 140309 (PPP) 140307 (ADV) 140544 (VOC).

(a) Application for non-material amendments to application ref: 120604 for the proposed change of use of public house (A4) to retail (A1) together with demolition of existing single storey extension and erection of two single storey extensions (Ref: 140359); (b) Advertisement consent for a Totem Advert (Ref: 140306); (c) Advertisement consent for Various signage (Ref: 140307); (d) Planning permission for installation of plant (Ref: 140309); (e) Application for variation of a condition of planning application Ref 120604 relating to landscaping and external finishes (Ref: 140544) – RATTON.

The application related to previous applications which were granted on appeal in relation to the change of use from a public house to a retail unit, which was also subject to a lawful development certificate (Ref: 120585).

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) (1) Permission be granted in respect of 140359 (NMC).

(2) That advertisement consent be refused in respect of 40306 (ADV) on the grounds that the proposed totem sign by virtue of its location, size and design would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area contrary to saved policies UHT1, UHT4, UHT12 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan (Saved policies 2007) and policies B2 and D10A of the Eastbourne Core Strategy Local Plan (2013) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

(3) That advertisement consent be approved in respect of 140307 (ADV) with standard conditions, approved drawings and condition in relation to hours of illumination limited to no later than 23:00 or after the premises are closed to the public (whichever is the earlier).

(4) That permission be granted in respect of 140309 (PPP) subject to conditions (1) Time Limit; (2) approved drawings; (3) Rating Noise level condition.

(5) That in respect of 140544 permission be granted for a variation of application 120604 relating to landscaping and external finishes.

119 2 Upwick Road. Application ID: 140155.

Application for approval of details reserved by condition of original permission (EB/2011/0193(FP)) and EB/2012/0753(FP)) - OLD TOWN.

Two applications for the redevelopment of the site at 2 Upwick Road for the erection of 6 houses, with car parking and landscaping had been approved on appeal. The current application sought approval of details reserved by condition attached to the original permissions granted.
East Sussex County Council Highways raised no objections subject to the wheel washing water not dispersing over the public highway.

Mr Cline addressed the Committee against the proposal and stated a complaint had been submitted to the Local Government Ombudsman regarding the planning process for the application. He also raised concerns regarding the accuracy of some of the drawings submitted and the support of the boundary wall.

Mr J Pearce addressed the Committee on behalf of the applicant and made reference to the extensive consultation undertaken with officers and appeal Inspector.

The Committee was advised that the Local Government Ombudsman complaint was not relevant to the application. With regard to the width of the accessway serving the site, the appeal Inspector had taken independent site measurements and based their determination on the measurements taken, which accorded with the submitted details.

(NB: Councillor Ungar withdrew from the room whilst this item was considered. Councillor Murray took the Chair).

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) In respect of 140155 that the details reserved by condition of original permission (EB/2011/0193(FP)) be approved: Condition 3: Samples of external materials; Condition 8: Protective fencing for trees; Condition 9: Details of wheel washing for construction traffic; Condition 11: Details of access road and turning area (including details of: finished surfacing materials, gradient and drainage).

(2) In respect of 140156, that the details reserved by condition of original permission (EB/2012/0753(FP)) be approved: Condition 3: samples of external materials; Condition 7: Protective fencing for trees; Condition 8: Facilities for cleaning wheels of construction traffic; Condition 10: Details of access road and turning area (including: finished surfacing materials, gradient, kerb radii, drainage, stepped access to No. 2 Upwick Road).

120 South Downs National Park Authority Planning Applications.

None were reported.

The meeting closed at 8.50 pm

Councillor Ungar (Chairman)
Executive Summary:
Amended plans submitted following site visit with applicant and agent have reduced the size of the terrace and therefore the impact on neighbouring residential properties. The application went to the Delegated Meeting on 14th May 2014 and was deferred to committee by the Chair due to the level of objection to the proposals. The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of impact on the amenities of surrounding residential properties and in terms of design, preserving the character and appearance of the Meads Conservation Area and therefore it is recommended that planning permission is granted.

Constraints:
Meads Conservation Area
Archaeological Notification Area

Relevant Planning Policies:
National Planning Policy Framework

Eastbourne Core Strategy Local Plan Policies 2013
B1 Spatial Development Strategy
B2 Creating Sustainable Neighbourhoods
C11 Meads Neighbourhood Policy
D4 Shopping Meads Street District Shopping Centre
D10 Historic Environment
D10A Design
Site Description:
The site is a terraced 3 storey property which has a commercial unit at ground floor level (dentists surgery) and a flat above which is to be occupied by the owner of the dentists surgery. The surrounding properties are of the same layout. The property is situated within the Meads Conservation area and District Shopping Centre. There is a similar structure to that proposed at 13 Meads Street, which appears to have been in situ for some time however there is no record of permission having been granted for these works.

Relevant Planning History:
090109
Proposed change of use of ground floor and basement premises from estate agents (A2) to a dental surgery (D1) (amended description).
Planning Permission
Approved conditionally
03/04/2009

Proposed development:
The applicant wishes to erect a balcony at first floor level at the rear. This will be accessible from the kitchen of the flat, span the width of the projecting rear elevation (and provide access to the rear garden from the flat).

This involves the removal of the current pitched roof over the rear projection and the garden store in order to create space for the external steps.

The bottom of the balcony lies 2.8m high which including the balustrade extends to 4m high. On the North elevation there is a 1.8m high screen proposed along the edge of the balustrade.

The habitable area of the balcony extends 2.8m from the rear elevation and there is a narrow walkway extending a further 2.95m and at 1.1m wide on the boundary with 13 Meads Street, before the step access to the garden leads right to the rear boundary.

The steps, handrail and balustrade are all galvanised metal. The door to replace the window at first floor level to gain access to the balcony is uPVC and there are to be roof deck tiles on the resulting flat roof.

Consultations:
Internal:
Specialist Advisor Design and Conservation – no comments.

Neighbour Representations:
Objections have been received from 9 Meads Street, Ground Floor Flat 9 Meads Street and 16 Milnthorpe Road and cover the following points:
- Endangering wildlife and their habitats
• Impact on protected trees
• Setting a precedence that will create disturbance and rubbish
• Overlooking
• Privacy
• Overshadowing/loss of light
• Visual impediment to the original red brick outline of the property – effect on conservation area.

Appraisal:

Principle of development:
There is no objection in principle to installing a balcony at the building provided it would be designed to a high standard, respect the established character of the area and would not have an adverse effect on amenity or the character of the conservation area and would be in accordance with policies of the Core Strategy 2013, and saved policies of the Borough Plan 2007.

Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers and surrounding area:
Due to the fact the property and those surrounding are terraces and this is a minor addition, there is not perceived loss of outlook or light. Main concerns surround loss of privacy to 9 Meads Street through creating a first floor view of the property.

Following a meeting onsite the plans were amended to reduce the depth of the balcony to reduce the impact of overlooking to residents at 9 Meads Street. There are flats at first floor level and above, with one flat at the ground floor rear of this property. There is also a screen proposed on the North side to reduce this impact of overlooking/perceived overlooking from the proposed terrace. These amendments have lessened the ability to overlook to an acceptable level.

Concerns surrounding increased noise are under consideration because the amenity space created is to serve a residential flat, whereas the garden which could be used for amenity is currently not in full use as it serves a business. However, the size of the balcony alleviates these concerns as there is unlikely to be an inappropriate number of people creating noise, smell etc in an area this small.

Design issues:
The size of the development and materials used are not unusual or offensive to a plot of this size or the conservation area. Especially as the balcony and access are situated at the rear of the property. Where the balcony is situated is sensitive to the neighbouring properties and is not visually dominant or overbearing on this modest site.

Impact on character and setting of a conservation area:
As the balcony is situated at the rear of the property and is not visible from the public realm the conservation area is not negatively impacted and due to the nature of the development the county archaeologist was not consulted due to the low risk of this development, therefore, the historic environment is protected.
Other matters:
This also accords with the vision of the Meads Neighbourhood Policy in that the historic environment has been protected from inappropriate development. The proposal has no impact on the district shopping area hierarchy.

Human Rights Implications:
The impacts of the proposal have been assessed as part of the application process. Consultation with the community has been undertaken and the impact on local people is set out above. The human rights considerations have been taken into account fully in balancing the planning issues; and furthermore the proposals will not result in any breach of the Equalities Act 2010.

Conclusion:
The proposed development has been designed as such that residential amenity is not significantly affected. The location and development type conserve the historic environment.

This is subject to conditions but the proposal accords with Eastbourne Borough Local Plan (Saved policies, 2007), Eastbourne Core Strategy Local Plan (2007-2027) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

Recommendation:
Approve conditionally

Conditions:
1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
   Reason: To comply with Sections 91 and 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.)

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings no. 229000-03 Rev A submitted on 30 April 2014.
   Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the proposed development is carried out in accordance with the plans to which the permission relates.

3. The 1.8m in height privacy screen shown on the approved drawing 229000-03 Rev to the northern edge of the terrace hereby permitted shall be installed prior to the commencement of the use of the terrace and maintained permanently thereafter.
   Reason: To protect the amenity of the neighbouring residential properties.

Appeal:
Should the applicant appeal the decision the appropriate followed, taking into account the criteria set by the Planning Inspectorate, is considered to be written representations.
App.No: 140420 (HHH)  
Decision Due Date: 29 May 2014  
Ward: Old Town

Officer: Toby Balcikonis  
Site visit date: 23 April 2014  
Type: Householder

Site Notice(s) Expiry date: N/A  
Neighbour Con Expiry: 01 May 2014  
Weekly list Expiry: 25 April 2014  
Press Notice(s): N/A

Over 8/13 week reason: The application expired on 29/05/2014 following a referral from Delegated Committee on 14 May 2014.

Location: 12 Manvers Road, Eastbourne, BN20 8HJ

Proposal: Proposed loft conversion, including hip to gable roof enlargement with rear dormer. Also included are 2 x rooflights to the front roof slope and proposed new window in to the gable end.

Applicant: Mr & Mrs D. Ashford

Recommendation: Approve with conditions

Executive Summary
Two applications have been submitted (one pertaining to each property) to extend at roof level a pair of semi-detached properties with a hip to gable extension, a rear dormer and rooflights to the front elevation roof slope. It should be noted that whilst the applications are for planning permission the works in the majority could be considered permitted development; the reason planning permission is required is in relation to the connection of the dormer extensions over the firewall at roof level. It is not considered that the works would result in significant impacts in terms of amenity on adjacent residential properties to warrant the refusal of the application and the works are considered to result in acceptable impacts on the visual appearance of the properties; as such it is recommended that planning permission is granted.

Relevant Planning Policies:
National Planning Policy Framework

Eastbourne Core Strategy Local Plan Policies 2013
B1 - Spatial Development Strategy and Distribution
B2 - Creating Sustainable Neighbourhoods
C4 - Old Town Neighbourhood Policy
D5 – Housing
D10A - Design

Eastbourne Borough Plan Saved Policies 2007
Site Description:
The application property comprises a 2-storey, 3-bed semi-detached property situated on the Western side of Manvers Road (attached to number 14 Manvers Road to the North). The application property shares its Southern flank boundary with 10 Manvers Road (a semi-detached property, adjoined with 8 Manvers Road).

Relevant Planning History:
100428 – 16 Manvers Road
Erection of a single storey rear extension replacing conservatory.
Approved Conditionally - 10/09/2010

140087 – 2 Manvers Road
Hip to gable extension to roof comprising space for an extra bedroom and bathroom.
Approved Conditionally – 02/04/2014

EB/2006/0580 – 13 Cherry Garden Road
Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for an extension to the side and rear of the roof in connection with a loft conversion.
Issued – 03/10/2006

140425 – 14 Manvers Road
Proposed loft conversion, including hip to gable enlargement with rear dormer. Also included are 2 x roof lights to front roof slope and proposed new window to the gable end.
Submitted – 01/04/2014

Proposed development:
The applicant seeks permission to alter the roof space through the creation of a Hip to Gable extension to the Southern roof slope (closest to the shared boundary with 10 Manvers Road) and in addition the creation of a rear dormer in the rear roof slope elevation running the entire width of the property (6.4 metres), which projects a maximum of 2.6 metres, at a maximum height of 2.2 metres.

- Hip to Gable: Additional volume created of approximately 19m$^3$
- Rear Dormer: Additional volume created of approximately 18m$^3$
- Total additional volume of created roof space: 37m$^3$

Proposed external finishing materials include:

- Roof extension – Plain tiles to match the existing roof
- Dormer/gable walls - Plain Concrete tile hanging to match roof of main dwelling
- Flat Dormer roof granite chippings imbedded in bitumen

The applicant also seeks to add a window in to the gable end of the proposed roof extension to provide natural light to the new stairwell leading up to the converted loft.
space and landing; and the addition of 2 roof lights in the front roof slope (facing out on to Manvers Road) serving the proposed new bedroom.

**Consultations:**

**Neighbour Representations:**
15 neighbouring properties were consulted by letter for this application. 1 letter of Objection was received from No.16 Manvers Road concerning the appearance of the cumulative effect of proposed roof alterations at the 12 & 14 Manvers Road especially when viewed from the rear.

**Appraisal:**

**Principle of development:**
There is no objection in principal to the extension of a property in this area by way of alterations to the roof, including the construction of a dormer to the rear, providing the development is in-keeping with the surrounding streetscene, and does not have an unacceptable impact of the amenities of the adjacent properties.

**Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers and surrounding area:**
Due to the path of the sun from East to West throughout the day there is considered to be no unacceptable impact by way of loss of light or overshadowing as a result of the proposed development to the neighbouring property at number 10 has the same alignment of their respective rear elevations and is situated to the South of the application address negating any impact.

There are not considered to be any concerns through overlooking from the proposed rear West-facing dormer. Glazing already exists in this elevation on first floor level and the new window serving the proposed second floor bedroom is located away from any of the shared boundaries to minimise any intrusive views and is considered to be acceptable.

The proposed new side elevation window indicated in the extended gable end serves a stairwell, leading on to a landing accessing the proposed new bedroom and bathroom in the converted roof space. This is a transitory space and the function of the window is to provide natural light to area and is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the residential amenities of the neighbouring property by way of loss of privacy by overlooking, and it is not deemed to condition the indicated window to be obscure glazed.

The submitted planning applications for this property and the adjoining dwelling at number 14 Manvers Road cannot be carried out individually due to the full width rear dormer running the full length of both properties and there are considered to be no unacceptable detrimental impact to residential amenity on either of the adjoining properties caused by the development at the other.

The distance to the neighbouring properties to the front and rear are sufficient so as to cause no concerns through issues of overshadowing or loss of natural light.

**Design issues:**
The majority of properties found along Manvers Road consist of pairs of semi-detached dwellings with those on the Eastern side of the road noticeably more uniform in appearance (style, setting and alignment) than those on the Western side where the application property is sited. Although varying in appearance across pairs of semi-detached properties on the Western side of the street, they are characterised by the fact that in most circumstances both of the properties within the pairs are finished identically providing symmetry across the pairs which the applications submitted for 12 and 14 are seeking to do.

There are examples along the road where roof spaces have been extended and converted through Permitted Development and submitted planning applications for hip to gable extensions, rear dormers and the installation of roof lights in the front roof slope, setting precedence for this type of development in the area. It is considered that the proposed developments at numbers 12 and 14 will not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the streetscene and character of the Western side of Manvers Road.

There are currently no examples along the street where both properties within a pair of semis have both carried out extensions, and there is a concern that the resulting development across the pair of application properties will have a greater visual presence than neighbouring properties when looking at them straight on, although this will be offset by the fact that the front façade is set further back in the site than either of the adjacent pairs of semi-detached properties, meaning that the proposed roof extensions will not be visible from most of the public realm.

When viewed from the rear gardens of next door properties (to 12 and 14 Manvers Road) in particular, the rear elevation will effectively become three storeys across both properties which will be more visually imposing than the properties appear currently.

Although the majority do not cover the full width of the rear roof slope, there are a number of larger rear dormer extensions in close proximity to the application sites namely 22 & 26 Manvers Road, 13 Cherry Garden Road to the South (completed under Permitted Development with LDC granted) as well as a recent permission granted (approved with conditions 01/04/2014) for a hip to gable extension and rear dormer at number 2 Manvers Road.

The properties to the rear along Cherry Garden Road are situated over 5 metres higher and over 50 metres from the application site and are not considered to be affected significantly by the proposed development.

It is considered that although the cumulative effect of development across both 12 and 14 Manvers Road will make the properties more imposing, especially when viewed from the rear, the works to increase the property size could be achieved in the main through permitted development, and it is considered that the development would not cause sufficient concern to restrict the grant of planning consent.

There are numerous examples along Manvers Road of roof lights being installed in to the front roof slope of residential dwellings, and this element of the proposal is therefore not out-of-keeping within the locale and the size, number and positioning is considered to be appropriate for the host property and therefore considered to be acceptable. It is
important also to note that the installation of rooflights could be considered permitted development.

**Impact on character and setting of a listed building or conservation area:**
The application property is not located in or near a Conservation Area, and not within the setting of a Listed Building.

**Impacts on trees:**
It is considered that there will be no impact to trees / vegetation as a result of the proposed development. The proposed works are all to the roof area, in addition to the fact that there is no significant vegetation located in close proximity to the development.

**Impacts on highway network or access:**
There are considered to be no highways issues as a result of the proposed works.

**Sustainable development implications:**
There are not considered to be any sustainable development implications as a result of the proposed development.

**Other matters:**
The scope of the proposed developments falls almost entirely within that of permitted development in that it is proposed to be finished in materials to match the existing dwelling and the additional volume of under 40 cubic metres created as a result of extending and converting the loft is below the limit of 50 cubic metres for a semi-detached property as directed by the General Permitted Development Order for Householders.

At present the plans indicate that due to the construction, the dormers sought permission for at 12 & 14 Manvers Road would not be able to be built in isolation to each other. However if the respective applicants were to separate the dormers so that the construction remained within their own boundaries they could be constructed without planning permission, under Permitted Development.

The further remaining element to which could not be constructed under permitted development is the proposed gable end window which is not indicated as being obscure glazed (as per PD regulations). However, as covered earlier on in the appraisal, the proposed new side elevation window serves a stairwell and transitory space and is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the residential amenities of the neighbouring property.

The proposed roof lights to the front roof slope (facing out on to Manvers Road) could be installed without planning consent, under Permitted Development.

**Human Rights Implications:**
The impacts of the proposal have been assessed as part of the application process. Consultation with the community has been undertaken and the impact on local people is set out above. The human rights considerations have been taken into account fully in balancing the planning issues; and furthermore the proposals will not result in any breach of the Equalities Act 2010.
Conclusion:
The proposed development is considered to have an acceptable impact to residential amenity by way of overshadowing / loss of natural light to the surrounding area and neighbouring properties and there are considered to be no concerns with regard to loss of privacy as a result of the proposed development.

The majority of the works at both 12 and 14 Manvers Road could be carried out by the applicants under permitted development. The works are considered to be reasonable in size, and choice of finishing materials to match the existing dwelling/s and therefore it is recommended that planning permission is granted.

Recommendation:
It is recommended that the proposed development be approved with the following conditions:

Conditions:
1) The development herby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of permission.
Reason: To comply with Sections 91 and 92 of the Town and County Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings submitted on 01/04/2014:
Drawing No.: 227000.04 - Proposed Floor Plans
Drawing No.: 227000.05 - Proposed Elevations
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3) The external finishes of the development hereby permitted shall match those detailed in the approved drawings and application form submitted 01/04.2014.
Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that order with or without modification), no windows, dormer windows, doors or openings of any kind (other than those expressly authorised by this permission) shall be constructed in the upper floors of the South East Flank of the development.
Reason: To safeguard the privacy of the occupiers of adjoining properties.

Summary of reasons for decision
The proposed development is considered to have an acceptable impact to residential amenity by way of overshadowing / loss of natural light and loss of privacy to the adjacent residential properties as a result of the proposed development. The roof alteration are considered to be acceptable in terms of its size, style and use of materials.
and accords with policies UHT1, UHT4 and HO20 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan Saved Policies 2012, the Eastbourne Core Strategy Local Plan, and the NPPF.

**Appeal:**
Should the applicant appeal the decision the appropriate followed, taking into account the criteria set by the Planning Inspectorate, is considered to be *written representations.*
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### Agenda Item 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>App.No: 140370 (HHH)</th>
<th>Decision Due Date: 23 May 2014</th>
<th>Ward: St Anthonys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officer:</strong> Richard Elder</td>
<td><strong>Site visit date:</strong> 23 May 2014</td>
<td><strong>Type:</strong> Householder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Notice(s) Expiry date:</strong> N/A</td>
<td><strong>Neighbour Con Expiry:</strong> 5 April 2014</td>
<td><strong>Weekly list Expiry:</strong> N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Press Notice(s):</strong> N/A</td>
<td><strong>Over 8/13 week reason:</strong> Out of time to align with Committee Schedule and request to speak</td>
<td><strong>Location:</strong> 12 Netherfield Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong> Side, Rear and Basement Extension with associated internal alterations to provide enlarged accommodation.</td>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong> Mr Ian Poorman</td>
<td><strong>Recommendation:</strong> Refuse Planning Permission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning Status:
Predominantly residential area

### Relevant Planning Policies:
Eastbourne Core Strategy Local Plan Policies 2013
B2: Creating sustainable neighbourhoods
C8: Langney Neighbourhood Policy
D10A: Design

Eastbourne Borough Plan Saved Policies 2007
UHT1: Design of New Development
HO20: Residential Amenity

### Site Description:
The application property is a linked (by garage) detached bungalow on the southern side of Netherfield Avenue. The property possesses similar architectural detailing as a number of other properties in the area.

To the front of this range of properties is an area of well maintained informal public open space. To the rear of the plot lies an existing allotment site and The Bishop Bell School. There is no significant change of levels within the rear garden.

The adjoining properties are separated by low boundary fences and they possess a number of extensions and outbuildings.

### Relevant Planning History:
Proposed development:
Consent is sought to construct a side, rear and basement extension with associated internal alterations to provide enlarged accommodation.

The scheme proposes the excavation under the footprint of the proposed single storey extension to provide a basement extension with further excavation to provide garden access.

The footprint of the extension is stepped (staggered) along the common boundary with No 14 Netherfield Avenue and off set from the common boundary with No 12 Netherfield Avenue. The proposed extension is capped with a flat roof and incorporates three roof lanterns to provide internal illumination.

The extension extends 4.5m beyond the rear main wall of the property and a total of approximately 12m beyond the rear of the existing side addition of application property. The maximum width of the extension is 9.5m. The height of the extension excluding the roof lanterns is approximately 6m with 3m sited above ground level.

At ground floor level the extension provides space for a utility room, kitchen and living/dining room. At basement level the extension provides accommodation for a family room.

Consultations:
External:
None considered applicable

Neighbour Representations:
Three objections have been received (representing the owners adjacent nearby residents and cover the following points:
• Large amounts of earth will need to be moved
• Heavy plant and machinery will disrupt shared driveway to the front of the plot. May cause damage to driveway and drainage
• Noise and disturbance during construction process
• Increase in space will increase the parking demands on the area.
• Loss of light
• Existing works within the plot has caused localised flooding
• Trees have been cleared from the site
• Outbuilding used for business (office) purposes
• Overshadowing
• Eyesore
• Affect the character of the area
• Affect the wildlife of the area
• Overlooking
• Affect the quality of the adjacent gardens
• May cause subsidence, may require underpinning

Appraisal:
The main issue to take into account in determining this application are the impacts on visual and residential amenity.
Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers and surrounding area:
The application abuts an existing allotment site to the rear, therefore the proposed development would only affect the properties on either side.

In addition the proposal includes a single storey extension above ground level and in terms of the impact upon neighbouring properties (overshadowing/loss of privacy) it is this relationship/impact that has been assessed.

10 Netherfield Avenue – The proposed extension is offset from the common boundary with this property by 6m and on this common boundary are the adjoining garages. Given this separation and the orientation it is considered that the extension would not result in substantive harm/impact upon the amenities of the occupiers of this property.

14 Netherfield Avenue – It is accepted that given the siting of the extension it would have greater impact upon this property. However given the stepped flank wall/footprint and orientation of the properties there would not be harm to the amenities of this property sufficient to substantiate a refusal of planning permission.

Within the rear elevation of this property is a bedroom and lounge window, whilst both are deemed to be main habitable rooms it is considered that the separation and the orientation is such that that there would not be any material harm in terms of loss of light/overshadowing.

It is accepted that the extension runs for a significant length of the common boundary with this property, however given the stepped (staggered) footprint and only single storey above ground level it is considered that there should not material harm to the occupiers of the this property.

On both of the common boundaries with the application site the plots are separated by existing low boundary fences. These fences whilst long standing do not provide the privacy screening that is common with residential properties. Given this the proposed flank windows and doors may afford overlooking into adjoining properties/plots; this is considered no more severe than from standing within the existing garden level and as such a refusal based on this issue could not be substantiated.

Design issues:
The height of the extension has an eaves level above that of the original property; this is due to current building standards and ties/consistent with the height of the existing side addition (more recent addition). Notwithstanding the eaves issue the materials used in the external appearance of the property would be consistent with those used in the area.

The extension is located wholly to the rear and as such will not impact upon the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Other matters:
The application proposes a basement construction and further excavations to facilitate access to garden level.
The application does not provide any information on the quantum of soil material to be excavated to secure this development, nor does it stipulate that this spoil would be removed or remain on site.

If to remain on the site there are no level details accompanying the application, and in the absence of this information it is considered that the proposal may give rise to a material loss of amenity to the occupiers of the adjoining properties through direct overlooking and may also give rise to a material increase in surface water run off which in turn may cause an increase in localised flooding.

If the spoil were to be removed from the site then there is likely to be a significant amount of skips and or ‘muck away’ vehicles visiting the site. There is no information with the application outlining how these will be accessed/serviced/filled. In the absence of this information it is considered that the location, servicing and frequency of transfer may have a material impact upon the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of the adjacent/adjoining properties.

In addition there is no information supplied with the application providing information that the quality of the external informal amenity space to the front of the properties in this part of Netherfield Avenue will be maintained and not adversely impacted as part of this development project.

It is accepted that these issues would normally be controlled via planning condition however given the unusual nature of this development (basement), the size of the rear garden and the nature and characteristics of the public realm to the front of the site are considered a unique set of circumstances that the site construction method statement is a determinative issue and in the absence of the information it is considered that the proposal may result in a an adverse impact upon the amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining occupiers and also upon the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

**Human Rights Implications:**
The impacts of the proposal have been assessed as part of the application process. Consultation with the community has been undertaken and the impact on local people is set out above. The human rights considerations have been taken into account fully in balancing the planning issues; and furthermore the proposals will not result in any breach of the Equalities Act 2010.

**Conclusion:**
The scale, orientation and design of the proposal and the impact on the amenities of the adjoining residents are considered, on balance, to be acceptable, subject to appropriate conditions.

The lack of information relating to spoil removal gives rise to concern sufficient to substantiate a refusal of planning permission.

**Recommendation:** Refusal Planning Permission

The application fails to satisfactorily demonstrate how the excavated spoil will be disposed off and in the absence of this information it is considered that:-
• if the spoil is left on site may give rise to loss of residential amenity through direct overlooking from raised ground level and may also increase surface water run off causing an increase in localised flooding and,
• if the spoil is removed from the site then there may be conflict with existing access arrangements to the site which may give rise to localised highway and pedestrian safety issues and
• if the spoil is removed from the site then there may be damage to the quality of the public realm to the front of the site which would detract from the character and amenity of the area.
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### Executive Summary

Two applications have been submitted (one pertaining to each property) to extend at roof level a pair of semi-detached properties with a hip to gable extension, a rear dormer and rooflights to the front elevation roof slope. It should be noted that whilst the applications are for planning permission the works in the majority could be considered permitted development; the reason planning permission is required is in relation to the connection of the dormer extensions over the firewall at roof level. It is not considered that the works would result in significant impacts in terms of amenity on adjacent residential properties to warrant the refusal of the application and the works are considered to result in acceptable impacts on the visual appearance of the properties; as such it is recommended that planning permission is granted.

### Relevant Planning Policies:

- National Planning Policy Framework
- Eastbourne Core Strategy Local Plan Policies 2013
  - B1 - Spatial Development Strategy and Distribution
  - B2 - Creating Sustainable Neighbourhoods
  - C4 - Old Town Neighbourhood Policy
  - D5 - Housing
  - D10A - Design

- Eastbourne Borough Plan Saved Policies 2007
Site Description:
The application property is a 2-storey, 3-bed semi detached property situated on the Western side of Manvers Road (attached to number 12 Manvers Road to the South). The application property shares its Northern flank boundary with 16 Manvers road (a semi-detached property adjoined with 18 Manvers Road) at a distance of 2.3 metres between the properties.

The rear elevation of the neighbouring pair of properties to the North of the application address (which includes number 16) are set back at a distance of over 1.5 metres from the main rear elevation of the application address. The occupant at number 16 has erected a rear single storey conservatory approximately 3.7 metres in depth.

Relevant Planning History:

100428 – 16 Manvers Road
Erection of a single storey rear extension replacing conservatory.
Approved Conditionally - 10/09/2010

140087 – 2 Manvers Road
Hip to gable extension to roof and rear dormer comprising space for an extra bedroom and bathroom.
Approved Conditionally – 02/04/2014

EB/2006/0580 – 13 Cherry Garden Road
Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for an extension to the side and rear of the roof in connection with a loft conversion.
Issued – 03/10/2006

140420 – 12 Manvers Road
Proposed loft conversion, including hip to gable enlargement with rear dormer. Also included are 2 x roof lights to front roof slope and proposed new window to the gable end.
Recieved – 01/04/2014

Proposed development:
The applicant seeks permission to alter the roof space through the creation of a Hip to Gable extension to the Northern roof slope (closest to the shared boundary with 16 Manvers Road) and in addition the creation of a rear dormer in the rear roof slope running the entire width of the property (6.4 metres), which projects a maximum of 2.6 metres, at a maximum height of 2.2 metres.

- Hip to Gable: Additional volume created of approximately 19 m$^3$
- Rear Dormer: Additional Volume created of approximately 18 m$^3$
- Total additional volume of created roof space: 37 m$^3$

Proposed external finishing materials include:
- Roof extension – Plain tiles to match the existing roof
- Dormer/gable walls - Plain Concrete tile hanging to match roof of main dwelling
- Flat Dormer roof granite chippings imbedded in bitumen

The applicant also seeks to add a window in to the gable end of the proposed roof extension to provide natural light to the new stairwell leading up to the converted loft space and landing; and the addition of 2 roof lights in the font roof slope (facing out on to Manvers Road) serving the proposed new bedroom.

**Consultations:**

**Neighbour Representations:**
15 neighbouring properties were consulted by letter for this application,

1 comment of objection was received from No.16 Manvers Road concerning the appearance of the cumulative effect of proposed roof alterations at the 12 & 14 Manvers Road especially when viewed from the rear; and the impact on the loss of light to rear windows as the application property is set back from No.16.

**Appraisal:**

**Principle of development:**
There is no objection in principal to the extension of a property in this area by way of alterations to the roof, including the construction of a dormer to the rear, providing the development is in-keeping with the surrounding streetscene, and does not have an unacceptaile impact of the amenities of the adjacent properties.

**Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers and surrounding area:**
The main impact of the proposed roof alteration by way of the potential effects to residential amenity would be to number 16 Manvers Road (next door property to the North) as the alignment of rear elevation extends over 1.5 metres further back than the main façade of its neighbour which can increase the potential impact of a proposed roof alteration.

The path of the sun throughout the day from East to West would means that there will be an increase in the amount of overshadowing occuring to the rear of the property at number 16 and in particular the site of the recently constructed rear extension and to a lesser extent, the rear bedroom in the South East corner of the property.

The extension at number 16 houses a kitchen and has two rooflights to increase the amount of natural light reaching this extended space. The proposed hip to gable extension and rear dormer at number 16 will be visible from the roof lights (and in particular the one closest to the shared boundary) and will cause some overshadowing to these components. There is however sufficient glazing to the the rear elevation of the extension which will not be affected directly by the proposed roof alterations and it is considered that the effects of overshadowing to this area will be to an acceptable level.

There are not considered to be any concerns through overlooking from the proposed rear West-facing dormer. Glazing already exists in this elevation on first floor level and the
new window serving the proposed second floor bedroom is located away from any of the shared boundaries to minimise any intrusive views and is considered to be acceptable.

The proposed new side elevation window indicated in the extended gable end serves a stairwell, leading on to a landing accessing the proposed new bedroom and bathroom in the converted roof space. This is a transitory space and the function of the window is to provide natural light to area and is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the residential amenities of the neighbouring property by way of loss of privacy by overlooking, and it is not deemed to condition the indicated window to be obscure glazed.

The submitted planning applications for this property and the adjoining dwelling at number 14 Manvers Road cannot be carried out individually due to the full width rear dormer running the full length of both properties and there are considered to be no unacceptable detrimental impacts to residential amenity caused to either of the adjoining properties by the development at the other.

The distance to the neighbouring properties to the front and rear are sufficient so as to cause no concerns through issues of overshadowing or loss of natural light.

Design issues:
The majority of properties found along Manvers Road consist of pairs of semi-detached dwellings with those on the Eastern side of the road noticeably more uniform in appearance (style, setting and alignment) than those on the Western side where the application property is sited. Although varying in appearance across pairs of semi-detached properties on the Western side of the street, they are characterised by the fact that in most circumstances both of the properties are finished identically providing symmetry across the pairs which the applications submitted for 12 and 14 are seeking to do.

There are examples along the road where roof spaces have been extended and converted through Permitted Development and planning applications for hip to gable extensions, rears dormers and the installation of roof lights in the front roof slope have been carried out, setting precedence for this type of development in the area. It is considered that the proposed developments at numbers 12 and 14 will not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the streetscene and character of the Western side of Manvers Road.

There are currently no examples along the street where both properties within a pair of semis have both carried out extensions at roof level, and there is a concern that the resulting development across the pair of application properties will have a greater visual presence than neighbouring properties when looking at them straight on, although this will be offset by the fact that the front façade is set further back in the site than either of the adjacent pairs of semi-detached properties, meaning that the proposed roof extensions will not be visible from most of the public realm.

When viewed from the rear gardens of next door properties (to 12 and 14 Manvers Road) in particular, the rear elevation will effectively become three storeys across both properties which will be more visually imposing than the properties appear currently.
Although the majority do not cover the full width of the rear roof slope, there are a number of larger rear dormer extensions in close proximity to the application sites namely 22 & 26 Manvers Road, 13 Cherry Garden Road to the South (completed under Permitted Development with LDC granted) as well as a recent permission granted (approved with conditions 01/04/2014) for a hip to gable extension and rear dormer at number 2 Manvers Road.

The properties to the rear along Cherry Garden road are situated over 5 metres higher and over 50 metres from the application site and are not considered to be affected significantly by the proposed development.

It is considered that although the cumulative effect of development across both 12 and 14 Manvers Road will make the properties more imposing, especially when viewed from the rear, the works to increase the property size could be achieved in the main through permitted development, and it is considered that the development would not cause sufficient concern to restrict the grant of planning consent.

There are numerous examples along Manvers Road of roof lights being installed in to the front roof slope of residential dwellings, and this element of the proposal is therefore not out-of-keeping within the locale and the size, number and positioning is considered to be appropriate for the host property and therefore considered to be acceptable. It is important also to note that the installation of rooflights could be considered permitted development.

Impact on character and setting of a listed building or conservation area:
The application property is not located in or near a Conservation Area, and not within the setting of a Listed Building.

Impacts on trees:
It is considered that there will be no impact to trees / vegetation as a result of the proposed development. The proposed works are all to the roof area, in addition to the fact that there is no significant vegetation located in close proximity to the development.

Impacts on highway network or access:
There are considered to be no highways issues as a result of the proposed works.

Sustainable development implications:
There are not considered to be any sustainable development implications as a result of the proposed development.

Other matters:
The scope of the proposed developments falls almost entirely within that of permitted development in that it is proposed to be finished in materials to match the existing dwelling and the additional volume of under 40 cubic metres created as a result of extending and converting the loft is below the limit of 50 cubic metres for a semi-detached property as directed by the General Permitted Development Order for Householders.

At present the plans indicate that due to the construction, the dormers sought permission for at 12 & 14 Manvers Road would not be able to be built in isolation to each other.
However if the respective applicants were to separate the dormers so that the construction remained within their own boundaries they could be constructed without planning permission, under Permitted Development.

The further remaining element to which could not be constructed under permitted development is the proposed gable end window which is not indicated as being obscure glazed (as per Permitted Development regulations). However, as covered earlier on in the appraisal, the proposed new side elevation window serves a stairwell and transitory space and is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the residential amenities of the neighbouring property.

The proposed roof lights to the front roof slope (facing out on to Manvers Road) could be installed without planning consent, under Permitted Development.

**Human Rights Implications:**
The impacts of the proposal have been assessed as part of the application process. Consultation with the community has been undertaken and the impact on local people is set out above. The human rights considerations have been taken into account fully in balancing the planning issues; and furthermore the proposals will not result in any breach of the Equalities Act 2010.

**Conclusion:**
The proposed development is considered to have an acceptable impact to residential amenity by way of overshadowing / loss of natural light to the surrounding area and neighbouring properties and there are considered to be no concerns with regard to loss of privacy as a result of the proposed development.

The majority of the works at both 12 and 14 Manvers Road could be carried out by the applicants under permitted development. The works are considered to be reasonable in size, and choice of finishing materials to match the existing dwelling/s and therefore it is recommended that planning permission is granted.

**Recommendation:**
It is recommended that the proposed development be approved with the following conditions:

**Conditions:**
1) The development herby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of permission.
   
   Reason: To comply with Sections 91 and 92 of the Town and County Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings submitted on 01/04/2014:

   Drawing No.: 227000.04 - Proposed Floor Plans
   Drawing No.: 227000.05 - Proposed Elevations

   Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
3) The external finishes of the development hereby permitted shall match those detailed in the approved drawings and application form submitted 01/04.2014.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that order with or without modification), no windows, dormer windows, doors or openings of any kind (other than those expressly authorised by this permission) shall be constructed in the upper floors of the North West Flank of the development.

Reason: To safeguard the privacy of the occupiers of adjoining properties.

**Summary of reasons for decision**

The proposed development is considered to have an acceptable impact to residential amenity by way of overshadowing / loss of natural light and loss of privacy to the adjacent residential properties as a result of the proposed development. The roof alteration are considered to be acceptable in terms of its size, style and use of materials and accords with policies UHT1, UHT4 and HO20 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan Saved Policies 2012, the Eastbourne Core Strategy Local Plan, and the NPPF.

**Appeal:**

Should the applicant appeal the decision the appropriate followed, taking into account the criteria set by the Planning Inspectorate, is considered to be written representations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>App.No:</strong></th>
<th>Decision Due Date:</th>
<th><strong>Ward:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>140441 (HHH)</td>
<td>5 June 2014</td>
<td>Upperton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Officer:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Site visit date:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Type:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sally Simpson</td>
<td>16 April 2014</td>
<td>Householder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site Notice(s) Expiry date:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Neighbour Con Expiry:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Weekly list Expiry:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Press Notice(s):</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>1 May 2014</td>
<td>30 April 2014</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Over 8/13 week reason:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request to speak at Planning Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Location:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44 Kings Drive, Eastbourne, BN21 2PB.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Proposal:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed first floor extension over garage to form en-suite shower/dressing room together with internal alterations, including installation of staircase to increase ceiling height of lower ground floor rooms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Applicant:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs J. Hennessy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Recommendation:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approve conditionally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relevant Planning Policies:**

- National Planning Policy Framework 2012
  Paragraphs 17 & 58

- Eastbourne Core Strategy Policy 2013
  B1 Spatial Development Strategy and Distribution
  B2 Creating Sustainable Neighbourhoods
  C2 Upperton Neighbourhood Policy
  D5 Housing High Value Neighbourhoods
  D10 Historic Environment Archaeological Notification Area
  D10A Design

- Borough Plan Policies 2007 (Saved Policies)
  UHT1: Design of New Development
  UHT4: Visual Amenity
  HO2: Predominantly Residential Areas
  HO20: Residential Amenity
  US4 Flood Protection and Surface Water
  US5 Tidal Flood Risk
  HO2 Predominantly Residential Areas
**Site Description:**
The site consists of a large part three storey, three bedroomed residential detached family dwelling with attached garage. The property is located on one of the main access routes into Eastbourne Town Centre. There are other properties along this residential main road which have carried out similar works – mainly an extension over the garage in to form of a dormer, for which there is not always a record of planning permission granted.

**Relevant Planning History:**
No relevant planning history.

**Proposed development:**
The applicant is seeking planning permission to extend above the existing garage to create an en-suite shower room and dressing room. The proposed internal alteration will include the installation of a staircase to improve the ceiling height of the lower ground floor rooms.

**Consultations:**
- **External:**
  - County Archaeologist – No comments

  Environment Agency - Although the site is located in an area that is within a flood zone, the risk of flooding from a proposal for a first floor extension above the garage is unlikely to have any impact that would increase the risk of flooding.

  **Neighbour Representations:**
  1 letter of objection has been received from 46 Kings Drive the neighbour located to the side (West) elevation and the issues raised are summarised below:
  - This proposal would set a precedence as other extensions over existing garages have been in the form of a dormer construction thereby substantially reducing the impact of the structure on the adjoining properties – majority are detached dwellings
  - With only one clear side access the impact (of the proposal) would be facing our home and would be an eyesore
  - Loss of light – only natural light to the side elevation of our house is from this point and (proposal) would obliterate light to our lower ground floor, ground floor and first floor common parts. The large window on the half landing giving light to the whole house is an important design feature as well as the only natural light we currently enjoy.

**Appraisal:**
- **Principle of development:**
  There is no objection in principle of erecting an extension above the existing garage in this residential area provided it would be designed to a high standard, respect the established character of the area and would not have an adverse effect on the amenity or the character of the area and is in accordance with the policies of the Core Strategy 2013, and saved policies of the Borough Plan 2007 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
The internal alterations which include the provision of bi-fold doors to the lower ground floor and staircase do not require planning permission and therefore cannot be taken into consideration in determining this application, and as such would only be covered by building regulations.

**Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers and surrounding area:**
The neighbour located immediately to the West elevation of the proposal has expressed their objection in terms of loss of light and the overall negative effect the proposal would have on their residential amenity. However, the window on the flank elevation that would have a view towards the proposed extension, is a landing window and not a window letting in light/sunlight to a habitable room. For this reason it is considered that an objection cannot be sustained in respect of loss of light/sunlight or an overbearing relationship.

There are a number of extensions above garages within the street and as such a refusal based on visual intrusion cannot be justified.

**Design issues:**
The actual design of this proposal is sympathetic to the host dwelling in retaining its original character. The proposed roof to the garage extension would be tiled and pitched and the walls would be rendered which would match the existing property in terms of design and character. There are no windows proposed in the side elevation facing the neighbouring property which respects and retains privacy for both properties.

**Impact on character and setting of a listed building or conservation area:**
This proposal is not within a conservation area or near a listed building.

**Impacts on trees:**
This development would not have any impact on trees as there are none within the vicinity of this proposal.

**Impacts on highway network or access:**
There is an existing driveway with access to the main road; the proposed works will not have any detrimental impact on highway access or safety.

**Human Rights Implications:**
The impacts of the proposal have been assessed as part of the application process. Consultation with the community has been undertaken and the impact on local people is set out above. The human rights considerations have been taken into account fully in balancing the planning issues; and furthermore the proposals will not result in any breach of the Equalities Act 2010.

**Conclusion:**
On balance it is not considered that a refusal based soley on design and bulk could be substantiated; it is not considered that the extension above the garage would result in significant impacts on the amenity of the adjacent property, no. 46 Kings Drive to warrant a refusal of the application.
The proposed extension above the garage is considered acceptable in terms of scale, design and would have minimal impact in terms of visual and neighbour amenity and therefore complies with sved policies UHT1, UHT4, HO2, HO20 of the Borough Plan 2007, Policies B2 and D10A of the Eastbourne Core Strategy Local Plan 2013 and the guidance outlined within the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

**Recommendation:** Approve, subject to the following conditions

**Conditions:**
1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings received on 2 April 2014:
   - Drawing Number 223700-01 - Existing Site Plan & Proposed Block Plan
   - Drawing Number 223700-03 - Proposed Plans & Elevations
   - Drawing Number 223700-04 - Proposed First Floor Plan & Sections
   **Reason:** For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the proposed development is carried out in accordance with the plans to which the permission relates.

2. That all materials used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those on the existing building in terms of type, texture and colour.
   **Reason:** To secure that the development is in harmony with the existing building.

3. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no window, dormer window, rooflight or door other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed without planning permission obtained from the Local Planning Authority.
   **Reason:** To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and to comply with policies B2 & D10
**App.No:** 131017  
**Decision Due Date:** 26 April 2014  
**Ward:** Langney

**Officer:** Hayley Cornford  
**Site visit date:** 15 April 2014  
**Type:** Planning Permission

**Site Notice(s) Expiry date:** 7 May 2014  
**Neighbour Con Expiry:** 5 May 2014  
**Weekly list Expiry:** 27 May 2014  
**Press Notice(s):** 5 May 2014

**Over 8/13 week reason:** Planning Committee cycle following referral from Delegated

**Location:** Sports Ground, Shinewater Lane, Eastbourne

**Proposal:** Erection of 4no. floodlights, measuring 18m in height, and a covered terrace, measuring 8m wide, 3m in depth and 2.8m high, to the football ground. Floodlights to be in operation on Saturday afternoons and for 1no. weekday fixture per week.

**Applicant:** Mrs Tracey Saunders

**Recommendation:** Refuse

**Executive Summary:**
The application is being recommended for refusal on the grounds that the floodlights would have an adverse impact on the amenity of the adjacent neighbours.

As the application also includes the covered terrace, this will not be considered separately.

**Relevant Planning Policies:**
National Planning Policy Framework 2012

Core Strategy Local Plan 2013 Policies
C9: Shinewater & North Langney Neighbourhood Policy
D7: Community, Sport and Health

Eastbourne Borough Plan Saved Policies 2007
NE28: Environmental Amenity
UHT4: Visual Amenity
NE18 Noise
UHT13: External Floodlighting
Site Description:
The application site is one of a pair of playing fields (known locally as ‘Hankham and Stone Cross Playing Fields’) located on the south-east side of Shinewater Lane and surrounded by a residential area, largely privately owned, and with a school to the west of the fields.

The are managed by ‘Fields In Trust’ and it is understood that they were willed to the residents of Hankham and Stone Cross.

One of the two areas of the playing field is left to meet the informal recreational needs of the community whilst the other (application site) is laid out for/as a playing field. The existing football pitch has previously (with planning permission) had railings fitted and is currently used by Langney Wanderers, who are currently playing in Division 3 of the Sussex County League.

The football pitch is located on part of the site that is bounded on the three sides by a complex of school buildings, mature tree/shrub planting and residential dwelling houses on on one side by the remaining part of the playing field.

Relevant Planning History:
There is an extensive planning history for this playing field, whilst there has been support for development over the years there remains little development on at the site. In short, the club changing room building, the street lamps and the railing around the pitch were all present at the time of the site visit.

EB/1955/0094 Sports pavilion
Approved Unconditional 1955-03-10

EB/1969/0510 Timber shed for use as changing room
Approved Conditional 1969-10-09

EB/1970/0041
Single storey concrete building for use as changing room
Approved Conditional 1970-02-05

EB/1973/0073 Single storey pavilion
Approved Conditional 1973-02-22
EB/1978/0445 Prefabricated replacement changing room
Approved Conditional 1978-10-17

EB/1981/0069 Single storey extension to sports pavilion
Approved Unconditional 1981-03-10

EB/1992/0222
Extension and minor alterations to pavilion and dugout
Approved Conditional 1992-07-07

EB/1993/0038 Rebuild Pavilion Approved Conditional 1993-03-16

(960093)  EB/1996/0180 Erection of spectator stand.
Approved 1996-10-09

(970553)  EB/1997/0019 Construction of access road from Lavender Close
and provision of car parking area for 30 cars.
Refused 1997-04-16

(080533)  EB/2008/0552 Retrospective application for 8 street lights on
footpath and provision of one street post for connection of CCTV
APPROVED CONDITIONALLY 2008-09-30

(130158)  EB/2013/0124 Erection of railings around football pitch
APPROVED CONDITIONALLY 2013-05-02

**Proposed development:**
The applicants have submitted a supporting statement outlining that for the Football Club to continue to progress up the league pyramid the ground has to comply with a number of set infrastructure requirements.

Therefore in an attempt to comply with these requirements this application has two discrete elements to it.

1. To erect 4no. 18m high floodlights to the ground. The floodlights would be manually operated and would be used on a Saturday afternoon and for 1 game midweek (if scheduled) and as light requires. On a Saturday the game would commence at 2pm or 3pm weather dependant. No evening/night time use at the weekends.

2. To erect a covered terrace to the south-eastern end of the pitch, measuring 8m wide, 3m in depth and 2.8m high. The covered terrace would be set back from the existing railings by 1m and would be 9m to the east of the south-west corner of the railings.

**Consultations:**
Internal:
Estate Manager:
• No comment to make.

Specialist Advisor (Arboriculture):
• Recommends condition on tree protection and service trench details to be supplied and agreed.

Specialist Advisor (Environmental Health):
• No comment received at time of writing report.

External:
None.

Neighbour Representations:
8 objections have been received and cover the following points:
• Field for all to enjoy and not just the football club
• Potential anti-social behaviour and noise/disturbance from people using the covered terrace when football is not being played.
• Unacceptable light pollution to neighbouring properties.
• Changing the unspoilt look of the field by erecting floodlights, spoiling the natural habitat.
• Who will monitor the floodlights and how will the council ensure compliance?
• Would increase indiscriminate car parking at and within the vicinity of the site.
• Inappropriate location for football matches, better suited to Shinewater Park.
• Recall that previous application for floodlights was refused (Shinewater Football Club).

Support:
• 3no. comments in support of the application have been received and cover the points:
  o Improvements made to the field and club house has benefitted the community.
  o The applicant maintains the fields (mowing both pitches) and working with Langney Wanderers football club.
  o Anti-social behaviour has reduced and the fields are no longer covered in dog excrement.
  o Hold events on the field and allow use of the club house for wider community functions and thereby supports local community spirit

Appraisal:
Principle of development:
There is no objection in principle to community societies/clubs wishing to extend/adapt/alter their facilities to meet changing demands and responsibilities subject to their aspirations not resulting in any material harm to the interests of acknowledged importance. In short, where a proposal can
demonstrate that the development of a community asset can be achieved/delivered without giving rise to significant harm to either visual amenity or the amenities of the local residents then it should receive full support.

Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers and surrounding area:
Floodlights:-
The scheme proposes 4no. 18m high floodlights with a range of hooded lamps at the head of the pole. These are sizeable structures and of themselves and whilst slender in their form they will command both long and short range views. The impact upon these views will be more acute when the floodlights are in operation. The predominant pattern of development in the vicinity is two storey residential properties and as such these columns will be visible from a number of vantage points around this part of town.

It is accepted that the height of the proposed columns along with the hoods/shielding to the lamps assists in reducing the amount of light spillage around the perimeter of the pitch. Officers accept the supporting information supplied with the application, but remain concerned over the loss of amenity to the residents that would ensue from their use.

Currently the site is a very discreet playing field surrounded by mature vegetation and whilst it is not located within the open countryside and very much within the urban fabric of Langney, it is not an area that possesses the feel of many of the towns more urban parks. It is considered therefore that the impacts/change to the current environment by the use of these floodlights would be likely to be more acutely felt than in other parts of the town.

Covered Terrace:
Whilst the design is not considered inappropriate, there is potential for anti-social behaviour as the terrace is open and could encourage use at times when the football club are not present/using the facilities.

Members will note that support for this type of facility was given in the past (see planning history) and officers see no substantive reason for not to continue with this support.

Issues of antisocial behaviour are a material planning consideration however officers consider that subject to a management regimes these could be controlled to a level where the benefits of the community asset outweigh the concerns on this issue.

Design issues:
The size of the covered terrace is modest and suitable for the needs of the club.
The 4no. floodlights would incorporate 16no.(in total) 1500watt metal halide lights providing a constant light level of 180 lux average. The lighting assessment states that the lights are designed with reflectors and visors to control and direct light onto the pitch and reduce the impact on the surrounding area.

In design terms and in isolation there are no objections to the integral design of the light columns and or the covered terrace.

**Impacts on trees:**
See Specialist Advisor Trees response for conditions to be applied to protect the trees if permission were granted.

**Impacts on highway network or access:**
The proposed works will not impact on the highway network or access. The proposal is not changing the existing use of the field which has already been established.

It is accepted that the use of the equipment will permit the use of the field on a formal basis into parts of the day that do not currently exist; as a result the increase in indiscriminate on street parking in the locality may also increase. There has been no response from the County Highways Department and as such it is assumed that they have no comments to make.

**Other matters:**
Those that are supporting this proposal have identified the wider community benefits that may result from this initiative, however officers consider that the impacts of the proposal in terms of harm to residential amenity and also harm to the visual amenity of the site and surrounding area outweigh the potential wider community benefits.

**Human Rights Implications:**
The impacts of the proposal have been assessed as part of the application process. Consultation with the community has been undertaken and the impact on local people is set out above. The human rights considerations have been taken into account fully in balancing the planning issues; and furthermore the proposals will not result in any breach of the Equalities Act 2010.

**Conclusion:**
The creation of a floodlit sporting facility would be an asset to the town and also this part of the local community, however these benefits are outweighed by material harm caused by the floodlights.

**Recommendation:**
Refuse.
The proposal by reason of their height, degree of illumination and the proximity to the boundaries of the site are likely to give rise to material harm to the residential amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of the nearby properties and also would be visually harmful to the long and short range views of the site and would be contrary to the policies NE28 Environmental Amenity, UHT4 Visual Amenity, UHT13 External Floodlighting and HO20 Residential Amenity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>App.No:</strong> 140237 (ADV)</th>
<th><strong>Decision Due Date:</strong> 13 May 2014</th>
<th><strong>Ward:</strong> Meads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officer:</strong> Toby Balcikonis</td>
<td><strong>Site visit date:</strong> 15 April 2015</td>
<td><strong>Type:</strong> Advertisement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site Notice(s) Expiry date:** 09 April 2014  
**Neighbour Con Expiry:** 09 April 2014  
**Weekly list Expiry:** 19 March 2014  
**Press Notice(s):** 19 March 2013  

**Over 8/13 week reason:** The application is being determined outside of its 8 week deadline due to a referral to Planning Committee at Delegated level.

**Location:** The Eastbourne Centre, 47-53 Grand Parade, Eastbourne

**Proposal:** Free standing signboard with perimeter LED illumination displaying Hotel logos and information at hotel entrances. "V" Hotel logo fixed to bulkhead. Bar Entrance (South Elevation). Free standing signboard with perimeter LED illumination displaying Hotel logos and information "VISTA" Bar logo fixed to ceramic balcony. Grand Parade (South East Elevation). Hotel logo manifestation to existing glazed balustrades.

**Applicant:** Mr Matt Huddart

**Recommendation:** Approve with standard advert conditions

**Planning Status:**  
Hotel in prominent seafront location in vicinity of predominant tourist accommodation alongside a block of residential properties.

**Constraints:**  
Listed Building – Grade II - 1971-05-17  
Howard Square - Nos. 1 to 6 (consec) & Nos. 9 to 12 (consec)

**Conservation Area**  
Town Centre and Seafront Conservation Area

**Relevant Planning Policies:**

- UHT4 - Visual Amenity  
- UHT12 - Advertisements  
- UHT15 - Protection of Conservation Areas  
- HO20 - Residential Amenity  
- UHT17 - Protection of listed Buildings
**Site Description:**
The Eastbourne Centre is a large substantial modern building, which holds a prominent position on the Eastbourne Seafront. The building is a 1970’s multi-storey purpose built hotel, consisting of a sub-basement, basement and ground up to seven floors.

The hotel restaurant sought to be refurbished, extends across the mezzanine and 1st floor levels, as a single, high-ceilinged room and opens on to a balcony.

The balcony faces directly south towards the seafront, across the corner of the hotel, and is located above the bar entrance.

The south-west elevation, which is formed of a series of tinted glazed, panels into communal and guest rooms, faces a residential block of apartments, Devonshire Mansions, at a distance of 15.5m from the outside perimeter of the hotel.

**Relevant Planning History:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>App Ref:</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision:</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EB/2011/0601</td>
<td>Erection of two totem signs fronting Grand Parade</td>
<td>Approved - standard conditions - advertising</td>
<td>02/02/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB/2009/0022 / 090825</td>
<td>Description: Replacement windows throughout and reconfiguration of main entrance doors and upgrading external works</td>
<td>Approved - conditionally</td>
<td>09/03/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB/2012/0186 / 120767</td>
<td>Single storey, glazed extension to existing mezzanine restaurant, extending onto balcony area.</td>
<td>Approved - standard conditions - advertising</td>
<td>30/05/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140192</td>
<td>Internally refurbish ground to first floor public areas of existing hotel. Refurbishment of the hotel exterior and creation of new stepped access at corner of Grand Parade and Lascelles Terrace to allow direct access to the hotel bar.</td>
<td>Current Application and reported elsewhere on this agenda</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed development:**
The applicant seeks permission for the erection of external signage representing the proposed new hotel livery (‘The View’ hotel). Proposed new signage includes:

1) Fascia Sign – Balcony (East)
• Polished and painted Stainless Steel “V”
• Mounted on Stainless Steel Panel
• Soffit-mounted down lights to provide illumination
• Signage area: 1 metre high x 2.79m wide
• Faces diagonally out to Grand Parade / Howard Square – West Rocks Hotel opposite

2) Fascia Sign – Above entrance (facing out to Howard Square)

• Polished stainless steel lettering of “V The View Hotel Eastbourne”
• Fixed to existing bulkhead above main entrance door
• “V” (above hotel name) to be polished and painted red stainless steel to reflect branding.
• Halo lighting illumination

3) Free-Standing ‘Totem’ signs x 2 - (Located adjacent to main entrance and outside bar area)

• 3m high + 20cm riser
• Narrow gauge 58cm long rods at top to connect to overhang for stability
• Aluminium Panel with stainless steel framed hotel signage
• Colours to reflect brand standards
• Recessed LED strip within frame to illuminate face

4) Manifestation

• “V The View Hotel” branding opaque transfers
• Applied to existing glass balustrade at raised ground floor level

5) Fascia Sign – Balcony (South)

• Painted steel “Vista Bar & Lounge” lettering
• Mounted on ceramic tile balcony above bar entrance
• Colouring to reflect hotel branding
• Halo lighting to provide illumination

Consultations:
Internal:
Tourism Manager: No response received.

Conservation Officer: Received (14.03.12):
• Considered that the proposed signage is unsympathetic to the building and its setting within the Conservation Area and the seafront in relation to:
  o Location
  o Materials
  o Finishes
  o Method of installation where specified

External:
Eastbourne Hotels’ Association: No response received.
The Group raised major objections to the proposal. It was felt that the proposed scale, material, colour, form and illumination were inappropriate for the surrounding Conservation Area.

**Neighbour Representations:**
64 consultation letters have been sent to neighbouring properties with 3 objections have been received and cover the following points:

- Proposed ‘neon’ sign will face residential apartment block (Devonshire Mansions
  - ‘neon’ light will disturb sleep
- 'neon’ light is unsuitable for this part of town
  - Lascelles Terrace quiet street
  - Hotels in this location have small subdued lit signage
  - Bar sign should face seafront / grand parade not residential flats
- Free standing signboards detract from integrity of Grand Parade
- The town’s unique charm lies in its difference from the fronts of its nearest neighbouring seaside towns (such as Brighton and Hastings)
- T&G Centre is already a “dagger in the heart” of the parade
  - Freestanding signboards will only compound the matter
- Understand the need for hotels / businesses to advertise with signage
- Desire for any lighting to be on front of building and not on Lascelles Terrace

A letter of support was received from Stephen Lloyd MP (dated 20/05/2014) concerning the refurbishment works planned for the hotel.

**Appraisal:**
**Principle of development:**
There is no objection in principal to the installation of new signage in this location so long as it is does not have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring residential properties, and is in-keeping with the host building and sympathetic to the adjacent Grade II listed buildings in Howard Square.

**Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers and surrounding area:**
The siting of The Eastbourne Centre is such that the majority of the proposed signage will not directly impact on the amenities of the adjacent buildings by way of the proposed illuminations. The Devonshire Mansions residential flats located on the corner of Lascelles Terrace and Grand Parade are sited at a distance of close to 22 metres at the closest point to one of the 'free-standing' totem signs (signage type 3) and 19 metres of the fascia sign on the balcony above the bar (signage type 5).

Concerns have been raised from residents of the Devonshire Mansions regarding the affect of the lighting shining on to their properties, and in particular disturbing sleep. Comments received have alluded to the use of neon signage, which has far greater luminance levels than the type of signage proposed in this vicinity (halo lighting for the bar signage and led frame lit for the free standing totem sign).
The halo style lighting consists of a light source located behind each of the individual letters, creating a glow around the lettering, rather than projecting light forwards. No luminance levels have been supplied for the proposed signage, so details of this will be conditioned to ensure it is of an appropriate level for the location. The type of lighting proposed in itself is not considered to be directed towards the adjacent residential properties, and is considered acceptable.

For the totem signage, the led lighting set within the frame will project light on to the board itself highlighting the facilities detailed on the main body of the board. The totem sign is located towards Grand Parade and there is no concern that this sign will adversely affect residential amenity in the nearby Devonshire Mansions.

Design issues:
Concerns were raised by the Conservation Officer regarding the proposed signage, however, The Eastbourne Centre is building of modern styling, unlike the majority of the other hotels along and around the seafront. The proposed style of signage is considered to be appropriate to the age and appearance of the application property, and is of a size and location that is appropriate within the context of the building.

The size, location and type of lighting and other signage proposed is not considered to be visually dominant and the number of proposed is appropriate to the size of the building and their specific positions.

Impact on character and setting of a listed building or conservation area:
The application building falls within the Town Centre and Seafront Conservation Area and adjacent to 9 - 12 Howard Square, and diagonally opposite across Howard Square, The Ambassador and Lathom Hotels all Grade II Listed buildings and concerns were raised by both CAAG and the Conservation Officer that the signage was inappropriate for the Conservation Area.

The free standing totem sign (type 3) is located at the closest point to the neighbouring building on the Southern side of the square. The sign will be located sympathetically beneath the entrance canopy at a distance of 2.9 metres within the footprint of the building. At 3 metres in height the sign is quite large but is not considered to visually dominant within the façade of the Eastbourne Centre, and is not considered to adversely impact upon the setting of Howard Square. The type of lighting is considered appropriate for the sign and its location.

Application reference EB/2011/0601 granted permission for two totem signs in similar positions to those proposed by the current application. The proposed signs are of comparable size to those which were granted permission although the approved signs were proposed to be internally lit.

Sign types 1 and 2 are considered to be positioned sympathetically within the confines of the site. The Fascia Sign, a painted stainless steel “V” with lighting to be mounted on the soffit above is to be mounted between the supporting pillars which define the East Elevation and will not be visible within much of Howard Square itself and is considered to be appropriate in its setting and size.
The Halo-Lit hotel sign fixed to the bulkhead above the main entrance door beneath the canopy formed by the first floor balcony. The sign is considered appropriate for the host building (which is in itself is stark contrast to the style of buildings in the square) and is positioned sympathetically so that it will not have a significant detrimental affect on the buildings within Howard Square.

**Impacts on trees:**
No trees will be affected as a result of the proposed signage.

**Impacts on highway network or access:**
The proposed signage is positioned well within the site, and not on the extremities of any of the elevation projections. Along with the proposed lighting to illuminate the different types of signage the proposed signage is not considered to be visually dominant, is appropriate for the location and should not have an adverse affect on the safety of persons using the adjacent highway.

**Sustainable development implications:**
The owners of the hotel are proposing to alter signage in line with a program of works to refurbish the hotel and attract more business to the hotel, providing a desirable location for visiting holiday makers and providing the town with a modern venue for conducting conferences. The proposed works, represent the new branding across the façade of the hotel in a manner that is considered to be appropriate in size, number and positioning and is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the appearance of this area of Grand Parade.

**Human Rights Implications:**
The impacts of the proposal have been assessed as part of the application process. Consultation with the community has been undertaken and the impact on local people is set out above. The human rights considerations have been taken into account fully in balancing the planning issues; and furthermore the proposals will not result in any breach of the Equalities Act 2010.

**Conclusion:**
The proposed signage will not have a significant and unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring residential properties, and is considered to be in-keeping with the host building and sympathetic to the adjacent Grade II listed buildings in Howard Square and the conservation area and is therefore considered to be appropriate in accordance with the relevant policies of the Borough Plan Saved Policies, Core Strategy Local Plan and the NPPF.

**Recommendation:**
It is recommended that the application is approved with the following conditions:

**Conditions:**

1 – 5) STANDARD ADVERT CONDITIONS
6) - PROVISION OF A LIGHTING ASSESSMENT – ADJ DEVONSHIRE MANSIONS

**Summary of reasons for decision**
The proposed signage will not have a significant and unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring residential properties, and is considered to be in-keeping with the host building and sympathetic to the adjacent Grade II listed buildings in Howard Square and the conservation area and is therefore considered to be appropriate in accordance with policies UHT4, UHT12, UHT15, UHT17 and HO20 of the Borough Plan Saved Policies, Core Strategy Local Plan and the NPPF.

**Appeal:**
Should the applicant appeal the decision the appropriate followed, taking into account the criteria set by the Planning Inspectorate, is considered to be *written representations.*
### Agenda Item 13

#### Planning Status:
Hotel in prominent seafront location in tourist accommodation zone with nearby residential properties.

#### Constraints:
- Listed Building – Grade II - 1971-05-17
- Howard Square - Nos. 1 to 6 (consec) & Nos. 9 to 12 (consec)

#### Conservation Area
Town Centre and Seafront Conservation Area

#### Relevant Planning Policies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UHT1</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Design of development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UHT4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Visual Amenity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UHT15 - Protection of Conservation Areas
UHT17 - Protection of listed Buildings
HO20 - Residential Amenity
TO4 - Improvements to existing accommodation

**Site Description:**
The Eastbourne Centre is a large substantial modern building, which holds a prominent position on the Eastbourne Seafront. The building is a 1970’s multi-storey purpose built hotel, consisting of a sub-basement, basement and ground up to seven floors.

The hotel restaurant sought to be refurbished, extends across the mezzanine and 1st floor levels, as a single, high-ceilinged room and opens on to a balcony.

The balcony faces directly south towards the seafront, across the corner of the hotel, and is located above the bar entrance.

The south-west elevation, which is formed of a series of tinted glazed, panels into communal and guest rooms, faces a residential block of apartments, Devonshire Mansions, at a distance of 15.5m.

**Relevant Planning History:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>App Ref:</th>
<th>Description:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EB/2011/0601</td>
<td>Erection of two totem signs fronting Grand Parade</td>
<td>02/02/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision:</td>
<td>Approved - standard conditions - advertising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB/2009/0022 / 090825</td>
<td>Description: Replacement windows throughout and reconfiguration of main entrance doors and upgrading external works</td>
<td>09/03/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision:</td>
<td>Approved - conditionally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB/2012/0186 / 120767</td>
<td>Single storey, glazed extension to existing mezzanine restaurant, extending onto balcony area.</td>
<td>30/05/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision:</td>
<td>Approved conditionally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140237</td>
<td>Free standing signboard with perimeter LED illumination displaying Hotel logos and information. At hotel entrances. &quot;V&quot; Hotel logo fixed to bulkhead. Bar Entrance (South Elevation). Free standing signboard with perimeter LED illumination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
displaying Hotel logos and information "VISTA" Bar logo fixed to ceramic balcony. Grand Parade (South East Elevation). Hotel logo manifestation to existing glazed balustrades.

Decision: Current Application Date: N/A

Proposed development:
The applicant seeks permission to internally refurbish ground to first floor public areas of existing hotel and carry out refurbishment of the hotel exterior and create a new stepped access at corner of Grand Parade and Lascelles Terrace to allow direct access to the hotel bar.

EXTERNAL:
- Clean and replace where required slate podium base (using reclaimed slate from external terrace)
- Introduce new stepped access (using recycled slate where possible)
- Clean white tiling and colour cement joints
- Repaint balcony soffits (white) – to give greater horizontal emphasis
- Clean and refurbish attic level and leadwork (methodology TBC)

GROUND FLOOR:
- Stepped access at hotel bar/restaurant

MEZZANINE FLOOR (External terrace):
- Slate floor tiles removed and replaced with ceramic (slates re-used)
- Void on terrace filled in to increase floor area and coverage for ground floor

OTHER MEZZANINE LEVEL WORKS:
- New restaurant layout
- New toilet layout
- Mezzanine bar reconfigured (new event bar and dining)
- Refurbish kitchen
- Frameless ‘picture’ window on south-facing corner
- Double height dining space split in to 2 levels by adding new floor for increased floor space on conference level

Applicant’s Points:
Following advice from the Council, the proposal has been revised to address Conservation concerns identified during the consultation period regarding the siting of a proposed temporary kitchen on the balcony adjacent to Lascelle’s Terrace. This has been deleted from the proposals.

The applicant recognizes the historical significance of the building and its association with the Trade Unions and to Jack Jones involvement and are keen to
protect the historical assets where possible including the Eastbourne Trade Union mural currently sited in the internal double-height dining space.

**Consultations:**

**Internal:**

Tourism: No response received.

Specialist Advisor Conservation
The application has also been considered within the context of the significant contribution the T & G centre has within the associative and historic importance and contribution of the building in the history of the Trades Unions movements in British social history.

- Concerned that works represent significant harm to the fabric and fittings of the hotel specifically loss of:
  - Double height internal spaces
  - Original light fittings
  - Concealment / removal of original surfaces
  - Creation of new stepped access – Adversely affect the intended balance and proportion of the exterior to the Eastbourne Centre.
  - Commemorative Plaque – Moved to unspecified location

**External:**
Eastbourne Hotels' Association: No response received.

CAAG: (01/04/2014)
The Group raised objections to the provision of a portacabin on the front terrace, and considered that this would have an adverse impact on the exterior of the building and the wider conservation area (REMOVED FROM THE SCOPE OF THE APPLICATION).

Strong concerns were raised regarding the loss of the original internal features, such as the lighting in the double height restaurant and the mural, which had particular historical references to the trade union movement.

**Highways:**
The pavement around this site has been adopted as public highway. In theory the area of land in question can be used for construction of the access following:

- Apply for a stopping up order for area
  - Legal process to be completed before anything built
  - Application subject to public consultation
  - Control of land returns to original

**Neighbour Representations:**
64 consultation letters have been sent to neighbouring properties with 5 objections received covering the following points:

- Objection to creation of new access to bar
  - Keep access through the hotel
- Noise and disturbance already by smokers / mobile phone users standing outside bar
- 18 residents of Devonshire Mansions whose principal bedrooms face Lascelle’s Terrace
- Proposed works (inc. proposed signage) damage integrity, charm and beauty of Eastbourne

OFICER NOTE: It is important to note that the greatest strength of objection was received toward the proposed siting of a temporary kitchen on the outside balcony adjacent to Lascelles Terrace, which has now been removed from the scope of the proposed works.

SUPPORT:
Comments of support have also been received for the external refurbishment of the building through representation received from the residents of the Devonshire Mansions, despite concerns raised for other elements of the scheme.

A letter of support was received from Stephen Lloyd MP (dated 20/05/2014) concerning the refurbishment works planned for the hotel covering the following points:

- Future success of The Eastbourne Centre will be greatly enhanced by the proposed refurbishments.
- Refurbishments and improvements to hotel exterior complete modernisation of the hotel and facilities will;
  - Meet demands of increasingly sophisticated client base
  - Whilst maintaining character of original development
  - Key element in the town’s tourism and conference inventory
  - Planned improvements support local employment
  - Encouragement of investment in the town welcomed

Appraisal:
Principle of development:
There is no objection in principal to the internal and external refurbishment of the building and the creation a new stepped access so long as it is does not have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring residential properties, and is in-keeping with the host building and sympathetic to the adjacent Grade II listed buildings in Howard Square.

Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers and surrounding area:
The external refurbishment works themselves to improve the appearance of the building is welcomed, and do not cause any concerns with regard to their impact on residential amenity.

The majority of objection received for this application came from adjacent residents in Devonshiore Mansion located across Lascelles Terrace to the South West, at a distance of 15.5 metres at the closest point, paid regard to the originally proposed temporary kitchen (now removed from the scope of the works) and the creation of the new stepped access from the corner of Grand Parade / Lascelles Terrace and in particular the concern of the effects that an increase of footfall to this area would cause by way of increased noise.

Communications received reflect instances of noise disturbance from people using the area at night, and in particular smokers and mobile phone users. Although communications reference complaints made to the Eastbourne Centre, the Council’s Environmental Health Team have confirmed that historically this has not been an issue, and that there have been no complaints received expressing these concerns to the department.

The outside area adjacent to the bar is currently accessible to patrons, and this will not change. The creation of the stepped access is intended to make navigation easier than the current access through the hotel lobby, which is convoluted and inconvenient for users of the bar and hotel alike and not in-keeping with the proposed model to increase the vitality of the venue.

A stepped access is transitory in nature, and therefore is considered not to generate noise as a direct result of their use. The steps lead from a terrace already in use, and on to Grand Parade, already used visitors to the town at all times of the day and night, and this element of the proposal is therefore deemed to be an acceptable addition to the host building.

**Design issues:**
A concern regarding the creation of the internal floor created in the double height space was it potential impact on the external appearance of the building and in particular to ensure that the level did not mean that it appeared to be mid-window height.

It has been demonstrated through photographs and a site visit that this feature will be installed at a level which will have limited visual impact externally as it will be fixed at a level internally which aligns with the external spandrels dividing the windows, and will have an acceptable impact.

With regard to the external balcony terrace in the South / WSouth West corner of the building works include the filling of a rectangular void measuring an area of 10.5 square metres and replacement of slate flooring / facing with ceramic tiling. This element does not have a significant presence in the public realm, but is
highly visible from upper floors in the adjacent Devonshire Mansions, and other nearby hotels with levels at a higher vantage point.

Submission of the replacement ceramic material will be secured by condition to ensure that it will have an acceptable appearance that is in keeping with the host building and surrounding conservation area.

Currently the void in the terrace balcony floor is situated above the bar entrance door which reduced the usable external floor in the terrace, and reduces protection against the elements in the covered area at the external raised ground floor terrace. By filling in the void there will be a loss of an original feature of the building, but it does not have a significant presence on the external appearance of the building, and therefore its loss is not felt to be of great concern.

Conservation concerns have been raised due to the concealment and replacement of existing features of the building. The applicant has responded to concerns where possible in that slate reclaimed from the external balcony terrace will be re-used to clad newly created areas (such as the proposed new stepped access in the Southern corner of the site) to ensure a greater amount of continuity. Reclaimed slate will also be used to replace existing damaged slate.

In response to the loss of important features of historical importance such as the internal mural, the applicant has formulated a program for its continued display, covered later on in the report. It is considered that the applicant has had sufficient regard to the preservation of important features, which must also be given weight against the rationale behind the intended works to ultimately rebrand the hotel in line with a greater commercial emphasis to ensure the vitality of the premises and the surrounding seafront area, and town as a whole.

Conservation comments were raised regarding the creation of the steps upsetting the “intended balance of the building”. The stepped access, 3 metres in length creating an additional area of just under 8 square metres is considered to be relatively minor in terms of the scale of the building as a whole, and is an integral part of the project to create a new, more direct access to the rebranded ‘Vista Bar’.

The external refurbishment works are considered to be appropriate, and have been welcomed by local residents, reflected in comments received.

Impact on character and setting of a listed building or conservation area:
The application building falls within the Town Centre and Seafront Conservation Area and adjacent to 9 - 12 Howard Square, and diagonally opposite across Howard Square, The Ambassador and Lathom Hotels all Grade II Listed buildings and concerns were raised by both CAAG and the Conservation Officer which focused predominantly on the loss of historical features. One of the major concerns was with regard to the proposed temporary kitchen to be sited
externally on the terrace, which was removed from the scope of the works following feedback from the Conservation Officer and CAAG.

The proposed new stepped access on the Southern corner of the building will not affect the setting of the listed buildings in Howard Square, and are not considered to have significant affect on the impact of the intended balance of the building.

The hotel owner / operators are keenly aware of the significance of the Eastbourne Mural which will be relocated into plans for new Unite National Education and Conference Centre which will be situated in Birmingham. This bespoke facility is being created by Unite the Union and it is felt believe that featuring this item in the new building will allow us to incorporate a part of the important past into our new dedicated venue.

A detailed photographic record of the mural has already been undertaken to enable this to be relocated perfectly and assurances have been offered to English Heritage that plans exist to ensure the safe keeping and protection of this item.

Impacts on trees:
No trees will be affected as a result of the proposed development.

Impacts on highway network or access:
The creation of a new stepped access will involve ‘reclaiming’ a section of the pedestrian area adjacent to the Southern corner of the boundary to create steps leading up to the Eastern corner raised platform. The corners of the host building have been designed to face South and East respectively to take advantage of the views that Eastbourne has to offer, which has led to an enlarged pedestrian pavement area at these points.

It is considered that the creation of steps in this location is appropriate for the location and should not have an adverse affect on the safety of persons using the adjacent pavement / highway along with the proposed external refurbishment works.

Sustainable development implications:
The owners of the hotel are proposing to undertake a program of works to refurbish the hotel and take a more commercial approach In the running of the establishment to attract more business to the hotel, providing a desirable location for visiting holiday makers and providing the town with a modern venue for conducting conferences. The proposed works, represent improvements to the appearance of the hotel (as well as parallel into works to improve the functionality of the layout in line with the new business model, and new branding across the façade of the hotel (separate application).
The proposed development is considered to be appropriate in terms of its size, use of materials for the host building and locale and is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the appearance of this area of Grand Parade.

**Human Rights Implications:**
The impacts of the proposal have been assessed as part of the application process. Consultation with the community has been undertaken and the impact on local people is set out above. The human rights considerations have been taken into account fully in balancing the planning issues; and furthermore the proposals will not result in any breach of the Equalities Act 2010.

**Conclusion:**
It is considered that the proposed refurbishment works, including the creation of a new stepped access, will not have a significant and unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring residential properties, and is considered to be in-keeping with the host building and sympathetic to the adjacent Grade II listed buildings in Howard Square and the conservation area and is therefore considered to be appropriate in accordance with the relevant policies of the Borough Plan Saved Policies, Core Strategy Local Plan and the NPPF.

**Recommendation:**
It is recommended that the application is approved with the following conditions:

**Conditions:**

1) Time
2) Materials (AS SUBMITTED)
3) Approved Drawings
4) Limited hours of demolition / construction (in line with standard)
5) Submission of materials – ceramic tiles for external balcony terrace
6) Siting of Plaque

**Summary of reasons for decision**
It is considered that the proposed refurbishment works, including the creation of a new stepped access, will not have a significant and unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring residential properties, and is considered to be in-keeping with the host building and sympathetic to the adjacent Grade II listed buildings in Howard Square and the conservation area and is therefore considered to be appropriate in accordance with the policies UHT4, UHT12, UHT15, UHT17, HO20 and TO4 of the Borough Plan Saved Policies, Core Strategy Local Plan and the NPPF.

**INFORMATIVE:**
The applicant is reminded to contact East Sussex Highways to arrange the necessary ‘Stopping Up Notice’ for works to the proposed stepped access on the corner of Grand Parade / Lascelles Terrace.

**Appeal:**
Should the applicant appeal the decision the appropriate followed, taking into account the criteria set by the Planning Inspectorate, is considered to be **written representations**.
App.No: 140157 (VCO)  
Decision Due Date: 26 May 2014  
Ward: Devonshire

Officer: Hayley Cornford  
Site visit date: 6 May 2014  
Type: Variation of Condition

Site Notice(s) Expiry date: 27 May 2014  
Neighbour Con Expiry: 27 May 2014  
Weekly list Expiry: 27 May 2014  
Press Notice(s): n/a

Over 8/13 week reason: Due to Planning Committee cycle and receipt of a request to speak.

Location: Land rear of 11-23 Eshton Road, Eastbourne


Applicant: Mr Ken Wilson

Recommendation: Approve unconditionally

Executive Summary:

It is acknowledged that the condition was originally applied to ensure parking provision for the property known as 11a Eshton Road to prevent impacting on the on-street parking and congestion in the surrounding streets.

Concerns from residents regarding parking as a result of future development are not relevant to this application and would be assessed/considered as and when applications are received.

In this case, the lack of use of the area provided for parking as part of the previous application demonstrates that the facility has not been required to date. It is therefore considered that the continued use without compliance with Condition 4 relating to the land now known as 11a Eshton Road would have no detrimental impacts on the amenity of neighbouring properties and as such is considered to be in accordance with Saved Policies HO2, HO20, TR2 and TR11 of the Eastbourne Local Plan and Policies B1 and C3 of the Eastbourne Core Strategy Local Plan.

Relevant Planning Policies:
National Planning Policy Framework 2012
Site Description:
The application site is an area of land to the rear of 11-23 Eshton Road, a section of which formed part of a previous application relating to the construction of a work/live premises to the rear of 1-11 Eshton Road.

The land in question is on the southern side of Eshton Road, accessed by a passageway between 11 and 11b, or from a passageway leading from Carlton Road.

Relevant Planning History:

030339 – 11a Eshton Road
Conversion of works/store and single-storey extension into a live/work unit. Planning Permission Approved conditionally 09/10/2003

050442 EB/2005/0523- 11a Eshton Road
Demolition of works/store and single storey extension, and erection of live/work unit. Planning Permission Approved conditionally 05/10/2005

Proposed development:
The applicant seeks to continue the residential use of 11a Eshton Road without compliance with Condition 4 which was applied to application ref: EB/2005/0523, protecting an area of land for parking (along with an associated turning area).

Consultations:
Internal:
Housing Services Manager – no response at time of report.

External:
County Archaeologist - did not believe that any significant archaeological remains were likely to be affected by these proposals. Made no recommendations/request for conditions in this instance.

Highways ESCC - no response at time of drafting report

Neighbour Representations:
14no. objections have been received from 13no. properties and cover the following point(s):

- The original approval considered parking provision on site and permanent retention to be essential due to parking and potential congestion issues. Removal now would undermine the original decision.
- Parking situation has not changed and may deteriorate if the nearby nursery is extended.

Concerns have also been raised regarding potential future development on the land to the rear of 11-23 Eshton Road; however they are not relevant to this application. Any application for future development will be assessed and determined on its own merits at the time of determination of these future applications.

**Appraisal:**

*Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers and surrounding area:*

The condition was originally applied so as not to cause difficulties parking in the immediate vicinity and to ensure adjacent properties would not be affected by additional cars belonging to the new property parking on-street.

Objections, referred to above, have been made against this application. However, as mentioned below in 'Impacts on highway network or access’ there appears to have been no parking on site to date and therefore the removal of the condition would not change the existing status.

The area is well served by a regular bus service and it is not essential to have a vehicle if living and working in the town and residing in this area.

It is therefore considered that it would have little or no impact in terms of amenity on this adjacent neighbour to the west.

**Design issues:**

Not applicable.

*Impact on character and setting of a listed building or conservation area:*

The property is not listed, nor is it situated within a conservation area.

*Impacts on trees:*

None.

*Impacts on highway network or access:*

The removal of the condition would mean that no parking provision is made on site for 11a Eshton Road. However, from a recent site visit and also by comparing with previous site photos and an aerial photography layer (from 2005/06) available to the Council it is clear that the area has not been used for parking for some considerable years, if at all.
As such it is considered that there has been little or no parking on the site as originally planned for, therefore the removal of the removal of the condition is unlikely to adversely impact on the surrounding roads.

No comment has been made by the Highway Authority against the removal of the condition and withdrawal of the parking area.

**Sustainable development implications:**
None.

**Other matters:**
As members are aware the breach of planning condition can become lawful if evidence is available demonstrating that the breach has existed for a period of 10 years. Members will note from the planning history section that the use has been in existence for approaching 10 years without any facility for off street parking and turning and without complaints being received.

It is considered that the length of time the site has been operating without compliance with the relevant condition has estopped the Council from taking formal enforcement action to secure compliance. Notwithstanding this and as outlined above there is no demonstrable harm caused by the operation of the site without providing off street parking.

**Human Rights Implications:**
The impacts of the proposal have been assessed as part of the application process. Consultation with the community has been undertaken and the impact on local people is set out above. The human rights considerations have been taken into account fully in balancing the planning issues; and furthermore the proposals will not result in any breach of the Equalities Act 2010.

**Conclusion:**
It is considered that the continued use of the site without compliance with Condition 4 relating to the land now known as 11a Eshton Road would have no detrimental impacts on the amenity of neighbouring properties and as such is considered to be in accordance with Saved Policies HO2, HO20, TR2 and TR11 of the Eastbourne Local Plan and Policies B1 and C3 of the Eastbourne Core Strategy Local Plan.

**Recommendation:**
Approve unconditionally.
App.No: 140451 (PPP)  
Decision Due Date: 31 May 2014  
Ward: Hampden Park

Officer: Katherine Gardner  
Site visit date: 29 April 2014  
Type: Planning Permission

Site Notice(s) Expiry date: 16 May 2014
Neighbour Con Expiry: 16 May 2014
Weekly list Expiry: 2 May 2014
Press Notice(s): N/A

Over 8/13 week reason: To bring to Planning Committee

Location: Inglewood Nursing Home, 9-9 Nevill Avenue, Eastbourne

Proposal: Proposed 2-storey extension to provide 10 additional residents bedrooms complete with en-suite facilities, and alteration of existing rooms to provide improved circulation, an additional lounge and en-suite facilities to existing rooms. Also relocation of external store and associated changes to car parking.

Applicant: Mr Brian Cooney

Recommendation: Approve conditionally

Executive Summary:  
Escalated to committee due to neighbour request to speak.

Constraints:
TPO Trees - TPO12  
Willingdon Levels Catchment Area

Relevant Planning Policies:
National Planning Policy Framework

Eastbourne Core Strategy Local Plan Policies 2013
B2: Creating Sustainable Neighbourhoods  
C7: Hampden Park Neighbourhood Policy  
D7: Community, Sport and Health  
D10A: Design

Eastbourne Borough Plan Saved Policies 2007
NE7: Waste Minimisation Measures in Residential Areas  
NE28: Environmental Amenity  
UHT1: Design of New Development  
UHT4: Visual Amenity  
HO20: Residential Amenity
TR11: Car Parking

**Site Description:**
The application property is an established Nursing Home registered for 57 residents, situated at the junction of Nevill Avenue and Brassey Avenue. The existing property is a result of the change of use of three previously residential properties and a range of extensions to link these buildings and enlarge the site.

The rooms are over 2 floors with 3 separate wings. The building itself is set back from the road creating a car park and drop off area on site. The Avalon Nursing Home is next door to the application site, created through similar extensions and conversions.

The site is opposite the rear of properties (even numbers) in Nevill Avenue which have substantial gardens and foliage cover from the site. The site currently has 13 parking spaces, one disabled bay and one doctor parking space. There is a bin store and workshop situated in the car park area and near to the one TPO tree at the front of the site. There are currently 3 staircases and one small lift to provide access around the building.

The current building is constructed in brickwork and render (white) with plain hanging tiles and plain roofing tiles. The windows and doors are a combination of timber, aluminium and uPVC. The boundary treatments are brickwork and timber with asphalt paving hardstanding for vehicles. To the rear of the site is the driveway to 57a Brassey Avenue, with 57 and 57a Brassey Avenue lying adjacent to the rear.

There is a roof terrace to the property facing Brassey Avenue which has raised concerns with neighbours and is currently unused.

**Relevant Planning History:**

EB/1968/0389  
C/U FROM A HOUSE TO REGISTERED OLD PEOPLES HOME  
Approved Unconditional  
1968-08-08

080753  
Single storey extensions at rear to form three residents bedrooms and enlarged dayroom. Single storey extension at front to enlarge kitchen.  
Planning Permission  
Refused  
06/02/2009

080788  
First floor extension at rear to provide seven additional residents bedrooms complete with en-suite facilities, together with additional day spaces.  
Planning Permission  
Refused  
06/02/2009

090217
Proposed single storey extensions at rear to form two resident bedrooms and enlarged dayroom. Single storey extension at front to enlarge kitchen
Planning Permission
Refused
22/05/2009

100187
Provision of roof terrace on existing flat roof extension fronting Brassey Avenue by raising height of surrounding false pitch
Planning Permission
Approved conditionally
16/07/2010

100388
Erection of a single storey extension to the rear to enlarge day room
Planning Permission
Approved conditionally
27/08/2010

Proposed development:
The applicant is proposing a 2 storey extension to the rear which will increase the gross internal floorspace by 416 square metres, 139 sqm at ground floor and 277sqm first floor.

The extension is the same height as the existing building with the same roof pitch. The extension has a depth of 13.2m, leaving 2.44m distance from the boundary with the driveway of 57a Brassey Avenue and 8.6m from the boundary with 57 Brassey Avenue. The width of the extension extends to a maximum of 14.8m. The 2 storey addition requires the removal of the existing roof terrace to alleviate concerns about use of this as amenity space.

The extension is to provide 10 additional residents bedrooms (4 on ground floor and 6 on first floor) complete with en-suite facilities, and will provide the ability to alter existing rooms to provide improved circulation, an additional lounge and en-suite facilities to 4 existing rooms (1 on ground floor and 3 on first floor). There is no increase in staff proposed.

Internal alterations associated with the extension are to provide:
- Larger lift to accommodate wheelchairs and beds.
- Additional staircase and fire exit at rear.
- Larger and improved corridors for better circulation.
- First floor lounge.
- First floor visitors/staff WC.
- Additional storage.

There will also be a relocation of the external store at the front and associated changes to car parking and access. This involves the removal of the store from its current position to the boundary of 5 Nevill Avenue and the public footpath. This means the current access from the highway will be moved and dropped kerb relocated as appropriate. The changes to the car parking area allow for an extra 3 car spaces, 1 disabled space and an
area for 2 motorcycles and 6 bicycle parking spaces. This is also intended to open up views towards the main entrance from the street and facilitate improved view for vehicles exiting the site. At the rear there will be new steps and ramps to provide better access to the garden amenity space.

The materials used in the construction of the extension will match existing as per the site description. There is to be some landscaping involving the removal of the rear hedges to allow a clear fire exit route and perimeter path linking the rear and front secure gardens. There are 2 fire exit doors at ground floor facing the rear and 2 first floor windows facing the rear which serve the hallway and staircase.

**Consultations:**

**Internal:**
Specialist Advisor Planning Policy – Flood Storage Contribution required.
Specialist Advisor Arboriculture – conditions to be applied to any approval.

**External:**
East Sussex County Council Highways – conditions to be applied to any approval.
East Sussex County Council Adult Social Care – in support of the application. The facilities provided are in demand.
Environment Agency – no comments.

**Neighbour Representations:**
Objections have been received from 23 Firwood Close, 50 Brassey Avenue, 54 Brassey Avenue, 56 Brassey Avenue, 57 Brassey Avenue, 57a Brassey Avenue and 64 Brassey Avenue and cover the following points:
- Overdevelopment at the site.
- Overbearing and oppressive.
- Overshadowing.
- Loss of privacy – increased by the fact it is a Nursing Home and rooms are in all day use and the removal of the roof terrace.
- Traffic and parking issues within Brassey Avenue, including road safety and emergency access.
- Impact on Highway and environment.
- Negative effect on the residential character and ambience of the neighbourhood. Other commercial properties within the area blend in, however this does not.
- Aesthetic of the design. Lack of consideration to the existing character and architectural style of the buildings.
- Consideration that development has occurred consistently over many years to both The Inglewood Nursing Home and the Avalon Nursing Home next door.
- When the latest permission for single storey rear extension (100388) was agreed there was an agreement that no second storey should be added to it.
- Decrease in distance to boundary.
- Continuous unbroken length of roofline proposed is incongruous, out of scale and style in an area traditionally of detached and semi-detached 4 bedroom properties.
- Extends beyond the original building line.
- No provision for fire escape.
- No space for screening.
- Loss of amenity.
• Boundary wall may not survive excavation and cause damage to shrubs and foliage.
• Loss of soak-away area causing increased risk of flooding and slow drainage.

**Appraisal:**

**Principle of development:**
Pre-application advice was sought and there was no objection in principle to extending the dwelling in this largely residential area and making alterations to the building provided it would be designed to a high standard, respect the established character of the area and would not have an adverse effect on amenity, in accordance with policies of the Core Strategy 2013, and saved policies of the Borough Plan 2007.

**Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers and surrounding area:**
The main impacts on residential amenity concern 57 and 57a Brassey Avenue. The distance from the boundary to these properties is decreased due to the rear projection of the extension. The driveway of 57a Brassey Avenue separates the application site from 57 Brassey Avenue, providing some distance between the two, however the 2 storey nature of the property has an increased impact than the single storey.

Therefore consideration is given to the available view from one property to another. There is door access proposed on the rear ground floor which is acceptable and there are two first floor windows. As these serve the stairway and corridor and the only window on the side elevation of 57 Brassey Avenue serves the landing. This a low level window, however there is less concern as to overshadowing as this is not considered a habitable room for planning consideration. The fact that the roof terrace is removed means that privacy is improved for these neighbours due to the amenity space being removed and no windows to habitable rooms being present.

The outlook from the landing window at 57 Brassey Avenue is diminished due to the second storey and decreased proximity to the boundary, however again, due to the fact the only window effected is the landing, this does not warrant refusal.

Although there is an increase in residents, it is unlikely that noise, general disturbance or odour will increase due to the nature of the site and the existing use continuing.

**Design issues:**
The height of the proposed extension matches that of the existing building and there is only a small increase in projection from the existing side elevation facing Brassey Avenue, due to the bay windows and ground floor access. The extension is constructed in materials to match existing and removes the first floor terrace, therefore the view from Brassey Avenue forms a complete 2 storey elevation along this whole side. The addition of a second storey does not effect any important vista or cause loss of natural screening and maintains the distinctive nature of the building itself. Therefore the appearance and character of the local environment is maintained. There are concerns about this area being primarily residential and although there is no objection to the current use of the building as a Nursing Home, the fact that the building has been extended to form a large site in this area of single private dwellings is not supported by all. However, the proposal makes effective use of the site and there is sufficient space on site for a development of this size. The layout has been considered in terms of residential amenity but also
designed to have effective use of floorspace and appropriate fire safety and disabled access etc. The decision to remove the redundant terrace in efforts to improve privacy for neighbours are noted. In response to concerns over fire escape route, the fire escape is detailed on the extension at the rear and is fully internal.

**Impacts on trees:**
There is some landscaping proposed and the alterations to the parking and storage cause some concern in relation to the TPO tree at the front of the property. The Specialist Advisor for Arboriculture has been consulted and advises that due consideration must be given during construction and that any approval should carry conditions for the protection of the TPO trees on site.

**Impacts on highway network or access:**
There is an increase in 3 parking spaces and 1 extra disabled bay proposed with provision for parking for cycles which was previously absent. There is an increase of 10 rooms but no increase in staff, however 4 spaces are now specifically allocated for staff. Therefore the only likely users of the additional spaces are transient visitors.

There is no on-street parking available on Nevill Avenue but the nearby residential streets of Brassey Avenue and Freeman Avenue provide unlimited on street parking, which can make these areas very busy at peak times. The properties in the area largely have off street parking available for residents, but these areas are very busy with car parks. The nature of the use of the site means that visitors are not staying for unnecessarily long periods and are present throughout the day, also the staff are on shifts so the influx of vehicles to and from the site is consistent and spread out. Due to this fact, although concerns over parking provision have been considered the impact is deemed to be minimal due to the above factors. Highways have been consulted and advise that the new parking provision is sufficient to cater for the increase in rooms and that it improves the standard of parking in line with ESCC guidelines. The plans for cycle storage are to be specified in more detail though. The alteration to access is also deemed acceptable by Highways provided conditions are met.

**Other matters:**
Effect on Environmental Amenity has been considered, however due to the use continuing as a Nursing Home and the fact the additional rooms provide bedrooms rather than kitchens etc that are likely to produce addition smells, this is not considered a major concern.

The application is supported by East Sussex County Council's Adult Social Care Department, Supported Housing Development Team as current and projected demographic, health and social care needs data on people age 65+ over the next 2 decades and information on current supply in Eastbourne shows that there is both current and future demand for this type of accommodation. The proposal supports the requests from this department that the rooms would be single rather than shared to enable choice and services which support dignity and respect. The addition of ensuite rooms and a first floor residents lounge, with better wheelchair access provides more suitable accommodation and improves the current accommodation in line with requirements.
The Environment Agency and Planning Policy were consulted because the development is within the Willingdon Levels Catchment area. The Environment Agency confirmed they had no comments to make, however policy have calculated that the size of the proposal requires a Flood Storage Compensation Contribution of £650.00. This is to be conditioned.

The proposal does not contravene any of the visions for the Hampden Park Neighbourhood but supports the policy to enhance existing community facilities in that it provides needed accommodation which is of an acceptable standard for these members of the community.

**Human Rights Implications:**
The impacts of the proposal have been assessed as part of the application process. Consultation with the community has been undertaken and the impact on local people is set out above. The human rights considerations have been taken into account fully in balancing the planning issues; and furthermore the proposals will not result in any breach of the Equalities Act 2010.

**Conclusion:**
The proposed development is in keeping with the site and surrounding area. Residential amenity is maintained to an acceptable level and the Willingdon Levels and TPO's are protected.

The development provides suitable accommodation in terms of Adult Social Care requirements and is a good addition to this community facility.

This is subject to conditions but the proposal accords with Eastbourne Borough Local Plan (Saved policies, 2007), Eastbourne Core Strategy Local Plan (2007-2027) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

**Recommendation:**
Approved conditionally

**Conditions:**
1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
   Reason: To comply with Sections 91 and 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.)

2. No development shall commence until the necessary flood storage contribution of £650 has been received by the Local Planning Authority.
   Reason: For the ongoing maintenance of the Eastbourne Park Flood Storage area and to reduce the risk of future flooding.

3. The use hereby permitted shall not commence until the existing access has been stopped up and the kerb and footway reinstated in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by the Director of Economy Transport and Environment.
   Reason: In the interests of Highway safety.
4. The new access shall be in the position shown on the submitted plan [number: SK11 rev A] and laid out and constructed in accordance with the attached HT407 form/diagram and all works undertaken shall be executed and completed by the applicant to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of development. Reason: To ensure the safety of persons and vehicles entering and leaving the access and proceeding along the highway.

5. The development shall not be occupied until parking areas have been provided in accordance with the approved plans and the areas shall thereafter be retained for that use and shall not be used other than for the parking of motor vehicles. Reason: To ensure the safety of persons and vehicles entering and leaving the access and proceeding along the highway.

6. The development shall not be occupied until cycle parking areas have been provided in accordance with details which have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority and the areas shall thereafter be retained for that use and shall not be used other than for the parking of cycles. Reason: In order that the development is accessible by non car modes and to meet the objectives of sustainable development.

7. T10 Landscape design proposals: Vii Proposed and existing functional services below ground (e.g. drainage, power communication cables, pipelines indicating positioning. To ensure any new services are installed in a location to avoid damage to the trees indicated as retained. Reason: To ensure the provision of the amenity value afforded by trees in respect of the proposed development.

8. T4 Tree protection: Fencing (2.4m hoarding) to the edge of the root protection area on both protected trees. Reason: To ensure that trees to be retained are adequately protected from damage to health and stability throughout the construction period in the interests of amenity.

9. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings no. 4242 SK11 Rev C, 4242 SK06, 4242 SK09 (Proposed), submitted on 15 May 2014. Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the proposed development is carried out in accordance with the plans to which the permission relates.

Appeal:
Should the applicant appeal the decision the appropriate followed, taking into account the criteria set by the Planning Inspectorate, is considered to be written representations.
1 Background

Members will be aware that together we deal with a whole host of planning applications covering a range of differing forms of development.

Given the many varied types of planning application received Central Government require that all Councils report the performance in a consistent and coherent manner. To this end and for reasons the many varied applications are clumped together into three broad categories Major, Minor and Others.

In broad terms the types of application falling into these categories are outline below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>MINOR DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>OTHER DEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10+ Dwellings / Greater .5Ha</td>
<td>1-9 Dwellings/ greater .5Ha</td>
<td>Householder applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/light industrial greater 1000sqm/ 1Ha</td>
<td>Office /light industrial up to 999sqm under 1Ha</td>
<td>Change of use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General industrial greater 1000sqm / 1Ha</td>
<td>General Industrial up to 999sqm under 1 Ha</td>
<td>Adverts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail greater 1000sqm / 1Ha</td>
<td>Retail up to 999sqm under 1 Ha</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsy &amp; Traveller 10+ Pitches</td>
<td>Gypsy &amp; Traveller 0-9 Pitches</td>
<td>Conservation Area Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Certificates of Lawfulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Notifications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In analysing the performance for the processing of these differing types of application the Government do allow 13 weeks for the processing major applications...
and 8 weeks for processing the Minor and Other categories.

The figures below give the development control performance figures against these categories and over the calendar year 2013 and the first quarter of 2014.

In addition this report also includes information about the recent appeal decisions and Members should note that any decision made to refuse an application opens the potential for an appeal by the applicant to the Planning Inspectorate.

As Members will be aware the majority of the applications received are granted planning permission, however for those that are refused and challenged through to an appeal it is considered important to analyse the appeal decisions in order to determine and evaluate whether lessons need to be learnt, or interpretations need to be given different weight at the decision making stage.

In addition the evaluation of the appeal decisions will also go some way to indicate the robustness and the correct application of the current and emerging policy context at both a local and national level.

2 Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013 Q1</td>
<td>All determined</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Granted</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Q2</td>
<td>All determined</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Granted</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Q3</td>
<td>All determined</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Granted</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Q4</td>
<td>All determined</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Granted</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Q1</td>
<td>All determined</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Granted</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Whole Year</td>
<td>All determined</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>510 (89%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Granted</td>
<td>521 (91%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>49 (9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is clear from the tables above that the volume of the cases determined has been generally consistent throughout the year ranging from 88 – 205; this peak of cases determined in Q3 relates to the teams focused attention of shifting the backlog of cases that accrued during data migration to a new back office supplier and the development of new scripts and process needed to support the role out of Future Model.

It is considered that in granting planning permission for 91% of all application received that the planning services of Eastbourne Borough Council have supported/stimulated the local economy and also helped to meet the aspirations of the applicants and only where there are substantive material planning considerations is an application refused.

The focussed attention that the team have given over the year 2013 to learn and implement new ways of working and also clearing the backlog of cases has had an impact on the performance (speed of decision) during the year. The table below highlights the speed of decision against the three Govt categories (Major Minor and Other).

It is clear from the graphs below that at the team started the year from a very low position but against all of the performance criteria, however the trend line is on an upward curve and looking at the first part of Q1 2014 in isolation the team are exceeding the national performance indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>Q4 12/13 %</th>
<th>Q1 13/14 %</th>
<th>Q2 13/14 %</th>
<th>Q3 13/14 %</th>
<th>Q4 13/14 %</th>
<th>Q1 14/15 %</th>
<th>TARGET PI %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3 Appeals

As commented above all applications that are refused have to the potential to be appealed by the applicant. The Council received 25 appeal decisions within the year of 2013 and these have been summarised below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Approve/Allowed</th>
<th>Approve/Dismissed</th>
<th>Refuse/Allowed</th>
<th>Refuse/Dismissed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>7 (28%)</td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>12 (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (22%)</td>
<td>14 (61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>11 (29%)</td>
<td>3 (8%)</td>
<td>8 (21%)</td>
<td>16 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5 (22%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>16 (70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5 (35%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>4 (29%)</td>
<td>4 (29%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table identifies the relevant decision permutations.

**Column 1**

**Officer recommendation for approval – Member overturned – Appeal Allowed** It is important to keep a watching brief on this column as this is often the scenario where costs are awarded against the Council. Notwithstanding this at the time of reporting it is acknowledged that the % of cases in this column is generally consistent with other survey periods.
It is accepted that at times there are differences of opinion between officers and Members however given that this figure/percentage has not significantly increased is an indication that all parties are aligned in their thinking and are consistent with established policy and National Advice.

Column 2
**Officer recommendation for approval – member overturned – appeal dismissed (Officers were wrong and Members were right)** This shows that officers are not always right, but the volume of cases in the category is modest.

Column 3
**Officer recommendation for refusal – Member support for refusal (committee or delegated) – Appeal allowed – Officers and Member were wrong.** This shows that officer and Members are in tune but the officers have been over zealous with their recommendation and it has not been supported by the planning Inspectorate. This % has remained constant over time but again this needs to be monitored as it is an indication that Officers may not follow planning policy/advice and skewing recommendations following neighbour concerns or trying to second guess the outcome of planning committee. In essence it is important that officers do not shy away from making difficult recommendations if the recommendation is in accordance with national and local advice/policies.

Column 4
**Officer recommendation for refusal – Member support for recommendation (committee or delegated decisions) – appeal dismissed (officers and Members were right).** This column shows when Officers and Members are in tune and supported by the Planning Inspectorate. The Higher the % the better, Members will note that this category is by far the largest.

**Appeal Costs**
As members will be aware the appeal process can award costs of the appeal to any party where the counter party has acted in an unreasonable manner. During the survey period the Council received two awards of costs:-

120432 Redevelopment of St James Road;
The Council were wrong to resist the application on the lack of detailed drawings even though it was an outline application, the appeal inspector felt that sufficient information was submitted in order to determine the application.

120604 Change of use of The Parkfield Public House
The Council were wrong to refuse the application where the majority of the proposal did not require planning permission (authorised changes of use) and that the additions and alterations were very minor.
4 **Human Resources**

As members are aware the Customer First team within which the planning function rests has undergone significant change during the survey period. Notwithstanding this it is acknowledged that the team are currently recruiting towards a full staff compliment.

5 **Legal**

Save for the costs claims as referred to above there are no other legal issues arising from this report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Application Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 120309         | **Site:** Hillbrow Sports Centre, 1 Denton Road, Eastbourne, BN20 7SR  
(PPP)  
**Proposal:** Installation of a climbing wall on the south west elevation. |
| Meads          | **Cons. Area:** Meads  
**Officer:** Jane Sabin |
| **Officer Rec**| **Appeal Dec**  
**Main Issue**  
The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of nearby residents in Denton Road  
**Other Issues**  
No additional lighting controlled via condition |
| Approved       | Allowed             |
| 120356         | **Site:** 5 Elmwood Gardens, Eastbourne, BN23 8JH  
(PPP)  
**Proposal:** Erection of three bedroom chalet bungalow with integral garage together with new vehicular access (amendments to vehicular access) |
| Langney        | **Cons. Area:** Not applicable  
**Officer:** Suzanne West (no longer with E |
| **Officer Rec**| **Appeal Dec**  
**Main Issue**  
Effect on character and appearance of the street scene; unacceptable living conditions in relation to outlook, privacy and daylight  
**Other Issues**  
None |
<p>| Approved       | Dismissed           |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Application Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>120432</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site:</strong> Garage Block On The South Side Of, St James Road, Eastbourne, BN22 7BJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(OSR)</td>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong> Redevelopment of site including demolition of existing garages and erection of a terrace of three houses with associated parking (outline application)(AMENDED SITE ADDRESS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Devonshire</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cons. Area:</strong> Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Officer:</strong> Suzanne West (no longer with E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officer Rec</strong></td>
<td><strong>Appeal Dec</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application No.</td>
<td>Application Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>120513</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site:</strong> Flat 7 Central Court, 13 South Street, Eastbourne, BN21 4UJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PPP)</td>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong> Installation of glazed balcony and door to the rear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meads</td>
<td><strong>Cons. Area:</strong> Town Centre and Seafront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officer Rec</strong></td>
<td><strong>Appeal Dec</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse</td>
<td>Dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application No.</td>
<td>Application Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120789</td>
<td>Site: 29a Park Lane, Eastbourne, East Sussex, BN21 2UY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(PPP)**

**Proposal:** Redevelopment of site including demolition of existing buildings and erection of a terrace of 4 three bedroom houses and provision of associated parking

**Cons. Area:** Not applicable  
**Officer:** Suzanne West (no longer with E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer Rec</th>
<th>Appeal Dec</th>
<th>Main Issue</th>
<th>Other Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Application No.**  
**Application Details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>120599</th>
<th>Site: 2 Priory Road, Eastbourne, BN23 7AT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**(PPP)**

**Proposal:** Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of block of eight flats together with eight parking spaces

**Cons. Area:** Not applicable  
**Officer:** (R) Katherine Quint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer Rec</th>
<th>Appeal Dec</th>
<th>Main Points</th>
<th>Other Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>Dismissed</td>
<td>Loss of privacy and harm to the living conditions of neighbouring plots</td>
<td>No objection to principle or highway issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application No.</td>
<td>Application Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>120600</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site:</strong> 44A Dudley Road, Eastbourne, BN22 8HE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PPP)</td>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong> Retrospective application for the retention of enlarged replacement balcony and rendering of facing brickwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonshire</td>
<td><strong>Cons. Area:</strong> Not applicable</td>
<td><strong>Officer:</strong> Suzanne West (no longer with E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Rec</td>
<td>Appeal Dec</td>
<td>Main Points</td>
<td>Other Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>Dismissed</td>
<td>Impacts on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers with regard to privacy</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>120604</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site:</strong> The Parkfield, Lindfield Road, Eastbourne, East Sussex, BN22 0AU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PPP)</td>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong> Change of use from public house (A4) to retails (A1) together with demolition of existing single storey extension and erection of two single storey extensions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratton</td>
<td><strong>Cons. Area:</strong> Not applicable</td>
<td><strong>Officer:</strong> Bethan Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Rec</td>
<td>Appeal Dec</td>
<td>Main Points</td>
<td>Other Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
<td>Planning permission not required for change of use and extension acceptable</td>
<td>Costs awarded against the Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application No.</td>
<td>Application Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>120617</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site:</strong> Land To The Rear Of, 15 Hartfield Road, Eastbourne, BN21 2AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PPP)</td>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong> Erection of 2No. 3 bedroom dwellings with off street parking at front</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperton</td>
<td><strong>Cons. Area:</strong> Upperton Gardens  <strong>Officer:</strong> Suzanne West (no longer with E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Rec</td>
<td><strong>Appeal Dec</strong>  <strong>Main Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>Other Issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse</td>
<td>Dismissed</td>
<td>Impacts upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and adverse impacts upon living environment No1 Eversfield</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Application Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>120645</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site:</strong> Hampden Retail Park, Lottbridge Drove, Eastbourne, BN23 6QV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ADV)</td>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong> Display of three externally illuminated 48 sheet advertisements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampden Park</td>
<td><strong>Cons. Area:</strong> Not applicable  <strong>Officer:</strong> Suzanne West (no longer with E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Rec</td>
<td><strong>Appeal Dec</strong>  <strong>Main Issue</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse</td>
<td>Dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application No.</td>
<td>Application Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>120654</strong></td>
<td>Site: 74 Terminus Road, Eastbourne, BN21 3LX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ADV)</td>
<td>Proposal: Display of non-illuminated panel signs at first floor level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meads</td>
<td>Cons. Area: Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Rec</td>
<td>Appeal Dec Dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse</td>
<td>Effect of the first floor signage on the visual amenity of the site and its surroundings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>120664</strong></td>
<td>Site: Lathom Hotel, 4 - 6 Howard Square, Eastbourne, BN21 4BG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LBC)</td>
<td>Proposal: Conversion of hotel to provide for two town houses (fronting Howard Square) six self contained flats (fronting Howard Square/Compton) together with provision of new entrance steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meads</td>
<td>Cons. Area: Town Centre and Seafront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Rec</td>
<td>Appeal Dec Allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>No impact upon the tourist accommodation zone and would preserve listed building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application No.</td>
<td>Application Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>120665</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site:</strong> Lathom Hotel, 4 - 6 Howard Square, Eastbourne, BN21 4BG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PPP)</td>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong> Conversion of hotel to provide for two town houses (fronting Howard Square) six self contained flats (fronting Howard Square/Compton) together with provision of new entrance steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meads</td>
<td><strong>Cons. Area:</strong> Town Centre and Seafront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officer Rec</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main Issue</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>120675</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site:</strong> 18 Middleton Drive, Eastbourne, BN23 6HD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HHH)</td>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong> Erection of attached garage to the side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sovereign</td>
<td><strong>Cons. Area:</strong> Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officer Rec</strong></td>
<td><strong>Appeal Dec</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse</td>
<td>Dismissed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Application No. 120699

**Site:** 2-8 Upwick Road, Eastbourne, BN20 8NB

**(PPP)**

**Proposal:** Demolition of the garages at the rear of 2-8 Upwick Road and the erection of 2 No. 3 bedroom detached houses and garages, parking spaces and access road from Upwick Road.

**Old Town**

**Cons. Area:** Not applicable

**Officer:** Chris Cave (no longer with EBC)

**Officer Rec**

**Appeal Dec**

**Main Points**

Acceptable impact on the safety of those using the highway

**Other Issues**

None

---

Application No. 120915

**Site:** Land Rear Of Langney Cottages, Langney Rise, Eastbourne, BN23 7PG

**(PPP)**

**Proposal:** Erection of a self-contained bungalow to the rear in association with demolition of existing garages

**Langney**

**Cons. Area:** Not applicable

**Officer:** Mehdi Rezaie

**Officer Rec**

**Appeal Dec**

**Main Points**

Out of character with area and impacts upon living environment of nearby properties

**Other Issues**

None
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Application Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>120748</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site:</strong> 14 Carlton Road, Eastbourne, BN22 7EN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HHH)</td>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong> Erection of a single storey extension to the rear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonshire</td>
<td><strong>Cons. Area:</strong> Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Rec</td>
<td><strong>Officer:</strong> Chris Cave (no longer with EBC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal Dec</td>
<td><strong>Main Issues</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse</td>
<td>Acceptable impacts upon Neighbours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>130022</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site:</strong> 1 The Hyndeye, Eastbourne, BN22 9BU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PPP)</td>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong> Change of use from laundrette to A3/A5 takeaway with installation of new extraction ducting to the rear elevation and minor alterations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampden Park</td>
<td><strong>Cons. Area:</strong> Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Rec</td>
<td><strong>Officer:</strong> (R) Katherine Quint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal Dec</td>
<td><strong>Main Issues</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>Acceptable use in the area and would not impact upon residential amenity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Issues</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application No.</td>
<td>Application Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>130162</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site:</strong> Land To The Rear Of, 3 St Annes Road, Eastbourne, BN21 2AJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HHH)</td>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong> Erection of double garage to the rear of the property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Upperton Cons. Area:</strong> Upperton Gardens <strong>Officer:</strong> Ray Deans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officer Rec Refuse</strong></td>
<td><strong>Appeal Dec</strong> Dismissed <strong>Main Issues</strong> Fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area <strong>Other Issues</strong> None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Application Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>130168</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site:</strong> Land Between, 37-39 Friday Street, Eastbourne, BN23 8AR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(OSR)</td>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong> Erection of a single dwelling with parking spaces and vehicular access from Friday Street (outline application).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Langney Cons. Area:</strong> Not applicable <strong>Officer:</strong> Ray Deans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officer Rec Refuse</strong></td>
<td><strong>Appeal Dec</strong> Dismissed <strong>Main Issue</strong> Adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the area <strong>Other Issues</strong> None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application No.</td>
<td>Application Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>130195</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site:</strong> 15 Ravens Croft, Eastbourne, East Sussex, BN20 7HX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HHH)</td>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong> First floor front/side extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meads</td>
<td><strong>Cons. Area:</strong> Meads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Rec</td>
<td>Appeal Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Application Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>130236</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site:</strong> 39 Upperton Lane, Eastbourne, BN21 2DB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PPP)</td>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong> Change of use from vehicle repair workshop to a single private dwelling, together with external alterations, including the provision of a pitched roof with dormer to the rear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperton</td>
<td><strong>Cons. Area:</strong> Upperton Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Rec</td>
<td>Appeal Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse</td>
<td>Dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application No.</td>
<td>Application Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>130339</strong></td>
<td>Site: 88 Terminus Road, Eastbourne, East Sussex, BN21 3LX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PPP)</td>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong> Change of Use with installation of new shopfront, installation of x2 satellite dishes, aerial and x2 condensor units to the rear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meads</td>
<td><strong>Cons. Area:</strong> Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Rec</td>
<td><strong>Appeal Dec</strong> Dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow</td>
<td><strong>Other Points</strong> This application reverses the decision made by EBC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Application Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>130387</strong></td>
<td>Site: 23 Hartfield Road, Eastbourne, East Sussex, BN21 2AR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HHH)</td>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong> Provision of new parking area to front with new vehicular crossover. Includes demolition of part of the front wall and rebuilding of part of front wall. Conservation Area consent also applied for in relation to the development (Ref: 130496)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperton</td>
<td><strong>Cons. Area:</strong> Upperton Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Rec</td>
<td><strong>Appeal Dec</strong> Dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse</td>
<td><strong>Other Points</strong> None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Application No.** 130500  
**Site:** 34 Dillingburgh Road, Eastbourne, East Sussex, BN20 8LU  
(PPP)  
**Proposal:** Erection of two storey, two bedroomed detached property with garage and access from Dacre Road.

**Old Town**  
**Cons. Area:** Not applicable  
**Officer:** Mehdi Rezaie

---

**Application No.** 130613  
**Site:** Myrtle Cottage, 4 Old Barn Close, Eastbourne, East Sussex, BN20 9HJ  
(HHH)  
**Proposal:** Single storey extension to rear elevation.

**Ratton**  
**Cons. Area:** Willingdon  
**Officer:** Sally Simpson

---

**Officer Rec**  
**Appeal Dec** Dismissed  
**Main Points** Out of character with the area and adverse impacts upon the living conditions of the occupiers with regard to privacy

**Other Issues** None
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SUBJECT
Utilising the Planning Register through our Website

REPORT OF
Anna Clare Specialist Advisor (Planning)

WARDS
All

PURPOSE
This report provides details of the information in relation to planning applications available on our website and how to access this information.

CONTACT
Anna Clare
anna.clare@eastbourne.gov.uk
01323 415 644

RECOMMENDATION
That Members note the content of this report

The purpose of this information item is to bring to your attention the functions available through the Planning Register on our website.

You can access the Planning Register on our website at the following link; http://planning.eastbourne.gov.uk/lg/GFPlanningWelcome.page

This is a screenshot of the appearance of the Planning Register Home Page.

Useful links on this page can be used to obtain a weekly list of applications validated, a weekly list of decisions made and a list of ongoing appeals.
‘View most recent weekly list’ will link to a list of applications validated the previous week; for older ‘weekly lists’ see the list available which gives the previous 6 weeks lists.

The Weekly List of Planning Applications

In line with the principles of Customer First we are moving away from any Officer generated emails; with our website automatically instead providing all the information needed for the Council to fulfil its statutory obligations. The motivating factor is to enable greater customer satisfaction removing the need for additional work by Caseworkers to make information available and easy to obtain for all members of the public not just those registered to receive the weekly list.

Previously a list of applications received and validated would be generated internally by a Caseworker and emailed to those who have registered an interest in receiving the information. However the list of applications received is of little value as an application may not become valid, and at this time may not have a Caseworker assigned. The weekly list of applications on our website would change if there was a delay in validating an application and therefore was not a static list.

We have undertaken improvement works to our website so that the displayed weekly list of applications is a static list which will display all applications which have been validated in that week.

Screen shot of the weekly list.

Only valid applications are displayed on the website, an application is only made valid when we have received all information required for us to determine the application. Regardless of when an application is received it will appear in the weekly list of applications when it is validated and therefore the public consultation has begun.

You can open the application by clicking on the blue highlighted Application Reference to view all the documents associated with the application including the plans.
The weekly list of decisions

A weekly list of decisions is also provided through the website, this is also a static list which is populated when the application is determined. The list will include all decisions made that week, whether they are through Delegated powers or by Planning Committee. The decision is displayed on the front page; you can open the application by clicking on the blue highlighted Application Reference to see the decision notice with any conditions, and plans and any comments submitted during the application process.

List of Appeals

The view appeals function will display all appeals, both currently under consideration by the Planning Inspectorate and those already decided.
By clicking on the blue highlighted Application Reference you can open the application to view any plans etc. Once an appeal has been determined the Inspectors Decision will be available to read through the application. Our website is used to provide information in relation to the appeal but the appeal is handled and processed by the Planning Inspectorate. Important to note is the decision on the front page relates to the decision of the original application determined by the Council not the Appeal. Whether the appeal is allowed or dismissed will be detailed when you open the application as shown in the following screen shot.