

PLANNING COMMITTEE**Tuesday 8 February 2005****PRESENT:**

Councillor BOWKER (Chairman), Councillor TAYLOR (Deputy Chairman), Councillors Mrs HOWLETT, Mrs MURRAY, Mrs POOLEY, Mrs SIMS (as substitute for Skilton) and STEVENS.

(Apologies for absence were reported from Councillors Harris and Skilton).

- 36. MINUTES.** The minutes of the meeting held on 11 January 2005 were submitted and approved and the Chairman was authorised to sign them as a correct record.
- 37. EASTBOURNE TOWN CENTRE REGENERATION – PLANNING BRIEF.** The Committee considered the report of the Director of Economy, Tourism and Environment which required agreement to amendments to the draft Planning Brief following comments received after the public consultation exercise.

The consultation period had run from 15 November 2004 until 7 January 2005 and included direct letters, door drop letter and leaflet to affected properties, creation of a dedicated website, press releases, advertisements and public notice, permanent and roving exhibitions, radio phone in, meetings and public surgeries. Young people were also specifically targeted in an attempt to engage them to a greater extent. 285 individual responses were received, including a total of 885 comments, and these were contained in Appendix 1 of the report. Analysis of the comments revealed a lot of support in principle as well as a need to make a number of revisions to the draft brief and this was reprinted as Appendix 2 to the report.

Members were very impressed with the report and the amount of work that had gone into it and congratulated the officers on their work. The Chairman also thanked the public for their response to the consultation exercise.

RESOLVED: That Cabinet recommend that Full Council approves the revised planning brief as supplementary planning guidance for the regeneration of Eastbourne Town Centre.

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

(1) EB/2005/0007(CA) - 122-124 Pevensey Road and 142 Langney Road - demolition of existing properties (to enable the re-development of the site) to erect 27 flats with 27 parking spaces below - DEVONSHIRE. The Committee was advised that the application had been withdrawn.

NOTED.

(2) 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

Planning
8 February 2005

storage and planting of semi-mature trees. (outline application - further amended scheme) – MEADS. At the last meeting of the Planning Committee Members had agreed to defer this application to allow for a site visit, which took place on 24 January 2005. The Development Control Manager reported that since the report had been published 20 letters had been received objecting to the further amended scheme. The Crime Prevention Design Adviser, on behalf of Sussex Police, was pleased to note that his recommendations for a secure car park and garden area had been adopted. The Principal Highway Engineer (Planning) advised that the revised location and layout of the vehicular access incorporated the vehicular access to the adjacent property (Trevinhurst Lodge, 10 Baslow Road) but, given the existing number of traffic movements associated with Trevinhurst Lodge, together with the proposed alignment, a further amendment to the proposed junction was needed in order to avoid conflict and bulking, which would have highway safety implications. The access/junction arrangements had now been further amended and the Principal Highway Engineer (Planning) confirmed that the revised junction arrangements were acceptable subject to the new vehicular access onto the public highway being constructed in accordance with the Highway Authority's requirements. The Council's Arboricultural Officer advised that, although the plans indicated otherwise, the relocation of the access driveway would, in his opinion, lead to a loss of a mature Horse Chestnut and a mature Beech, both presently protected by a Tree Preservation Order. The loss of the trees would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area and, if the scheme was approved, replacement planting would be required.

Mr Dunford, Mr Dale, Mr Risley and Councillor Elkin addressed the Committee opposing the proposed development on the grounds of overlooking, overdevelopment, inadequate parking and loss of trees. Mr Knott, on behalf of the applicant, responded that they had been consulting with the authorities for over a year and the proposal complied with the Development Plan and with Government Policies. The current building was out of keeping with the area and they would consult on appearance and design before submitting a full planning application.

RESOLVED: Permission refused on the grounds that the proposal constitutes an over-development of the site which would result in the loss of mature trees, the subject of a tree preservation order, and give rise to overlooking of surrounding residential properties. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to Policies UHT1, UHT5 and HO20 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001-2011.

(3)/(4) EB/2004/0904 and EB/2004/0905(CA) (CONS AREA) - Granville Crest, 1 Bolsover Road - (a) proposed demolition of part of existing building, conversion into 6 no. units, new build apartment block on tennis court comprising 6 no. apartments and 1 no. penthouse with underground garaging and provision of a detached five bedroom house with garaging together with an additional garage (b) proposed demolition of gym, store and conservatory – MEADS. The Development Control Manager reported one letter of support from the occupiers of 4 Bolsover Road and five letters of objection from occupiers of properties in Buxton Road, Bolsover Road and St John's Road that had been received since the report had been published. The Conservation Area Advisory Group was supportive of the demolition of the extensions and refurbishment of the existing building, but recommended refusal of the application overall, as it was considered that the design and size of the proposed apartments would dominate the existing building. In addition, the Group felt that a contextual drawing should have been submitted for the detached house. Southern Water did not wish to comment on the application. The Environment

Agency had no objections in principle to the proposed development, but recommended that if planning permission was granted, conditions should be attached to prevent pollution of the water environment. The Council's Environmental Health Officer advised that the bedrooms, living rooms and kitchens all exceeded the minimum floor areas contained within the Houses in Multiple Occupation Standards. The Council's Principal Engineer had no objections in principle to the formation of new vehicular accesses onto Buxton Road and St. John's Road or to the widening of the existing access in St. John's Road. However it was noted on the submitted drawing that the pedestrian visibility splays on both sides of the entrance did not quite comply with current standards, which are 2 metres by 2 metres. The parking provision within the development site meets the current standards and, subject to the issue relating to pedestrian visibility being resolved, the Highway Authority would not resist the grant of consent. The Arboricultural Officer commented that the development would lead to the loss of a mature Horse Chestnut and a mature Wheatley Elm on the Highway verge. The majority of protected trees on the site would be retained and the use of protective fencing was recommended.

The Council's Consultant Historic Buildings Advisor commented on the various aspects of the proposed development separately and was supportive of the proposals to remove the later additions to the building and of the principle to convert. His further comments were taken into consideration by the Committee in reaching its recommendation.

It was reported that the applicant had requested a deferment for a site visit when the hoardings could be unlocked and Members could view the site properly.

RESOLVED: Consideration deferred for a site visit.

(5) EB/2004/0907 - Flats 2 and 3, 46 Blackwater Road - replacement of windows on front and side elevations with upvc windows – MEADS.

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 its visual amenity and would therefore contravene Policy UHT16 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001-2011.

(6) EB/2004/0909 - 47 Summerdown Road - single-storey extension at rear - OLD TOWN. The Development Control Manager reported that since the report had been published a significant amendment had been made to the design of the roof and the neighbour now had no objection to the development.

RESOLVED: Permission granted subject to condition D1.1 Commencement of development within five years.

(7) EB/2004/0915(DET) - Public highway in Summerdown Road, adjacent to Eastbourne College sports ground - installation of telecommunications apparatus comprising a 15m high telegraph pole and ancillary equipment - OLD TOWN. The Development Control Manager reported that since the report had been published 44 further letters of objection had been received from residents in Summerdown Road, Summerdown Close, Rectory Close and Paradise Close along

Planning
8 February 2005

with a petition signed by 50 residents. The objections were mainly on health grounds, property values and the obtrusive appearance of the equipment. The Highways Manager had concerns about the number and size of the cabinets proposed which he considered excessive and an unnecessary obstruction on the footpath.

Mr Cussons and Councillor Skilton addressed the Committee opposing the proposed development on the grounds of inappropriate location, unsightliness and health grounds. Miss Butt responded for Hutchinson 3G that a need had been identified and a comprehensive search had failed to find a more suitable location. The equipment fell within guidelines on emissions and could not be refused on health grounds.

RESOLVED: Prior approval of the siting and appearance be refused on the grounds that the proposed equipment, by reason of its size, location and prominence on the public highway, 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.

(8) EB/2005/0037(CC) - Ocklynge Junior School, Victoria Drive - construction of a multi-use games area (MUGA) with associated fencing and 10m high floodlights, replacement pavilion to provide changing rooms and storage facilities to the south-west of the site and realigned pedestrian access to Baldwin Avenue - OLD TOWN. This proposal was being dealt with by East Sussex County Council and the Council's views were being sought under Article 10 of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995.

41 further letters of objection and a petition of 116 names were reported from local residents. The Council's Arboricultural Officer considered the proposed MUGA and pavilion to be sited too close to the existing lime trees on the boundary with Victoria Drive and recommended that the enclosure and pavilion be moved away from the trees. He also raised concerns about the depositing of Honeydew on the carpet surface.

Ms Maley, Mr Cobby, Mr Edwards, Ms Tarrant and Councillor Skilton addressed the Committee opposing the proposed development on the grounds of increased density, periods of use, disturbance, light pollution, traffic generation, insufficient car parking, inadequate access for emergency vehicles, and loss of peace and privacy. It was also noted that the Head teacher did not know who had a key to the school car park gate. A complaint was also made that sufficient notification of the plans had not been given, although it was explained that this was a County Council matter, which should have been addressed by the County Planning Officer. Councillor Lucas indicated that as a governor and parent of children at the school he wanted the best facilities for the children and young people. He believed that many of the residents' concerns could be resolved through strict planning conditions but thought that the MUGA would not be able to proceed without support from local residents and suggested the County Council set up a consultation group before going any further. Concerns that a club house and bar could eventually be built were allayed by the Head teacher who addressed the Committee and responded to concerns about traffic, car parking and light spillage. He asserted that the school would retain control over outside use of the facility and believed parking problems would be no worse than at the beginning and end of the school day. The school's governors had been involved in the planning process and were supportive of the proposed facility.

The Planning Officer responded to concerns about the flood lights which would be high enough to minimise light spillage. He felt that the new building fitted well into the site and its use by the school was not a worry for residents. However, the worries expressed were over evening and weekend use and the resultant use of floodlights, increased traffic and noise. Members agreed to send a strong message to the County Council that they and local residents did not support the use of the proposed facility outside school hours by outside users.

RESOLVED: That the following comments be forwarded to the County Planning Officer (the precise wording to be agreed with the Chairman): That while the Council is generally supportive of the provision of the MUGA for use by the school, subject to the re-siting of the facility to ensure retention of the trees on the Victoria Drive boundary, objections are raised with regard to the following. Strong objections are raised to the floodlights and the use of the MUGA facility during the evenings and weekends for non-school use, due to the detrimental impacts this would have on the amenity of the surrounding residential properties, and the contravention of their human rights for the peaceful enjoyment of their possessions and property. Concerns are also raised over the apparent lack of consultation during the planning application stages. Members also request that the parking provision at the school be reviewed to ensure that this is in line with current standards and is adequate for the site.

(9) EB/2004/0924 - Land to rear of 15 Hartfield Road - a pair of semi-detached three bedroom 2-storey dwellinghouses - UPPERTON. The Development Control Manager reported that since the report had been published seven letters of objection had been received. Southern Water had advised that a sewer runs along the back gardens of properties fronting Hartfield Road and under the application site. The County Archaeologist advised that the application was of archaeological interest since it lies on the archaeologically important Upperton Ridge which was the focus for settlement, burial and land use during the Bronze Age to Anglo-Saxon periods. As such, it recommended that a watching brief be placed on the site and that a planning condition be imposed. The Environment Agency had no objections in principle to the proposed development but recommended conditions to prevent pollution of both controlled waters and of the water environment. The Senior Highway Officer recommended a number of conditions in respect of the finished surface and gradient of the driveways, vehicular crossings and to prevent the discharge of water onto the public highway.

RESOLVED: Permission refused on the grounds that the proposed development would, by reason of its massing and close proximity to adjoining residential properties, be inharmonious and unneighbourly, respectively, and therefore comprise an over-development of the site to the detriment of the visual and residential amenities of the area. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies UHT1 and HO20 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001–2011.

(10) EB/2005/0002(OL) - 4 Ratton Road - demolition of existing property and erection of 10 flats with access and parking - UPPERTON. 21 letters of representation were reported, the contents of which were summarised in the report, and a further 37 were reported since the report had been prepared. The views of the Eastbourne Ratepayers' Association, the County Archaeologist and the Senior Highway Engineer were summarised in the report. The Sussex Police Crime Prevention Advisor had also requested involvement at the detailed design stage to help improve security.

Planning
8 February 2005

Mrs Norwood, Mr Keep and Councillor Lacey addressed the Committee opposing the proposed development on the grounds of overlooking, overshadowing, not in keeping with the surrounding area, increase in noise, parking, access for emergency vehicles, security of neighbouring properties and loss of trees. Councillor Lacey was also concerned that the potentially important archaeological grave site identified had not been mentioned in the recommendations. The architect, Mr Allchurch, responded that the siting and scale of the proposal respected the existing building line and rhythm and height of the existing property. The footprint was equivalent in size to neighbouring semi detached properties and the neighbouring nursing home and the design would match the style and character of adjacent properties.

RESOLVED: Outline permission refused on the grounds (1) That the proposed erection of a building containing 10 flats on the application site would be an over-development of the site, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the locality; (2) That the proposed building, by reason of its siting, size, scale and form, would be unneighbourly and would result in overlooking, loss of privacy and increase general disturbance, to the detriment of occupiers of surrounding residential properties; (3) That the proposed parking area would result in the loss of trees and established planting along the front boundary of the site to the detriment of the visual amenities of the locality (4) For the above reasons, the proposed development is considered to be contrary to Policies UHT4, UHT5 and HO20 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001-2011.

(11) EB/2005/0001(OL) - Princess Alice Hospital, Carew Road (land adjacent to the Bourne Unit and Avenida House) - single storey extension to day hospital (outline permission) – UPPERTON. The comments of the Highways Department and Council's Arboriculturalist had been received since the report had been published. The Highways Manager wished to resist further access as Carew Road was likely to become the Ring Road and the Arboriculturalist reported that protected sycamore trees would be lost and two pines would be detrimentally affected.

RESOLVED: Permission refused on the grounds that (1) The proposed development would result in the loss of preserved trees and other trees which provide a valuable visual amenity to the area and adjacent residents in particular; (2) Insufficient details have been submitted to satisfactorily demonstrate that the proposed development would comply with approved parking standards, and would not cause unacceptable loss of residential amenity; (3) Further to Reasons 1 and 2 above, the proposed development would not comply with Policies HO20, LCF20, NE28, UHT4, UHT7, TR11 and TR12 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001-2011.

- 39. ARCHITECTS PANEL.** The Development Control Manager gave a verbal update on progress being made with the proposed establishment of an Architects' Panel. Consultations were ongoing with other local authorities and the RIBA and consideration was being given to merging such a panel with the Conservation Area Advisory Group. A further report would be presented to the next meeting of the Committee.

NOTED.

- 40. PLANNING APPEAL. SITE AT 39 FRIDAY STREET – EB/2004/0003.** The appeal against refusal to grant permission for the erection of a garage at the front of the house was allowed by the Inspector for the following reasons:

The houses were set well back from the street and although a tree would be lost, it was felt to be of no great stature or importance. Ample garden space would remain to avoid an excessively hard outlook from this and neighbouring houses and the pitched roof design of the garage would be acceptable. Near the street, hardstandings, parked vehicles and fences were the most noticeable features at the front of the houses and the view was not one of uninterrupted garden. A garage had recently been built at the front of no. 31 and was considered to fit in with the house and street scene and the Inspector felt that each proposal should be dealt with on its merits. He asserted that the scheme would accord with Policies UHT1, UHT4 AND UHT20 of the adopted Eastbourne Borough Local Plan.

The meeting closed at 7.25pm

PJ BOWKER
Chairman