



## Seaford Town Council

### Planning & Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting of the **Planning & Highways Committee** held at the **Council Chambers, 37 Church Street, Seaford** on **Thursday 21st April 2016**.

#### Present:

Councillor L Wallraven (Chairman)

Councillor R Honeyman (Vice Chairman)

Councillors D Burchett, P Boorman, C Campbell, A Latham, A McLean and L Worcester.

Lucy Clark, Support Services Manager – Seaford Town Council

Elizabeth Harvey, Admin Assistant (Finance) – Seaford Town Council (minutes)

6 members of the public.

#### **P112/4/16 Apologies for Absence and Declaration of Substitute Members**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors D Argent, M Lambert and P Lower.

Councillor C Campbell substituted for Councillor D Argent.

Councillor P Boorman substituted for Councillor P Lower.

#### **P113/4/16 Disclosure of Interests**

Under the Seaford Town Council Code of Conduct and the Localism Act 2011, Councillors D Burchett, C Campbell, L Wallraven and L Worcester declared a pecuniary interest in application LW/16/0124 due to being members of the Conservative party.

#### **P114/4/16 Public Participation**

There was no public participation.

#### **P115/4/16 Planning Applications**

Planning Applications week ending 1<sup>st</sup> April 2016

##### **Seaford**

LW/15/0731

##### **26 Blatchington Hill**

Listed Building Consent Application - Replacement of metal casement top floor windows with slim-light wooden casement windows for Ms M Perkins

It was **RESOLVED** to make **NO OBJECTION**.

##### **Seaford**

LW/16/0119

##### **120 Princess Drive**

Planning Application - Two storey side/rear extension for Mr D Mayers

It was **RESOLVED** to make **NO OBJECTION**.

##### **Seaford**

LW/16/0158

##### **58 High Street**

Planning Application - Installation of rear dormer and two Conservation-style Velux windows at the front for Ms E Ryan.

It was **RESOLVED** to make **NO OBJECTION**.

**Seaford**  
LW/16/0163

**Cresta Crouch Lane**

Planning Application - Erection of 2 x two bedroom detached bungalows and 2 x two bedroom semi-detached chalet bungalows (in place of previous application ref: LW/15/0870) for Si Homes

Tony Delaney

Stated The original application was withdrawn and advised of has various objections. The Design Access Statement brings up Lewes District Council policy RES15, which relates to planning boundaries and the conversion of dwellings to provide separate units of accommodation. The six dwellings in total on this site will increase density of the land use and leave very little open space. These properties will have a larger footprint and impact on the environment, as these properties will have a larger roof surface from which rain fall will run off and go down the drains and Steyne Road. In Crouch Lane/Steyne Road the drain is getting clogged up by soil from the Cresta Site due to current digging. East Sussex County Council have been advised who state there is a two yearly programme of clearing out drains. There has been no significant change on the eastern boundary of the site, by 67A Steyne Road, the new elevations of the building is looking straight down on us and the bungalows are all being set forward and the roof heights have been reduced only partially, however, the overlooking issue still occurs. No traffic issues have been looked at or speeding issues in Steyne Road or Crouch Lane. There is no pavement in Crouch Lane on the eastern side and the increased traffic movement will increase the hazards to pedestrians.

Susan Smith

Highlighted the similarities in the applications from the previous to the new applications. On this application the roof heights are only just slightly lower than the previous application and only named chalet bungalows due to having the bathrooms being down stairs. The roof ridge line of these bungalows are in line with the bungalows in the next planning application LW/16/0164 for the same site and all are 1 metre higher than the roof ridge of 67A Steyne Road and neighbouring properties. The house design has changed but the foot print remains the same. Previous Committee minutes in December 2015 looks like the only reason an objection was made was for an archaeological report to be done. There has been no evidence of a survey carried out by Natural England or other wildlife organisations to assess or monitor badger activity. Diggers on the site have already moved soil from west to east on the site to create a high plato, so the build of the chalet bungalows will be very overbearing. It is overdevelopment, out of character, over shadowing, and loss of privacy to neighbouring properties, no support to land or piling measures to stop landslides. The applicants statement on the development are not true and do not benefit the local residents of Seaford.

Rod Smith

Highlighted comments Lewes District Council made regarding the last application made for this site. That the development would bring more density to the site and would adversely affect the appearance and character of the area and how it relates to the



ST3 local plan. Quoted Lewes District Council condition number 5 on the previous application, which gives guidance to parking conditions and the properties not being occupied until the planning authority has given approval, given reasons for this due to highways safety of pedestrians. Application LW/16/0163 should have the number of bungalows cut to two semi de-attached, parking should be incorporated in the site that enhances the landscape and drainage, a provision for a footpath is made along the Crouch Lane perimeter. The application LW/16/0163, LW/16/0164 and LW/16/0124 be considered together on the appearance it has to the town.

Cllr Sam  
Adeniji

Speaking on behalf of the residents of Seaford. Realistically having four dwellings in the replacement of one on this site, with having front and back gardens and a parking space. It is overcrowding. Previous applications show it was rejected for overlooking on number 67A Steyne Road, Seaford. Object to this application on the following grounds; overdevelopment, overlooking, unreasonable density and quoted Lewes District Council ST3 condition stating that the development should respect the overall scale and height, density and layout of the site.

It was **RESOLVED** to **OBJECT** on grounds of overdevelopment; overshadowing and loss of privacy; over bearing and needs to be excavated 1 metre down due to height issues; out of keeping with street scene; unreasonable density; boundary line between applications LW/16/0163 and LW/16/0164 being too close.

The Planning Committee queries whether a full archaeological assessment has been carried out and would like clarification of this.

**Seaford**  
LW/16/0164

**Cresta Crouch Lane**

Planning Application - Demolition of existing bungalow Cresta and replacement with 2 x two-bedroom detached bungalows (in place of outline approval ref: LW/03/0929) for Si Homes

Tony Delany

Commented on the density of the land, height of the roof line, overlooking of properties on the south side of Steyne Road and how the bungalow has been pushed further to the front of the site. Parking issues and how the steps are going to focus the run off of rainfall in Steyne Road and drains will be clogged. Along with traffic issues and speeding cars.

Rod Smith

Stated that he had the same objections as to the last application as being overbearing to 67A Steyne Road and the neighbourhood, with the applications designed to confuse. Lack of clarity of the design for the steep slope on the eastern boundary and the party wall. The unexplained absence of 67A sun lounge from the plans, cited in the original plans to carry out, rights of light report, which has not be followed up upon. Application should cut the number of bungalow homes to two semi-detached bungalows, to contain

the parking in the site and enhance the landscape and drainage and insist that the developer meet his obligations under the party wall act and rights of light notifications. Recommend that the applications LW/16/0163, LW/16/0164 and LW/16/0124 be considered together on the appearance it has to the town. If there was a footpath on application LW/16/0163 along to the Constitutional Club, then it would be desirable for it to be extended along the length of the Constitutional Club development.

Susan Smith

Stated that there are two detached bungalows for this application and the high pitched deep and appal roofs are higher than 1 meter than 67A Steyne Road and adjoining properties. It is overlooking if roof dormers are added later. Overbearing and overshadowing to 67A Steyne Road. The most eastern end of the building comes out further than 67A at the front and back and the steep slope of sandy soil goes beyond the retaining wall, by about a meter and half. Pictures provided shows you the site and am awaiting a BRE report to assess the impact the 67A in the way of a computer module. The right of light report has not been done. The building units have just been moved around on the plan, nothing has fundamental changed. The impact is still the same and urged the Committee to reject the application.

Cllr S Adeniji

Speaking on behalf of the residents of Seaford. Not against development on this site, just against the overdevelopment of this site. The development is overbearing, overlooking, not in keeping with the area, unreasonable density. If thinking of approving this application than please insist on ST3 for pedestrian safety due to the lack of pavement by the property.

It was **RESOLVED** to **OBJECT** on grounds of overdevelopment; overshadowing and loss of privacy; over bearing and needs to be excavated 1 metre down due to height issues; out of keeping with street scene; unreasonable density; increased highway issues; the boundary line between applications LW/16/0163 and LW/16/0164 being too close.

The Planning Committee queries whether a full archaeological assessment was carried out and would like clarification of this.

The Planning Committee would also like to express their concerns that the notices for these applications were not prominently displayed and could appear misleading to the public who may think this is one application.

**Seaford**  
LW/16/0170

**19 Fairways Road**

Planning Application - Demolition of existing front porch and erection of replacement porch for Mr G Ferdinand

It was **RESOLVED** to make **NO OBJECTION**.



Planning Applications week ending 8<sup>th</sup> April 2016

**Seaford**                      **32 Hawth Crescent**  
LW/16/0111                  Planning Application - Erection of rear extension, front porch and roof conversion with rear dormer for Mr T O'Donnell

It was **RESOLVED** to make **NO OBJECTION**.


**Seaford**                      **Seaford Constitutional Club Crouch Lane**  
LW/16/0124                  Planning Application - Alterations and extension to the Seaford Constitutional Club to provide new club facilities, 8x2 bed flats, 3x1 bed flats & 8x3 bedroom houses together with new carpark layout and landscaping for Seaford and District Constitutional Club

Councillors D Burchett, C Campbell, L Wallraven and L Worcester left the room.

Councillor R Honeyman continued to chair the meeting.

Rod Smith                  Welcomed the development of the Constitutional Club, however, noise pollution and a footpath along the boundary need to be looked at.

Susan Smith                Minor planning amendments to the application will mean more noise pollution and nuisance. All elements to the social club is planned for the ground floor and two double large patio doors are shown to be leading to a garden area. The new proposed layout is designed to open up the function room onto the large terrace and garden area by lay of the patio doors. The intention of the Constitutional Club is to increase its membership and hire out it's facilities on a commercial basis, meaning increased numbers and events resulting in increased levels of noise, especially in warm weather. The immediate neighbours will be affected by the arrival of licensed premises in the outdoor space and ask for evidence that the Constitutional Club has asked for approval for the changes to the building and the change of use to their outdoor land as an amenity to a licence premise. Conditions are attached for aquatics assessments, specialist sound installation for all elements and fabric of the building including windows and access doors. Will air conditioning units be installed, think of the tenants residing above? Impose conditions and seek changes to stop detrimental effect to the local community.

Tony Delaney              Occasionally hear noise from the Constitutional Club and objecting on the grounds of land use and overdevelopment due to the huge number of dwellings put on this site. Plus the eighteen parking spaces for the residents and only 10 parking spaces for the Constitutional Club. On the website where this application is, the applicant explains about securing and keeping the viability of the Constitutional Club open into the future, meaning more noise pollution. 

Cllrs Adeniji

Speaking on behalf of the residents of Seaford. What should be taken into account is the community impact of this development. There are residences being proposed and there will only be 10 parking spaces for the Constitutional Club and this application breaches ST3 and ST4 of the Lewes District Council's Local plan. It produces noise pollution to the area and if going to approve then it shouldn't breach the licensing conditions which they currently have in place and request a Section 106 agreement for the extending of the pavement for pedestrian's safety.

Mrs G Hide

The club is having double glazed windows and previously only had single glazed. One patio door is now only being installed. Doors will be closed when entertainment is on. Not going to increase the size of the garden, they are creating a pathway to get around the building as the entrance is in a different place to the members. Constitutional club currently use the garden now in the summer and there will be no more noise than is current. Sound proofing will happen for the properties above and are considering what has been said.

It was **RESOLVED** to make **OBJECTION** on the grounds of overdevelopment of 8 dwellings to the front. Highway parking issues, not enough parking spaces. However, the committee favours the design on the actual Seaford and District Constitutional club.

Councillors D Burchett, C Campbell, L Wallraven and L Worcester re-entered the room.

**Seaford**  
LW/16/0132

**9 Kammond Avenue**

Planning Application - Single storey rear extension, extension of loft space and conversion of garage for Ms C Ryland

It was **RESOLVED** to make **NO OBJECTION**.

**Seaford**  
LW/16/0184

**2 Mark Close**

Planning Application - Erection of an attached double garage for Mr J Mockler

It was **RESOLVED** to make **NO OBJECTION**.

**Seaford**  
LW/16/0193

**6 Guardswell Place**

Planning Application - Proposed front dormer for Ms G Barker

It was **RESOLVED** to make **NO OBJECTION**.

**Seaford**  
LW/16/0198

**9 Mill Drive**

Planning Application - Demolition of existing 2 storey extension and erection of a new 2 storey extension for Mr R Sinclair

It was **RESOLVED** to make **NO OBJECTION**. 

Tree Works Applications

**Seaford**

**1 Willow Drive**

TW/16/0024/TPO

T1 x Holm Oak T8 of the order – fell

T2 x Holm Oak T7 of the order – reduce by approx. 1m.

It was **RESOLVED** to make **NO OBJECTION**.

**P116/4/16 Road Closure Request – Street Party, Queen’s 90<sup>th</sup> Birthday**

Members considered report 93/15

It was **RESOLVED** to **APPROVE** the report and make **NO COMMENT**.

**P117/4/16 Update Report**

The Committee considered report 166/15 and **RESOLVED** to **NOTE** its contents.

The meeting closed at 8.26pm.

L Wallraven 16/5/16

Councillor L Wallraven  
Chairman

