PLANNING COMMITTEE

Tuesday 11 January 2005

PRESENT:

Councillor BOWKER (Chairman), Councillor TAYLOR (Deputy Chairman), Councillors HARRIS, Mrs HOWLETT, Mrs MURRAY, Mrs POOLEY, SKILTON and STEVENS.

33. MINUTES. The minutes of the meeting held on 7 December 2004 were submitted and approved and the Chairman was authorised to sign them as a correct record.

34. REPORT OF HEAD OF PLANNING/PLANNING MANAGER ON APPLICATIONS.

(1) EB/2004/0844 - 31- 33 Latimer Road - single storey extension at rear and conversion of three flats into six flats - DEVONSHIRE. Two letters of objection were reported from local residents. The Development Control Manager reported that since the report had been published, two further letters of objection had been received concerning overshadowing, increased noise and the fact that the owner did not reside at the proposal site and, therefore, would lack control over the activities. The Development Control Manager considered, however, that the proposal would not result in any significant impact on residential or visual amenity or the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

RESOLVED: Permission granted subject to conditions (1) D1.1 Commencement of development within five years; (2) A5 No windows or other openings in north (flank) elevation.

(2) EB/2004/0868 - 5 St. Aubyn's Road - retrospective application for change of use from guesthouse to single private dwelling - DEVONSHIRE. No letters of objection had been received following the site notice. The Local Plan Officer had confirmed that the premises were within the designated Tourist Accommodation Area and insufficient evidence had been submitted to demonstrate that the guesthouse was not financially viable.

RESOLVED: Permission refused on the grounds that insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Council that the property cannot be run viably as tourist accommodation and therefore, as there are no exceptional circumstances, to allow the proposed change of use would be contrary to Policy TO2 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001-2011.

(3)/(4) EB/2004/0848(RM) AND EB/2004/0849(RM) - Highfield Park, land bounded by Hargreaves Road and Edward Road – (a) reserved matters application for construction of 1 no. three storey and 2 no. two storey office buildings and single storey light industrial/warehouse development including landscaping and associated parking (pursuant to outline planning permission EB/2004/0238 (OL)) (b) reserved matters application for construction of 1 no. three storey and 2 no. two storey office buildings and single storey light industrial/warehousing development including landscaping and associated parking (pursuant to outline planning permission EB/2004/0238 (OL)) - HAMPDEN PARK. The Development Control Manager reported two objections that had been received since the report had

been published, from the residents of 9B and 21B Dallington Road relating to landscaping of the buffer zone, noise pollution, hours of operation, no vehicular access from Dallington Road and that the building was contrary to an agreement made in 1998 relating to the distance from Dallington Road. The Police Crime Prevention Advisor had raised no concerns. The Environment Agency had expressed concern about the proximity of two of the units to a water course. Southern Water had said that the means of disposal of waste water was satisfactory. The County Archaeologist had said that the works were unlikely to affect any archaeological remains. The Health and Safety Executive had not raised any objections. The Principal Engineer Highways had confirmed that he did not wish to restrict consent as any issues had been satisfactorily resolved. The Council's Regeneration Officer and the Local Plan Officer had both supported the proposed development. The views of the Council's Arboricultural Officer were set out in the report. The Development Control Manager considered that the proposal would have no harmful effects on the amenities of occupiers of surrounding residential properties, on highway safety, or on the visual amenities of the locality.

RESOLVED: (1) That the Head of Planning be given delegated authority to negotiate amended plans to satisfy the requirements of the Environment Agency.

(2) Reserved matters in respect of EB/2004/0848 (RM) approved subject to the prior conclusion of a unilateral undertaking to secure a financial contribution for replacement tree planting and to conditions (1) That prior to commencement of the development on site, full details of the proposed river corridor shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Environment Agency; (2) That the door in the rear elevation of Unit 11 shall only be used as a means of escape in the event of an emergency and shall at all other times remain closed.

(3) Reserved matters in respect of EB/2004/0849 (RM) approved subject to the prior conclusion of a unilateral undertaking to secure a financial contribution for replacement tree planting; and to conditions (1) That prior to commencement of the development on site, full details of the proposed river corridor shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Environment Agency; (2) That the door in the rear elevation of Unit 11 shall only be used as a means of escape in the event of an emergency and shall at all other times remain closed.

(4) That an Informative be attached to the Decision Notices in respect of both applications advising the applicant that the conditions attached to outline planning permission EB/2004/0238 (OL), are reiterated and, unless otherwise discharged to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, should be complied with to ensure the validity of the planning permission.

(5) EB/2004/0854 - Highfield Park, land bounded by Hargreaves Road and Edward Road - application under Section 73 to relax condition no. 15 attached to outline planning permission EB/2004/0238 (OL) to allow businesses to operate machinery and carry out deliveries between the hours of 7.00 a.m. and 11.00 p.m. on Mondays to Fridays and 7.30 a.m. to 5.00 p.m. on Saturdays, Sundays and Public Holidays - HAMPDEN PARK. The Development Control Manager reported that since the report had been published three letters had been received concerning the potential for noise arising from the proposal. He considered that the proposed relaxation of condition no. 15 would have no detrimental impact on the amenities of the locality in general, or on the amenities of the occupiers of surrounding residential properties, and the proposal complied with Policies NE18 and NE28, and HO20 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001 -2011.

RESOLVED: Permission granted subject to condition that no machinery shall be operated and no deliveries shall be taken at or despatched from the site outside the hours of 7.00 a.m. and 11.00 p.m. on Mondays to Fridays and 7.30 a.m. and 5.00 p.m. on Saturdays, Sundays and Public Holidays.

(6) EB/2004/0888 - 26C Rosebery Avenue - two-storey extension at rear and single storey extension at side - HAMPDEN PARK. The Development Control Manager reported that since the report had been published four letters of objection had been received concerning the use of the driveway, privacy, drainage and that the proposal would be out of character. Also, the Environment Agency had raised no objection in principle, but had indicated that the area had been affected by flooding in the past. Revised drawings had been received but these did not result in an acceptable proposal.

RESOLVED: Permission refused on the grounds that the two-storey extensions would be inharmonious with the existing building and detrimental to visual amenity of the area, contrary to Policy UHT1 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001 - 2011.

(**NOTE:** Councillor Mrs Murray declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in this item as she lived in the vicinity of the application site and spoke and voted thereon).

(7) EB/2004/0898 - 21 Decoy Drive - two-storey extension and double garage at side and single-storey extension and conservatory at rear of house - HAMPDEN PARK. The Highways Agency had said they did not wish to restrict consent. The Development Control Manager had met with the applicant and had inspected the site to look at the difference in levels. His recommendation to the Committee was now to grant planning permission subject to conditions.

RESOLVED: Permission granted subject to condition A3 Use of matching materials.

(**NOTE:** Councillor Stevens declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in this item as the applicant was an acquaintance and spoke and voted thereon).

(8) EB/2004/0867 - 59 Friday Street - extension at rear of property and provision of vehicular access to Friday Street with hardstanding - LANGNEY. Four objections were reported since the report had been published, relating to concerns regarding the proposed access onto Friday Street, problems of cars overtaking buses stopped at nearby bus stops, problems of cars leaving properties, out of keeping, would set a precedent, and the front garden was an eyesore from excavation works. The Council‘s Senior Highway Engineer did to wish to restrict the grant of permission.

RESOLVED: Permission granted subject to conditions (1) D1.1 Commencement of development within five years; (2) C5.3 Hours of operation; (3) A1 Submission of samples of facing materials; (4) That samples of the proposed block paving materials to be used in the parking area shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, prior to the commencement of development and shall thereafter be provided on site to the satisfaction of the Council; (5) That, before the parking space is brought into use, a turning space shall be provided and maintained within the curtilage of the site to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority to allow a motor vehicle to enter and leave the site in a forward direction.

(9) EB/2004/0347(OL) - 10A Baslow Road - demolition of existing house and erection of five storey building (comprised of four floors of residential accommodation above a parking area for 12 cars) containing 10 two-bedroom flats together with alterations to the existing access road junction, refuse storage and planting of semi-mature trees (outline application - further amended scheme) - MEADS. A further amended scheme proposed an altered access and the re-positioning of the proposed block. The Principal Highway Engineer (Planning) had said that the proposed revised junctions arrangements were acceptable subject to meeting the Highway Authority's requirements. The comments of the Crime Prevention Design Adviser on behalf of Sussex Police, and those of the Council's Arboricultural Officer were summarised in the report. The further amended scheme had been notified to occupants of surrounding properties and 20 letters of objection had been received which were summarised in the report. An additional objection had been received relating to the disruption to the skyline and that the proposal would be out of keeping.

Mr Dunford, Mr Farmer, and Mr Riseley (Chairman of Meads Community Association) addressed the Committee in opposition to the proposal. Concerns were raised relating to privacy, accuracy of plans, inappropriate scheme for that part of Baslow Road, loss of trees, demolition of an existing good house, alterations to entrance and lack of community benefit. Mr Longhurst, the applicant's architect, responded to the concerns.

The Development Control Manager considered that the finally amended scheme was acceptable with the issues of design, landscaping and external appearance to be the subject of a future reserved matters application.

RESOLVED: Consideration deferred for a site visit.

(10) EB/2004/0794 (OL) - 3-17 Jevington Gardens - demolition of 3-17 Jevington gardens and erection of two buildings comprising 62 self-contained flats and 34 off street parking spaces – MEADS. 16 letters of representation were reported, the contents of which were summarised in the report. Since the report had been published, two further letters of objection had been received concerning the limited car parking provided, the low height of the boundary wall, and whilst welcoming the demolition of the existing premises, that the replacement scheme provided for too many flats. The views of the Council's Consultant Historic Buildings Advisor, the Local Plan Officer, the Principal Highway Engineer, the Crime Prevention Design Advisor, on behalf of Sussex Police, Southern Water, the Environment Agency, the Council's Strategy and Development Manager, the County Council's Development Contributions Co-ordinator and the Council's Parks and Gardens Manager were summarised in the report.

The Development Control Manager reported that he had received an e-mail from the applicant's agent deleting one flat from the scheme resulting in 61 flats being provided. Furthermore, a letter dated 6 January 2005 had been sent to the Committee from the applicant's agent asking for more time to complete the legal agreement. The Development Control Manager confirmed that the purpose of the time limit on the legal agreement was to meet the Government's target for determining planning applications. If, however, any delay were caused by either the County Council or the Borough Council, this would not lead to a refusal of permission. He considered that the proposed re-development scheme would, if implemented, consolidate the residential nature of Jevington Gardens.

RESOLVED: (1) (By 7 votes to 1) Outline consent granted subject to the prior

conclusion of appropriate legal agreements (with the Borough and County Councils) or undertakings in respect of on-site affordable housing units, open space funding and other development related contributions, as referred to in the report, together with conditions (1) Approval of the details of the design and external appearance of the buildings, and the landscaping of the site (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be obtained from the Local Panning Authority in writing before any development is commenced; (2) Plans and particulars of the reserved matters referred to in the above condition, relating to the design and external appearance of any buildings to be erected, and the landscaping of the site, shall be submitted in writing to the Local Planning Authority and shall be carried out as approved; (3) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission; (4) The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of five years from the date of approval of this permission, or before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later; (5) A2 Submission of samples of facing materials; (6) A9.3 Submission and approval of landscaping scheme; (7) No development approved by the permission shall be commenced until a scheme for the provision of surface water drainage has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage works shall be completed in accordance with the details and timetable agreed; (8) Prior to being discharged into any watercourse, surface water sewer or soakaway system, all surface water drainage from parking areas and hardstandings shall be passed through trapped gullies to BS 5911:1982 with an overall capacity compatible with the site being drained; (9) No material shall be deposited at the site other than clean, uncontaminated naturally occurring excavated material, brick and concrete rubble only; (10) C5.3 Hours of demolition and building operations; (11) The development, hereby approved, shall not commence until details of the proposed means of foul and surface water disposal have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Southern Water Services; (12) B8.2 Proper construction of car park spaces; (13) Details of the secure cycle parking facilities for each of the blocks of flats, hereby approved, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and no flat shall be occupied until the secure cycle parking is available for use in accordance with the approved details. The secure cycle parking shall be retained thereafter; (14) D6.1 Submission of details of storage and collection of refuse; (15) That, before the development hereby approved is commenced, details of measures for bird deterrent shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The approved measures shall be implemented before any of the flats are first occupied; (16) The highest part of the roof of either building, the subject of the application, shall be no higher than the main ridge of the adjoining property of 19 Jevington Gardens; (17) Before the first flat is occupied, a two metre high brick wall shall be constructed along the boundary of 1 and 3 Jevington Gardens to the satisfaction of the Local Panning Authority.

(2) In the event that the appropriate legal agreements (section 106, with the Borough and County Councils, or unilateral undertaking) are not concluded to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority by Tuesday 2 February 2005 (i.e. within the Government's 13-week deadline for determination of major planning applications), **outline consent be refused** on the grounds that the proposed residential development would not make provision for affordable housing, public open space or appropriate infrastructure and facilities in the community. As such, the development is contrary to Policies HO13 and LCF4 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001-2011 and Policy S3 of the East Sussex and Brighton and Hove Structure Plan 1991 - 2011.

(11) EB/2004/0801 - 10-12 Jevington Gardens - conversion of property into 13 self-contained flats, proposed erection of four storey extension at rear and provision of balconies and 5 on-site parking spaces - MEADS. Three letters of objection were reported since the report had been published, relating to overshadowing, over development, parking problems, noise disturbance and excessive size of the extension. The Development Control Manager considered that the proposed development was acceptable as it would provide a good standard of two and three bedroom self-contained flats and would have no harmful effects on the amenities of occupiers of surrounding properties. It complied with relevant policies in the Borough Plan.

RESOLVED: Permission granted subject to the conditions (1) Commencement of development within 5 years; (2) C5.3 Hours of building operations; (3) A2 Submission of samples of facing materials; (4) D6.1 Submission of details of storage and collection of refuse; (5) That samples of the proposed block paving materials to be used in the parking area shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, prior to the commencement of development and shall thereafter be provided on site to the satisfaction of the Council; (6) That prior to the first occupation of the flats hereby approved, 2 metre by 2 metre visibility splays shall be provided on both sides of the proposed parking area, directly behind the footway, to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

(12) EB/2004/0850 - Silverdale Garages rear of 33 and 35 Silverdale Road - demolition of first floor staff accommodation and changes to the "ground floor" garage walls including the installation of a security gate to provide secure overspill parking for the Grand Hotel - MEADS. One letter of objection was reported. Since the report had been published the Crime Prevention Design Adviser had said that the scheme presented no risks and the Tourism Manager had endorsed the need for the extra parking. The Senior Highway Engineer did not wish to restrict the grant of consent.

RESOLVED: Permission refused on the grounds that the proposed development will result in the loss of several residential units and would, by reason of the demolition of the existing buildings and the reduction in the height of the boundary walls, lead to an increase in light pollution, noise and general disturbance as well as having a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the area. Therefore the proposal is contrary to Policies HO3, HO20 and UHT4 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001 - 2011.

(13) EB/2004/0855 - 176 - 180 Terminus Road - two-storey extension including terrace at first floor level and second floor extension at rear in association with change of use from business to 3 no. self-contained flats at 1st and 2nd floor level and extension of office at ground floor level - MEADS. One letter of objection was reported. The views of the Local Plan Officer, Economic Development Department, Arboricultural Officer and the Environment Agency were summarised in the report.

RESOLVED: (1) Permission granted subject to conditions (1) D1.1 Commencement of development; (2) That the extensions hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with plans MW:02a and MW:03a received by the Local Planning Authority on 16 December 2004; (3) D6.1 Details of Bin Storage; (4) A17 Restriction of use of flat roof for amenity area; (5) A3 Use of matching materials; (6) C5.3 Hours of operation; (7) No development approved by this planning permission shall be commenced until (a)

A desktop study has been carried out which shall include the identification of previous site uses, potential contaminants that might reasonably be expected given those uses and other relevant information. In using this information, a diagrammatically representation (Conceptual Model) for the site of all potential contaminant sources, pathways and receptors has been produced; (b) A site investigation has been designed for the site using the information obtained from the desktop study and any diagrammatical representations. This should be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to that investigation being carried out on site. The investigation must be comprehensive enough to enable: (i) A risk assessment to be undertaken relating to groundwater and surface waters associated on and off the site that may be affected, refinement of the Conceptual Model and the development of a Method Statement detailing the redemption required; (c) The site investigation has been undertaken in accordance with details approved by the Local Planning Authority and a risk assessment has been undertaken; (d) A method statement detailing the remediation requirements, including measures to minimise the impact on the ground and surface waters, using the information obtained from the Site Investigation has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

(2) That an Informative be attached to the Decision Notice advising the applicant that that permission will be needed from the owner of the adjoining property to remove the large Ash tree. This tree could not be retained if the extensions were built and therefore you are advised to negotiate with the new owner of this property for the removal of this tree prior to the commencement of works.

(14) EB/2004/0872 - 4 Hardwick Road - installation of UPVC windows and doors, provision of glazed privacy screens and replacement glazed roof to front canopy and provision of pitched roofs (to replace flat roofs) at side and rear - MEADS. No representations were reported. The Council‘s Historic Buildings Advisor had stated that UPVC windows were unacceptable where they face the public domain.

RESOLVED: Permission refused on the grounds that by reason of their design and materials the proposed windows would result in the loss of traditional materials and features from the Area of High Townscape Value to the detriment of the visual amenity of the area, and would therefore conflict with Policy UHT16 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001-2011 and Guideline WD3 of the Eastbourne Townscape Guide (Supplementary Planning Guidance).

(15) EB/2004/0891 - 54 The Goffs - proposed alterations to front boundary wall installation of wrought iron sliding gate and pedestrian gate - UPPERTON. No representations were reported. The Council’s Consultant Historic Buildings Advisor had not supported the scheme, as it would be out of character with the area. No objections had been received from the Principal Engineer regarding the access.

RESOLVED: Permission refused on the grounds that the proposed vehicular gate and associated splayed boundary wall, by reason of their siting, design and appearance, would represent an incongruous feature in the streetscene, to the detriment of the visual amenities of the locality in general and the character and appearance of this part of the Old Town Conservation Area in particular. As such the proposed development is contrary to Policies UHT1, UHT4, and UHT15 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001-2011.

(16) EB/2004/0838 (DET) - Public Highway in Willingdon Road adjacent to

Westlords Playing Field - installation of a 12.5m high telecommunications mast and ancillary equipment cabinets - RATTON. The views of the Council's Arboricultural Officer were summarised in the report. The Development Control Manager considered that the proposal as submitted was unacceptable in terms of its impact on visual amenity; furthermore, the site plan was inaccurate and the mast would be located in the middle of the footpath. Three letters of objection had been received since the report had been published concerning detriment to visual amenities, too close to playing fields and contrary to Borough Plan policies.

Councillor Belsey addressed the Committee on behalf of local residents in opposition to the proposal.

RESOLVED: Prior approval of the siting and appearance be refused on the grounds that the proposed equipment, by reason of its size, bulk and height in a prominent position on an otherwise uncluttered grass verge, would be seriously detrimental to the visual amenities of the area, and would therefore conflict with Policy US9 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001-2011.

(17) EB/2004/0839 (DET) - Public Highway in Willingdon Drove adjacent to the junction with Kingfisher Drive - installation of a 12.5m high telecommunications mast and ancillary equipment cabinets - LANGNEY. Five letters of objection were reported and a further four letters of objection had been received since the report was published relating to health risks, safety issues at a busy junction, the equipment cabinet was obtrusive and that mast sharing should be investigated at an alternative site. Mr N Waterson MP had objected to the proposal. The Highways Manager had considered that the proposed size and location of the equipment was inappropriate and the Highway Authority would not be granting approval for the installation at the proposed location. The Development Control Manager considered that the proposal was unacceptable in terms of its impact on the visual amenities of the area and nearby residents.

Mrs. Smith, (Sunbury Farm Residents Association), addressed the Committee in opposition to the proposal, concerned that the equipment would be too close to residential properties, it would be an eyesore, it would be a distraction at a busy junction and there was no conclusive evidence that emissions were harmless. The applicant responded to the concerns.

The Development Control Manager confirmed that the drawings were inaccurate, as bungalows were situated behind the proposal and the construction would be 1.8m high, not 1.2m as stated.

RESOLVED: Prior approval of the siting and appearance be refused on the grounds that (1) The proposed mast and ancillary equipment would be intrusive and incongruous features in the streetscene, by reason of their height, size and bulk, and would therefore be detrimental to the visual amenities of the area and the amenities of adjacent residents; (2) Further to reason (1) the proposal would conflict with Policy US9 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan.

(18) EB/2004/0873 (DET) - Public Highway in Willingdon Road, outside 174 Willingdon Road - installation of telecommunications apparatus comprising 12.5m high telegraph pole and ancillary equipment - RATTON. Two letters of objection were reported. Since the report had been published a further 28 letters of

objection had been received from local residents relating to affect on health, trees, vehicle turning movements, impact on outlook, safeguarding the grass verges and an eyesore. A letter had also been received from Mr N Waterson MP opposing the proposal on the grounds that it would be detrimental to the appearance of the town and skyline. The Highway Authority would not be granting approval for the installation at the proposed location. The views of the Council's Arboricultural Officer were summarised in the report.

Mr Elliott addressed the Committee in opposition to the proposal, concerned that the depth of the foundations would affect the Elm sapling, obstruction of visibility problems, potential health issues and the accuracy of the plans. Councillor Belsey addressed the Committee in opposition to the proposal. The applicant responded to the concerns.

RESOLVED: Prior approval of the siting and appearance be refused on the grounds (1) That the proposed installation would be seriously detrimental to the residential amenities of the adjacent occupier, by reason of its size, bulk and location; (2) That the proposed installation would be seriously detrimental to the visual amenities of the area and prejudicial to the development of the adjacent tree by reason of its size, bulk and location; (3) That the proposed installation would have a detrimental impact on highway safety, by reason of its size, bulk and location within a visibility splay to a vehicular access on a busy classified road (A22); (4) That further to reasons (1) and (2), the proposal would conflict with Policy US9 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001-2011.

(19) EB/2004/0835 - Former Llewellyns Joinery Works, 29 Waterworks Road - change of use of existing building from joinery (Class B1) to offices and warehouse (Class B1 & B8), together with external alterations - ST. ANTHONY'S. One letter of representation was reported. The Economic Development Officer supported the proposal. Mrs Clarke addressed the Committee welcoming the design of the proposal, but seeking a control on the hours of operation, loading and adequate turning on site for vehicles.

RESOLVED: (1) Permission granted subject to conditions (1) D1.1 Commencement of development within five years; (2) That samples of the materials to be used on the roof and walls shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before the development hereby approved is commenced; (3) C5.3 Hours of operation; (4) That the use hereby authorised shall only take place between the hours of 7.30 a.m. and 6.00 p.m. on Mondays to Saturdays.

(2) That an Informative be attached to the Decision Notice advising the applicant to ensure that vehicles turn and load on the premises.

(20) EB/2004/0847 (DET) - Public Highway in Pevensey Bay Road, opposite the junction with Tanbridge Road - Installation of a 15m high telecommunications monopole mast and ancillary equipment cabinet - SOVEREIGN. One letter of objection was reported. A further letter of objection was reported since the report had been published relating to proximity to a school and possible health risks. The Highways Manager advised that he would not grant approval for the mast and associated equipment at the proposed location because of the significant injury accident record at the junction.

RESOLVED: Prior approval to the siting and appearance be refused on the

grounds that (1) The proposed monopole and ancillary equipment would be overbearing and intrusive features in the streetscene, by reason of their height, size and bulk, and would therefore be detrimental to the visual amenities of the area; (2) The location of the proposed equipment would result in an unacceptable hazard to highway safety so close to a junction with a poor accident record; (3) Further to reason (1), the proposal would conflict with Policy US9 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001-2011.

(21) EB/2004/0842 - 23 Gorringe Road - erection of a double garage to the front - UPPERTON. No representations were reported. The views of the Highway Authority were summarised in the report. The Development Control Manager considered that although the majority of the structure would not be visible from the street, the increase in height to the retaining wall to accommodate the garage and comply with building regulations would make an already prominent feature incongruous within the street scene.

RESOLVED: Permission refused on the grounds (1) That, by reason of its design, the proposed development would create an incongruous feature within the street scene and therefore not comply with Policies UHT1 and UHT4 of the Eastbourne Plan 2001-2011; (2) That the proposed garage does not meet the minimum requirements considered appropriate for highway safety due to the lack of visibility splays and the door opening over a public highway.

35. PLANNING APPEAL. SITE AT BUSHY RUFF, THE COLLEGE, 14 CARLISLE ROAD - EB/2004/0152. The appeal against refusal to grant permission for the removal of a shed, the erection of a 4.1m high galvanised chain link fence and the replacement of an existing grassed play area with a multi-use hard surface play area to the rear of Bushey Ruff was dismissed by the Inspector for the following reasons:

The main issues in the appeal were the effect of the proposal on residential amenities of neighbours and on 2 pine trees that were the subject of tree preservation orders. The use of the replacement surface would be likely to be more intensive than that of the existing grass surface, and the noise of balls hitting the additional chain link fence would cause a nuisance. He concluded that there would be an increase in noise and disturbance associated with the use of the play area which would be unacceptable. He also concluded that because not all of the required details had been submitted it was not possible to assess properly the effect of the proposals on the long term health and retention of the trees.

The meeting closed at 7.20pm

PJ BOWKER
Chairman