

Tuesday 20 June 2006  
at 4.30pm



# Planning Committee

**MEMBERS:** Councillor TAYLOR (Chairman); Councillor STEVENS (Deputy Chairman); Councillors BOWKER (as substitute for Stevens), Mrs GOODALL, HERBERT, MARSH, Mrs MURRAY, Mrs POOLEY and SLATER (as substitute for Harris).

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

## 5 Minutes.

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 May 2006 were submitted and approved and the Chairman was authorised to sign them as a correct record.

## 6 Declaration of Interests.

(i) Item 7 (5/6) Willingdon Golf Club, Southdown Road - Councillor Mrs Goodall declared a prejudicial interest in this item and left the room during consideration thereof. Councillor Herbert declared a personal interest as members of his family had objected to the proposal and spoke and voted thereon.

(i) Item 7 (1) Park College, Kings Drive - Councillor Mrs Goodall declared a prejudicial interest in this item and left the room during consideration thereof. Councillor Slater declared a personal interest as a former employee of Park College and spoke and voted thereon.

## 7 Report of Planning Manager on Applications.

**(1) EB/2006/0104(OL) - Park College, Kings Drive - demolition of existing building and construction of 84 self-contained flats within a landscaped garden setting, including parking provision - RATTON.**

Ten letters of objection were reported from local residents and the Friends of Hampden Park.

Following the submission of a detailed transport assessment East Sussex County Council and Eastbourne Council's Highways considered the scheme acceptable subject to conditions. It was also recommended that the number of car parking spaces be reduced from 88 to 84. The Committee felt that if the application was approved, the parking allocation should remain at 88 spaces. The Environment Agency, Environmental Health and Southern Water raised no objections but recommended a number of conditions.

The Crime Prevention Design Adviser, on behalf of Sussex Police had made a number of detailed comments and recommendations in respect of the access

(2006/2007 Minutes)

drive, perimeter treatment, clearly defined private gardens around ground floor windows and parking arrangements.

Councillor Woodall addressed the Committee on behalf of local residents and raised concerns regarding the impact of the development on the surrounding area, the increase in traffic and the dangers of further encroachment into the adjacent Sports Park area.

Councillor Lacey considered the proposal to be an overdevelopment of the site and that the application should be deferred for the preparation of a planning brief to guide the most appropriate use of the site, which should include community facilities.

Mr P Fryer responded on behalf of the applicant and advised of the new facilities required to effectively deliver the desired curriculum. The disposal of the current site would allow reinvestment into specialist facilities including a new performing arts centre, modern science laboratories and language facilities.

**RESOLVED: Permission in outline granted** subject to the prior conclusion of a legal agreement in respect of the following (a) to ensure that the capital receipts from the sale of the application site are used for the provision of compensatory educational and other ancillary facilities on the main campus; (b) the provision of affordable housing on site in accordance with Borough Plan Policy; (c) a commuted sum for open space provision; (d) compensatory flood storage contributions (if required); (e) any off-site highway works required by the Highway Authority; (f) County Council developer contributions; (g) Sustainability accessibility contributions and to conditions (1) M2.1 Outline permissions; (2) M2.2 Outline permissions; (3) M2.3 Outline permissions; (4) M2.4 Outline permissions; (5) A1 Submission of samples of facing materials; (6) T10 Landscape design proposals; (7) H5.1 Provision for disabled people; (8) H6 Hardstanding for wash-down facilities; (9) U4.4 Hours of operation; (10) None of the flats hereby approved shall be occupied until the existing barrier across the driveway from Kings Drive to Sussex Downs College has been relocated to a position agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority; (11) That before the commencement of development, details of the proposed means of foul and surface water sewerage disposal shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Southern Water. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details; (12) Prior to being discharged into any watercourses, surface water sewer or soakaway system, all surface water drainage from parking areas, roads and hardstandings shall be passed through trapped gullies to BS 5911:1982, with an overall capacity compatible with the site being drained; (13) A13 Bird Deterrent.

**(2) EB/2006/0245 - 28 Grange Road, demolition of existing building and erection of replacement building containing 14 one and two bedroom flats, with 12 car spaces – MEADS.** Seven letters of objection were reported from local residents. The observations of the Crime Prevention Design Adviser, on behalf of Sussex Police were set out in the

report. The Environment Agency, Arboricultural Officer and the Highway Authority raised no objections to the proposal subject to conditions.

**RESOLVED: Permission refused** on the grounds that the proposed development would, by reason of its design, scale and massing, not preserve an Area of High Townscape Value and would result in over-development and increased general disturbance to the detriment of surrounding residential properties. As such, the proposed development is contrary to Policies UHT1, UHT16 and HO20 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001-2011.

**(3) EB/2006/0264 - 144 Seaside - conversion of existing maisonette into two self-contained flats including dormer to rear, external staircase to rear and first and second floor walkways to the side – DEVONSHIRE.**

**RESOLVED: Permission refused** on the grounds that the proposed development, by reason of its design and height would result in overlooking, loss of privacy and loss of outlook and would therefore be detrimental to the visual amenities of the area and the amenities of adjoining residents. The proposal would therefore conflict with the Policies in the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001-2011.

**(4) EB/2006/0334(FP) (CONS AREA) - 3 New Upperton Road - installation of replacement UPVC double glazed windows – UPPERTON.** The Council's Historic Buildings Consultant advised that due to the amount of replacement windows in adjacent buildings the use of UPVC replacements could be permitted, but that the windows proposed were not an acceptable design. The Conservation Area Advisory Group at its meeting on 30 May 2006 raised objections to the proposal.

**RESOLVED: Permission refused** on the grounds that, by reason of their design, the proposed replacement windows would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the building, and the Old Town Conservation Area. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to Policy UHT15 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001-2011.

**(5) EB/2006/0292(FP) - Willingdon Golf Club, Southdown Road - provision of a telecommunications base station comprising a 15m high tree mast, together with ancillary cabinets and compound – RATTON.** Twelve individual letters and 184 signed proforma letters of objection were reported from local residents. An objection letter was also reported from Councillor Angel. A further letter from a local resident objecting to the proposal on health grounds was reported.

The Downland, Trees and Woodland Manager advised that it would be preferable not to have a mast of any type in this location, but that a tree mast was preferable to a monopole.

The Sussex Downs Joint Committee raised no objections to the proposal as although the tree mast would be visible, it was sited with woodland to the rear.

Mr C Gross and Councillor Angel addressed the Committee against the proposal on the grounds of its prominent and sensitive location in an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Local residents would suffer a loss of visual amenity and had voiced strong concerns regarding the health risks associated with such installations.

Mr N Kay addressed the Committee on behalf of the applicant and advised that the site would provide the required coverage and had been chosen as it was some distance from residential areas.

**RESOLVED: Permission refused** on the grounds that the proposed tree mast would be seriously detrimental to the visual amenities of the South Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the amenities of nearby residents by reason of its height, bulk, design and elevated position, and would therefore conflict with Policies D1 and US7 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001-2011.

**(6) EB/2006/0293(FP) - Willingdon Golf Club, Southdown Road - provision of a telecommunications base station comprising a 15 metre high monopole (including antennas) together with ancillary cabinets and compound – RATTON.** Twelve individual letters and 184 signed proforma letters of objection were reported from local residents. An objection letter was also reported from Councillor Angel.

The Downland, Trees and Woodland Manager advised that it would be preferable not to have a mast of any type in this location which would be highly visible on the golf course.

**RESOLVED: Permission refused** on the grounds that the proposed monopole would be seriously detrimental to the visual amenities of the South Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the amenities of nearby residents by reason of its height, bulk, design and elevated position, and would therefore conflict with Policies D1 and US7 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001-2011.

**(7) EB/2006/0331(FP) - Kings Drive Service Station - provision of new sales building, forecourt and canopy over; new double skinned fuel storage tanks, 14 parking spaces, 4 no. 5m high flood lights and repositioning of existing vehicular cross over in association with demolition of existing canopy, forecourt, sales building and car wash – RATTON.** Twelve local residents, Mr S Lloyd and Mr N Waterson MP, submitted objections to the proposal. The Environment Agency, Southern Water, Environmental Health, the Council's Arboriculturist and the Highway Authority raised no objections subject to conditions. The Planning Policy Unit advised that a flood storage contribution would be required.

The Council's Retail Consultant raised objections to the proposed retail store as no need had been identified for the increased retail space proposed. The application was likely to lead to the closure of convenience stores in the Rodmill Shopping Centre leading to the decline of this shopping parade. The applicant's response to the comments of the retail consultant was reported. The Committee was advised that the retail consultant's view remained that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the vitality and viability of the shopping centre.

Mr S Lloyd addressed the Committee against the proposal objecting on the grounds of the increase in traffic generation and that this could also impact on emergency vehicles entering the DGH.

Mr Wood addressed the Committee objecting to the noise and disturbance to local residents, the impact on the local shopping centre, wildlife and highway safety.

Mr D Maxwell responded on behalf of the applicant and advised that substantial investment was required to modernise the infrastructure and that the site was ideally suited to provide the enhanced facilities proposed. The applicant's opinion in respect of the retail impact was reiterated.

**RESOLVED: Permission refused** on the grounds that no need has been identified for the increased retail space proposed. Furthermore it has not been demonstrated that the viability and vitality of the existing Local Shopping Centre would not be harmed. Therefore the proposal is contrary to Policies SH4 and SH6 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001-2011.

**(8) EB/2006/0361(FP) - 4 Silverdale Road - change of use to student accommodation with live-in warden – MEADS.** Fourteen letters of objection were reported from local residents. Environmental Health advised that the property would require a licence to operate as a House in Multiple Occupation. The applicant had submitted a letter of support.

Mrs Glossop and Mr Freeman addressed the Committee objecting to the proposal on the grounds of loss of privacy and the increase in the noise and disturbance to local residents from students in this quiet residential area.

Councillor Elkin objected to the proposal and advised that residents in the Meads area had experienced problems in the past when students resided together in large numbers. Measures to limit the impact had proved ineffective, even with the presence of a warden.

Mr J Sutherland, Principal of St Giles College responded that the accommodation would house adult English language students with an average age of 25. The wardens flat would be occupied by a staff member of St Giles College and the College would take action in response to any reports of unneighbourly behaviour.

**RESOLVED: Permission granted** subject to no further objections being received before the deadline for consultation on 22 June 2006 and to conditions (1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the

expiration of three years from the date of this permission; (2) That the use hereby approved shall only be used as student accommodation for St Giles College, and shall not be let or sold separately; (3) That the wardens flat is occupied by a staff member of St Giles College in order to manage the accommodation hereby approved; (4) Before the commencement of the development, hereby approved, details secure and enclosed cycle parking, for the residents shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved cycle parking shall be provided before the first use of the development and thereafter maintained; (5) That details of the provision to be made for the storage in bulk containers of domestic refuse and for access thereto by the occupiers of the building and collection vehicles shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before the development hereby authorise is commenced.

**(9) EB/2006/0297(FP) - Eastbourne College, Summerdown Playing Field, Compton Drive - replacement of existing all-weather pitch with new astroturf pitch measuring 62m by 102m and erection of perimeter fencing 3m in height rising to 4.5m behind each goal area for a length of 30m - OLD TOWN.** One letter of objection and three commenting on the proposal were reported from local residents. The Arboricultural Officer raised no objections to the proposal.

**RESOLVED: Permission granted** subject to conditions (1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission; (2) That no demolition, site clearance or building operations shall take place except between the hours of 8.00 am and 6.00 pm on Mondays to Fridays and 8.00 am and 1.00 pm on Saturdays and that no works in connection with the development shall take place on Sundays or Bank/Public Holidays; (3) That details of the mesh fence hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The fence shall be provided in accordance with the approved details and maintained as such thereafter

**(10) EB/2006/0301(FP) - 20 - 22 Terminus Road - change of use from office (Class B1) to a wig-making training centre establishment (Class D1) - MEADS.** The Planning Policy and Economic Development Units supported the application.

**RESOLVED: Permission granted** subject to conditions (1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission; (2) The use hereby approved shall only be operated between the hours of 8.00 am to 7.00 pm Mondays to Saturdays and at no other time whatsoever.

**(11) EB/2006/0304(FP) - 35 Wade Close - single-storey extension at side of house to form new garage, with existing garage converted to living space, and a first floor extension at rear of house - SOVEREIGN.** One letter of objection was reported from the occupiers of the adjacent property. The Highway Authority raised no objections to the proposal.

Mrs Breed addressed the Committee objecting to the first floor extension, which would block out sunlight, particularly during the winter and would affect the outlook from her property. The applicant, Mrs Clarke responded and advised of the need for additional living space.

**RESOLVED: Permission granted** subject to conditions (1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission; (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) That the proposed first floor windows in the south-west and north-west elevations shall only be glazed in semi-obscure glass and incapable of being opened and shall be permanently maintained as such thereafter; (4) No railings, balustrading or other means of enclosure shall be erected on any part of the extension hereby approved, nor shall the roof of the extension be used as a balcony, patio, roof garden or similar amenity area at any time; (5) That the garage door shall not open out over the public highway.

**(12) EB/2006/0352(FP) - 20 Quantock Close - erection of a two-storey extension at side – LANGNEY.** The Committee was advised that the application had been withdrawn.

**NOTED.**

**(13) EB/2006/0364(ADV) (CONS AREA) - Fairlands Hotel, 15 - 17 Lascelles Terrace - two non illuminated fascia signs – MEADS.** The Historic Buildings Consultant and the Conservation Area Advisory Group at its meeting on 30 May 2006 raised objections to the proposal.

**RESOLVED: Permission refused** on the grounds that the signage by reason of its position and design has a detrimental impact on the character of the conservation area.

**(14) EB/2006/0299(FP) - Beechwood, Hartfield Road - change of use from single private dwellinghouse (Class C3) to a dental clinic (Class D1) – UPPERTON.** The Highway Authority raised no objections to the proposal.

**RESOLVED: Permission granted** subject to conditions (1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission; (2) That the premises shall be used for a dental surgery for no more than 2 dental practitioners and for no other purpose (including any other purpose in Class D1 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).

**(15) EB/2006/0369(FP) - 26 Windermere Crescent - part single storey part two-storey extension at rear and single storey extension to front - ST. ANTHONY'S.** The Committee was advised that the application had been withdrawn.

**NOTED.**

**(16) EB/2006/0381(FP) (CONS AREA) - 50 St Johns Road - addition of two flat roof dormers to side roofslope and one flat roof dormer to rear roofslope – MEADS.** The Historic Buildings Consultant and the Conservation Area Advisory Group at its meeting on 30 May 2006 raised objections to the proposed dormers.

**RESOLVED: Permission refused** on the grounds that the proposed dormers by reason of their size, positioning and design would be inharmonious with the host building and create incongruous features within the street scene that would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the conservation area and would therefore contravene Policies UHT1 and UHT15 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001-2011.

**(17) EB/2006/0345(FP) - 33 Meadowlands Avenue - erection of new two-storey dwelling with parking space – RATTON.** Nine letters of objection were reported from local residents. The Highway Authority raised no objections to the proposal.

Mr Fryer addressed the Committee objecting to the design, which was out of keeping with the area and the increase in parking.

**RESOLVED: Permission refused** on the grounds that the proposed dwelling would appear as an incongruous feature within the streetscene due to its siting and prominent location and would therefore be contrary to Policies UHT1 and UHT4 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001-2011.

**(18) EB/2006/0370(FP) (CONS AREA) - 114 Pevensey Road - addition of flat roof dormer to front elevation – DEVONSHIRE.** The Historic Buildings Consultant and the Conservation Area Advisory Group at its meeting on 30 May 2006 raised objections to the proposed dormer.

**RESOLVED: Permission refused** on the grounds that the proposed dormer due to its size and prominence would have a detrimental impact on the character of the conservation area and would therefore be contrary to Policies UHT15 and UHT1 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001-2011.

**(19) EB/2006/0335(FP) - 16 Station Parade - installation of security shutter and shutter box to shop front and security shutter to rear door – UPPERTON.**

**RESOLVED: Permission refused** on the grounds that the proposed shutter would have a deadening effect on the commercial frontage to the detriment of the amenities of the area and would therefore contravene Policies UHT1 and UHT4 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001-2011.

**(20) EB/2006/0378(OL) - 118 - 120 Seaside - demolition of existing building and erection of three-storey building comprised of retail unit on ground floor and 9 flats on first and second floors (outline planning application) – DEVONSHIRE.** Two letters of objection were reported from a local resident and the owner of the snooker club adjoining the proposal site. Mr Mullen addressed the Committee against the proposal on the grounds that residential properties in such close proximity to his

premises would result in complaints, which had implications for his premises licence.

**RESOLVED: Permission refused** on the grounds that (1) The building, by reason of its design, would be out of character with the established street scene and detrimental to the visual amenity of the area, contrary to Policies UHT1 and UHT4 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001 – 2011; (2) The development would overlook an amenity area detrimental to its privacy and use by neighbouring residents, provide poor outlook and privacy for the occupiers of the proposed ground floor flat and an undesirable pedestrian access at the side, contrary to Policies UHT1 and HO20 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001 - 2011.

**(21) EB/2006/0271(FP) - 8 Ashburnham Road - demolition of existing double garage and construction of new double garage with storage area above – UPPERTON.**

**RESOLVED: (By 6 votes to 1) Permission refused** on the grounds that the proposed development, by reason of its height, design and massing, would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the area and seriously detrimental to the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent property. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies UHT1 and HO20 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001-2011.

**(22) EB/2006/0313(ADV) - Primark, 49 Arndale Centre - display of illuminated sign at first floor level on eastern elevation of car park – DEVONSHIRE.**

**RESOLVED: Permission refused** on the grounds that due to its location and illumination, the sign would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the area, contrary to Policy UHT12 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001 - 2011.

**(23) EB/2006/0347(FP) - Lower Ground Floor, 32 Hyde Gardens - change of use of lower ground floor from health clinic (Class D1) to offices (Class B1) – MEADS.**

**RESOLVED: Permission granted** subject to the condition that the development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

**(24) EB/2006/0338(FP) - 34 Upper Kings Drive - erection of a two storey extension at side and a garage at front – RATTON.** Two letters of objection were reported from local residents. The detailed comments of the Council's Arboriculturist in respect of the trees on site were set out in the report.

Mrs Gamblen addressed the Committee objecting to the loss of trees and shrubs and the loss of outlook owing to the height and extent of brickwork on her boundary.

**RESOLVED: Permission refused** on the grounds that the proposed development would, by reason of its height, bulk, massing and siting, be overbearing and unneighbourly and therefore detrimental to the amenities of

the adjoining residents and the visual amenities of the area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies UHT1, UHT4 and HO20 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001-2011.

**(25) EB/2006/0384(FP) (CONS AREA) - Sussex Combined Services Museum Redoubt Fortress, Royal Parade - installation of a passenger carrying balloon (22 metre diameter) at the Redoubt Fortress parade ground (temporary permission for 5 years) – DEVONSHIRE.**

One local resident submitted a letter of support. The Conservation Area Advisory Group at its meeting on 30 May 2006 raised no objections to the proposal.

The detailed comments of the Historic Buildings Consultant in respect of the impact on the setting of this scheduled ancient monument and the conservation area were set out in the report. The County Archaeologist raised no objections and the Curator of the Redoubt Fortress supported the proposal. English Heritage considered the application acceptable if measures were in place to minimise the impact on the ancient monument and architectural remains and a temporary permission only was granted. The Senior Planning Officer reported on a recent visit to an operating 'HiFlyer' balloon in Bournemouth. An amendment to the proposed condition in respect of operating times and the requirement for the balloon to be deflated was proposed as result of the site visit and details submitted by the applicant of the considerable operation costs involved.

**RESOLVED: Permission granted** subject to no objections being received before the deadline for consultation on 23 June 2006 and to conditions (1) That the development, hereby approved, shall be removed and the site restored to its original condition before 30 June 2011; (2) The helium filled balloon, hereby approved, shall only operate between 7.00am and 11.00pm on any day between 1 March and 31 October, inclusive, each year or at such times and days to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority; (3) Any advertisements displayed on the balloon shall be the subject of a separate advertisement consent.

**(26) EB/2006/0342(FP) - 12B Susans Road - change of use from taxi/private car hire office to a hot food takeaway (Class A5) – DEVONSHIRE.** Two letters of objection were reported from the proprietor of 26 Seaside and Councillor Wallis. The Economic Development Unit raised concerns regarding the impact on residential amenity and the loss of business use.

**RESOLVED: Permission refused** on the grounds that the proposed development would be detrimental to the amenities of the area and nearby residents in particular, by reason of noise and disturbance, and would therefore conflict with Policies TC7 and HO20 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001-2011.

## **8 Tree Preservation Order - Land at 30 St Leonards Road, Eastbourne, East Sussex No 116 (2006).**

The Committee considered the report of the Planning Manager and Legal Services Manager which sought confirmation of a tree preservation order in respect of trees on the above land. No objections had been received to the order but the Beaufort Court Residents Association had requested that permission be granted to carry out sensible and permissible pruning as soon as possible. It was confirmed that an application for reduction works to one of the Elms was approved on 21 March 2006.

**RESOLVED:** That The Eastbourne Borough Council Tree Preservation Order (Land at 30 St Leonards Road, Eastbourne, East Sussex) No. 116 (2006) be confirmed without modification.

## **9 Proposed Protocol between Planning and the Private Sector Housing Team - New HMO Licensing Procedures.**

The Committee considered the report of the Planning Manager regarding the Licensing of Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) recently introduced through the Housing Act 2004 to improve controls. A protocol was proposed to ensure that the Council acted in a corporate way when dealing with HMO Licensing applications to ensure that the planning position was not compromised. This could occur if a HMO Licence was granted for a property which did not have the benefit of the required planning permission for this use. It was noted that the criteria under which HMO licence applications were determined was very different to the considerations taken into account when deciding whether to grant planning permission for an HMO.

A number of cases had already been identified where an HMO licence application has been submitted on a property which did not have the benefit of planning permission. These situations could potentially place the Council in a difficult position should planning enforcement action subsequently be authorised in respect of a use which had already been granted an HMO licence. The proposed protocol was set out in the report and had been agreed by the Private Sector Housing Team and a joint agreement would be sought with the other members of the Sussex Housing Group to promote an agreed joint response to the issue.

**RESOLVED:** That the proposed protocol as set out in section 3 of the report be endorsed.

## **10 Planning Appeals.**

**(1) 13 Beltring Terrace – EB/2005/0375. The appeal against a refusal to grant planning permission for the erection of a detached 2 bedroomed dwelling was dismissed by the Inspector for the following reasons:**

The Inspector considered that the main issue was the effect of the new house on the character and appearance of Beltring Terrace.

The new house would be lower than the adjacent terrace and slightly detached from it. Given the very regular pattern of the great majority of the terrace there would be a large gap between the adjacent roof lines, which would mar the uniform design of the terrace. The house would therefore appear out of place and jarring. The window positions would not match up with the remainder of the terrace and the design did not pay sufficient regard to the surroundings.

**(2) 9 The Goffs –EB/2004/0377 (Appeal A) and EB/2005/0732 (Appeal B). The appeals against a refusal to grant planning permission for the demolition of the existing residential care home and the erection of 14 apartments were dismissed by the Inspector for the following reasons:**

The Inspector considered that the main issues were the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, the amenities of adjoining residents, with particular reference to outlook and sunlight, traffic circulation, car parking and road safety.

The mass of the building would be significantly bigger than the existing house and would be more prominent in views from Gildredge Park. However its overall height, scale and design would be in keeping with neighbourhood buildings and would have no adverse visual effect on the surrounding area. In respect of both appeals it was concluded that the proposals would not be out of character with the area. Appeal A retained the boundary wall, hedge and trees along The Goffs frontage which would provide an effective screen and the new building would have only a minimal impact on views. In appeal B, with the removal of the hedge and trees and the wider entrance, the front of the property would be more visible, but as it was set well back from the frontage and retained a substantial length of boundary wall, it would not be unduly prominent.

With regard to the effect on the amenities of adjoining residents, it was considered that the expanse of windowless wall so close to the boundary of 7 The Goffs (Lade House) would be overbearing and adversely affect the outlook of the residents, particularly from the area of the garden nearest to the house.

The proposals provided 7 car parking spaces. The Highway Authority had indicated that a 50% reduction from the standard requirement was reasonable, making the total required provision 9 spaces. The Highway Authority had advised that 7 spaces would be sufficient, subject to them being unallocated. The Inspector considered that the demand for parking spaces from the residents of 14 apartments, and the number of traffic movements which that could create, would be potentially far greater than could be catered for with just 7 spaces. This would result in added pressure on the on-street parking available in the locality with an unacceptable impact on road safety, traffic congestion and parking.

**(3) 43D Blackwater Road – EB/2005/0797(OL). The appeal against a refusal to grant planning permission for the erection of an end of terrace house was dismissed by the Inspector for the following reasons:**

The Inspector considered that the main issues were the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

The proposal would infill the open corner between the two terraces and would extend close to the back edge of the pavement. The rear and side elevations would be prominent when viewed from Grassington Road. The extension forward of the established building line in Grassington Road and the proximity of the proposal to the side boundary of the site would be inconsistent with the alignment of other properties in the locality and the established pattern of development. This would undermine the open spacious character of Grassington Road and the surrounding Area of High Townscape Value.

**(4) 9A Grassington Road – EB/2005/0400(OL). The appeal against a refusal to grant planning permission for the demolition of existing building and erection of seven two-bedroom flats was dismissed by the Inspector for the following reasons:**

The Inspector considered that the main issues were the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of the occupants of adjoining dwellings in relation to disturbance, privacy and light.

The height of the building would be similar to the heights of nos 9 and 11 and while the proposal may exhibit components of other building designs in the locality, it was considered that the design in concept or detail did not respect the character and appearance of the immediate setting. Concerns were also raised regarding the removal of a significant section of the boundary wall. It was considered that the heavily patterned wall was a key feature of this part of the street scene. A further concern related to the effect on the character and appearance of the area of the loss of the Wheatley elm, which is an important visual and historic element of the street scene.

The Inspector concluded that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of the occupants of the adjoining building in relation to disturbance, privacy or light.

The meeting closed at 7.47 p.m.

**B E Taylor  
Chairman**