Tuesday, 10 June 2014  
at 6.00 pm

Planning Committee

Present:-

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

121 Minutes of the meeting held on 13 May 2014.

The minutes of the meeting held on the 13 May 2014 were approved and the Chairman was authorised to sign the as them as a correct record.

122 Apologies for absence.

An apology for absence was reported from Councillor Murray.

123 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.

None reported.

124 11 Meads Street. Application ID: 140389 (PPP).

Proposed erection of first floor balcony at rear together with external staircase and removal of existing pitched roof over rear projection – MEADS. Three objections had been raised.

The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report.

Specialist Advisor Design and Conservation raised no comments.

RESOLVED: (By 6 votes to 2) That permission be granted subject to the following conditions: 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings no. 229000-03 Rev A submitted on 30 April 2014 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.

125 12 Manvers Road. Application ID: 140420 (HHH).

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 – OLD TOWN. One objection had been received.
The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report.

**RESOLVED: (Unanimous)** That permission be refused on the grounds that the proposal due to the size, scale and design would be an intrusive form of development that fails to respect the host property and would therefore be likely to result in material harm to the appearance of the site and surrounding area and would be contrary to policies UHT1 and UHT4 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan Saved Policies 2007, policies B2 and D10A of the Eastbourne Core Strategy Local Plan 2013 and the NPPF 2012.

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

### 126 12 Netherfield Avenue. Application ID: 140370 (HHH).

**Side, Rear and Basement Extension with associated internal alterations to provide enlarged accommodation – ST ANTHONYS.**

Three objections had been received.

The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report.

Councillor Tutt, Ward Councillor, address the committee on behalf of the neighbouring residents stating that there were major concerns regarding subsidence due to the removal of soil, which may result in the need for underpinning and cause major structural damage to neighbouring properties. The scheme would result in overshadowing and loss of light to neighbouring properties and increase the risk of flooding.

The committee discussed the proposal and agreed that the scheme would be detrimental to the neighbouring properties for the reasons highlighted above.

**RESOLVED: (Unanimous)** That permission be refused on the grounds that the application fails to demonstrate how the development would be constructed (construction method statement) and in the absence of this information and given the proximity of the development to the boundaries of the site it considered that the development may have an adverse structural impact upon the integrity of the adjacent property/plot. In addition, the application fails to satisfactorily demonstrate how the excavated spoil would be disposed of 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.
2. The application fails to demonstrate how the development will be constructed (construction method statement) and in the absence of this information and given the proximity of the development to the boundaries of the site it considered that the development may have an adverse structural impact upon the integrity of the adjacent property/plot.

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

127 14 Manvers Road. Application ID: 140425 (HHH).

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 – OLD TOWN. One objection had been received.

The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) That permission be refused on the grounds that the proposal due to the size, scale and design would be an intrusive form of development that fails to respect the host property and would therefore be likely to result in material harm to the appearance of the site and surrounding area and would be contrary to policies UHT1 and UHT4 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan Saved Policies 2007, policies B2 and D10A of the Eastbourne Core Strategy Local Plan 2013 and the NPPF 2012.

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

128 44 Kings Drive. Application ID: 140441 (HHH).

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 – UPPERTON. One letter of objection had been received.

The County Archaeologist raised no comments. The Environment Agency stated that although the site is located in an area that was within a flood zone, the risk of flooding from a proposal for a first floor extension above the garage was unlikely to have any impact that would increase the risk of flooding.

Mr Hesketh addressed the committee in objection stating that the proposal would result in a loss of light to his property.

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

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.

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.


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 – LANGNEY.

Eight objections and three comments of support had been received.

The relevant planning history for this site was detailed within the report.

The Estate Manager and Specialist Advisor (Environmental Health) had no comment. The Specialist Advisor (Arboriculture) recommended a condition on tree protection and service trench details to be supplied and agreed.

Councillor Shuttleworth, Ward Councillor, addressed the committee in support of the application stating that the space was a well-used community hub, supported by many volunteers, who had improved the area greatly over a number of years. Councillor Shuttleworth felt that the impact would be minimal compared to the benefits the lighting would achieve for the community in the area.

Members felt that the usage and hours of lighting should limited.

RESOLVED: (By 5 votes to 2 with 1 abstention) That permission be granted subject to the following conditions: 1) Time for Commencement 2) Approved Drawings 3) Submission of samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the covered terrace/stand 4) The floodlighting (columns & lamps) hereby approved shall be implemented at the site in accordance with the details that accompanied the application and be retained as such thereafter 5) Plan TCBY.08/100B is used for the location and elevation details of the covered terrace/stand and shall not be used for the location of the floodlighting columns. For the avoidance of doubt the floodlighting columns shall be in accordance with the lighting assessment submitted with the application 6) The floodlights hereby approved shall not be in operational use outside of the following times:

- 13:00 to 18:00 hours on Saturdays
- 13:00 to 22:00 hours on Tuesdays.

130 Eastbourne Centre Adverts. Application ID: 140237 (ADV).
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 – MEADS. Three letters of objection had been received. A letter of support was received from Stephen Lloyd MP concerning the refurbishment works planned for the hotel.

The site was currently being considered for Listed Building status, however no decision had been made by English Heritage at this stage.

The planning history for this site was detailed within the report.

The Tourism Manager and Eastbourne Hotels’ Association made no comment on the signage. The Conservation Officer considered that the proposed signage was unsympathetic to the building and its setting within the Conservation Area and the seafront in relation to: location, materials, finishes and method of installation where specified.

The Conservation Area Advisory 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.

**RESOLVED: (By 7 votes to 1)** That permission be granted subject to the following conditions: (1 – 5) Standard Advert Conditions (6) - provision of a lighting assessment – adjacent Devonshire Mansions.

**131 Eastbourne Centre Refurbishment. Application ID: 140192 (PPP)**

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 – MEADS. Five objections had been received.

The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report.

The Tourism Manager and Eastbourne Hotels' Association made no response.

The Specialist Advisor Conservation commented that the application had also been considered within the context of the significant contribution the T & G centre had within the associative and historic importance and contribution of the building in the history of the Trades Unions movements in British social history. There were concerns that works represented 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.
The Conservation Area Advisory 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. 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.

The Highways department commented that the pavement around this site has been adopted as public highway. In theory the area of land in question could be used for construction of the access following: an application for a stopping up order for area, the legal process to be completed before anything built, the application be subject to public consultation and the control of land returns to original.

**RESOLVED:** (Unanimous) That permission be granted subject to the following conditions: 1) Time 2) Materials (AS SUBMITTED) 3) Approved Drawing 4) Limited hours of demolition / construction (in line with standard 5) Submission of materials – ceramic tiles for external balcony terrace 6) Siting of Plaque

132 Land at rear of 11-23 Eshton Road. Application ID: 140157 (VCO).

**Removal of condition 4 (obstruction) attached to planning permission ref: EB/2005/0523 - demolition of works/store and single storey extension, and erection of live/work unit – DEVONSHIRE.** 14 Objections had been received.

The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report.

The Housing Services Manager and Highways ESCC made no comment.

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

**RESOLVED:** (By 4 votes to 3 with 1 abstention) That permission be granted.

133 Inglewood Nursing Home, 9 Neville Avenue. Application ID: 140451 (PPP).

**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 – HAMPDEN PARK.** Seven objections had been received.

The relevant planning history for the site was detailed within the report.

The observations of the Specialist Advisor Planning Policy, Specialist Advisor Arboriculture, East Sussex County Council Highways, East Sussex County
Council Adult Social Care and Environment Agency were summarised within the report.

Mr Talbot addressed the committee in objection stating that the proposal would be a creeping over development of the site and that the scheme would increase the parking issues in the local vicinity.

Mr Franks, agent for the applicant, addressed the committee stating that the applicant had tried to resolve the current issues with the roof terrace, and stepped the development down towards the neighbouring properties to minimise the impact.

The committee agreed that the scheme would be an overdevelopment of the site, which would be detrimental to the surrounding area.

**RESOLVED: (By 5 votes with 3 abstentions)** That permission be refused on the grounds that the proposal by reason of the continuous unbroken length of roofline is incongruous, out of scale and style in an area where the predominant pattern of development is characterised by detached and semi-detached properties and as such the development would be visually dominant and out of character with the street scene. The proposal would be contrary to policies UHT1, UHT4 and HO20 of the Eastbourne Borough Local Plan (Saved policies, 2007) and B2 and D10A of the Eastbourne Core Strategy Local Plan (2007-2027).

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

134 **Planning Performance.**

The committee considered the report of the Senior Specialist Advisor – Planning providing a summary of performance in relation to key area of the Development Management Services for the relevant period.

Members will be aware that together the Council deals 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 were clumped together into three broad categories Major, Minor and Others.

In broad terms the types of application falling into these categories were outlined within the report.

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 within the report gave the development control performance figures against these categories and over the calendar year 2013 and the first quarter of 2014.

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

The majority of the applications received were granted planning permission, however for those that were refused and challenged through to an appeal it was considered important to analyse the appeal decisions in order to determine and evaluate whether lessons needed to be learned, or interpretations needed to be given different weight at the decision making stage.

In addition the evaluation of the appeal decisions would 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.

Councillor Taylor raised the issue of receiving reports on Enforcement action, and Councillor Jenkins raised the issue of reports from the Difficult Properties Group – The Chairman agreed to discuss this with the Senior Specialist Advisor – Planning at their next meeting.

**NOTED.**

135 **Planning Register.**

This item was withdrawn and would be reported to a future meeting.

136 **South Downs National Park Authority Planning Applications.**

There were none.

The meeting closed at 8.56 pm

*Councillor Ungar (Chairman)*