



Seaford Town Council

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting of the **Planning and Highways Committee** held at the **Council Chambers, 37 Church Street, Seaford** on **Thursday 10th October 2019** commencing at 7.00pm

Present:

Councillors L Wallraven (Chairman), Councillor R Honeyman (Vice-Chairman) ,Councillors J Edson, A Latham and M Everden
Geoff Johnson-Planning Officer
9 members of the public present

P 51/10/19 Apologies for Absence

Apologies were reported from Councillors N Adil and J Lord

P 52/10/19 Disclosure of Interests

None

P 53/10/19 Public Participation

None

P 54/10/19 Planning Applications

Planning Applications for week commencing 16th September 2019

Councillor Honeyman declared that he would abstain from voting on applications LW/19/0154,0626,0686,0632,0654,0655,0671 and 0704 as he had been unable to access the plans due to a fault on the Lewes D. C website

Seaford **30 Dukes Close**
LW/19/0154 Retrospective Application – Replacement of outbuilding

It was **RESOLVED** to **SUPPORT** the application.

Seaford **Fitzgerald House Croft Lane**
LW/19/0626 & Listed Building Application and Advert Consent – Replace and
LW/19/0686 upgrade exterior signage

It was **RESOLVED** to **SUPPORT** the applications 

Seaford
LW/19/0632

Seaford House Crouch Lane
Planning Application- Rebuilding of partially collapsed flint boundary wall

It was **RESOLVED** to **SUPPORT** the application

Seaford
LW/19/0654

9 Meads Road
Planning Application – Replace conservatory with single storey extension. Two storey side extension with infill extension to front and in/out driveway

The applicant read a supporting statement to the Committee raising points in response to a letter of objection from the occupiers of 11 Meads Road. It was argued that the alterations and extensions proposed were in keeping with the character and appearance of other properties in Meads Road. There would be no impact on the amenity and privacy of the neighbours. There were no windows in the proposed side elevation in order to avoid overlooking. Much time and thought had been given to the design and layout of the extensions

It was considered that the proposals had been well-designed and that the neighbours' objections could not be supported. It was therefore **RESOLVED** to **SUPPORT** the application

Seaford
LW/19/0655


39 Claremont Road
Planning Application – Replacement of 4 windows

It was **RESOLVED** to **SUPPORT** the application

Seaford
LW/19/0656

6 Steyne Road
Planning Application – Redevelopment of the site to create 14 apartments

A resident of Kingswell Court, the property neighbouring the application site, spoke against the application. She claimed it would result in loss of light and privacy to her flat. She supported the development of the vacant site in principle but favoured the previous less intensive scheme for six houses. Kingswell Court was originally proposed as one block but was amended to two smaller blocks due to its impact on Rayford Court. The same of principle of 'overdevelopment' applied to the new proposals.

It was considered that there were several issues on the application which required clarification including the full response from ESCC on the highways issues which had not yet been submitted. It was therefore **RESOLVED** to **DEFER** further consideration of the application to the next meeting on Thursday 31st October 2019 

Seaford
LW/19/0671

Anney Catholic Primary School Sutton Avenue
Planning Application – 2 x proposed single storey extensions to existing classrooms; development of partially covered play area and construction of 2 x external stores

It was **RESOLVED** to **SUPPORT** the application

Planning Applications for week commencing 23rd September 2019

Seaford
LW/19/0704

9 Hastings Avenue
Planning Application – Single storey rear extension and garage conversion

It was **RESOLVED** to **SUPPORT** the application

Planning Applications for week commencing 30th September 2019

Seaford
LW/19/0700

14-16 Sutton Park Road
Advertisement Consent Application – New signage to replace existing

It was **RESOLVED** to **SUPPORT** the application

Seaford
LW/19/0715

9 Poynings Close
Planning Application – Proposed garage extension, rear extension and dormer extension

It was considered that although this was a substantial extension to property, it was well-designed and could not be regarded as overdevelopment It was therefore **RESOLVED** to **SUPPORT** the application

South Downs National Park Authority Applications

Seaford
SDNP/19/04014/FUL **Flint Barn adjacent to The Granary Silver Lane Bishopstone Village**
Planning Application – Proposed erection of 3 outbuildings

It was **RESOLVED** to **SUPPORT** the application

Seaford
SDNP/19/04516/FUL

1 New Cottages The Street Bishopstone Village
Planning Application – Alteration and conversion of existing barn to holiday let for Helen and David Blaber

It was reported that the site notice inviting comments on the application had only been in place for two days prior to the meeting

It was therefore **RESOLVED** to **DEFER** consideration of the application to the next meeting on Thursday 31st October 2019



had received a detailed response from the Director of Regeneration and Planning dated 8th October 2019 a copy of which had also been circulated.

The notes highlighted the major flaws in the procedure which had deprived the residents of their right to address the Planning Applications Committee on the recommendation to approve the application and flaws in the decision itself in that the officer had failed to take significant planning considerations into account.

The residents were extremely concerned that the fact that consent had been granted would make it difficult for the Planning Authority to apply its policies against backland and tandem development to other similar applications and that further developments of this nature could have a devastating effect on the established historic character and appearance of the East Blatchington Conservation Area and the area surrounding.

The response from the Director had failed to address these concerns and contained significant inaccuracies

A resident addressed the Committee on some further concerns. It was stated that detailed plans of the proposed shared access had not been submitted and disclosed even though site clearance had started in preparation for the development. The Case Officer had stated that there had to be a turning space but no details had been provided.


This point was emphasised by a second resident who stated that it was not clear how the turning space could be achieved. Also the wall proposed originally as a means of minimizing the impact of the proposed driveway on Fieldings would have to be removed. This would have an adverse impact on Fieldings but had not been taken into account

Standing Orders were reimposed

The Committee considered the report 86/19 of the Planning Officer on this matter

The Committee also considered the issues raised by the residents and the Director's reply. Members fully supported the residents' case and were concerned at the inaccuracies in the response from Lewes D.C, in particular the weight placed by the authority on the fact that there had been no objection to the application submitted from the occupier of 'Fieldings'.

It was **RESOLVED** as follows:-

1. That Lewes D.C should acknowledge the clear error in process on this application
2. That the Authority should issue a clear statement to reassure residents and the Town Council that this consent will be regarded as a one-off aberration and will not create a precedent which could weaken the application of saved policy ST4 and any successor policies
3. That it is still considered that the Town Council's objection to the application was well-founded and reasonable. The District Council should acknowledge that it was wrong to treat the objection as unreasonable/unsustainable under the rules set out in the Scheme of Delegation. The application should therefore have been reported to Committee prior to any valid and lawful decision being made. 

4. That it was wrong for the Director to cite the lack of an objection from Fieldings in support of the granting of consent. The applicant in this case was the son of the owner/occupier of Fieldings making it highly unlikely that any objection would be made

5. That the Town Council continues to support the residents in their dealings with Lewes D.C

P 57/10/19 Proposed Road Closure – Remembrance Day Parade- Sunday 10th November

The Committee considered the report 87/19 of the Planning Officer on this matter

It was **RESOLVED** that **NO OBJECTION** be raised to the Road Closure Order

P 58/10/19 Update Report

The Committee considered report 88/19 of the Planning Officer on decisions taken by Lewes D.C on applications previously considered by this Committee

It was **RESOLVED** that the report be **NOTED**

The meeting closed at 8.15 p.m

L Wallraven 23/1/2020
CHAIRMAN
Circulation:

Committee: Councillor L Wallraven (Chairman) and Councillor R Honeyman (Vice Chairman).
Councillors N Adil, J Edson, M Everden, A Latham and J Lord.

For Information: Councillors L Boorman, P Boorman, M Brown, J Cash, S Dunn, M Hayder, R Hayder, O Honeyman, J Meek, R Morland, R Reed, G Rutland and B Webb .