



## Seaford Town Council

### **Seaford Town Council Planning & Highways Agenda – 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2022**

#### **To the Members of the Planning & Highways Committee**

Councillors L Wallraven (Chair), L Boorman (Vice Chair), D Argent, J Edson, M Everden, R Honeyman, J Lord, J Meek and B Payne.

A meeting of the **Planning & Highways Committee** will be held in **The View, Seaford Head Golf Course, Southdown Road, Seaford, BN25 4JS** on

**Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> February 2022** at 7.00pm, which you are summoned

to attend.

Adam Chugg  
Town Clerk

27<sup>th</sup> January 2022

#### **PLEASE NOTE: CHANGE OF NORMAL VENUE & RESCHEDULED DATE**

- The meeting will be video recorded and uploaded to the Town Council's YouTube channel after the meeting.
- See the end of the agenda for further details of public access and participation.
- All participants are encouraged to carry out a home Covid test before attending the meeting, wear a mask at the meeting (where able to do so) and ensure hands are sanitised upon entering.

### **AGENDA**

#### **1. Apologies for Absence**

To consider apologies for absence.

#### **2. Disclosure of Interests**

To deal with any disclosure by Members of any disclosable pecuniary interests and interests other than pecuniary interests, as defined under the Seaford Town Council Code of Conduct and the Localism Act 2011, in relation to matters on the agenda.

### 3. Public Participation

To deal with any questions, or brief representations, from members of the public in accordance with relevant legislation and Seaford Town Council Policy.

In accordance with Town Council policy, members of the public wishing to speak on individual planning applications may do so immediately before each planning application.

### 4. [Application LW/21/0705 – 3 Homefield Road](#)

To consider report 167/21 of the Planning Officer on the decision taken by Lewes District Council on 12<sup>th</sup> January to grant permission on this application (pages 6 to 12).

### 5. Planning Applications

LDC Planning Applications received in week commencing Monday 3rd January 2022

[LW/21/0927 – Seaford Head School, Arundel Road](#) - Reconfiguration of ground floor to form new reception area, meeting rooms and disabled WC, erection of single-storey entrance lobby to south elevation, replacement of ground floor and first floor windows on south elevation and widening of access and formation of vehicular crossover to Arundel Road to provide pedestrian and vehicular access for Seaford Head Academy Trust.

LDC Planning Applications received in week commencing Monday 10<sup>th</sup> January 2022

[LW/22/0020 – 3 Green Walk](#) - Removal of existing conservatory and replacement single storey rear extension with crown roof, rooflight, 3no. rear windows and patio doors to side access for Mr & Mrs Maleski.

[LW/22/0012 – 55 Saltwood Road](#) - Single storey rear extension with flat roof and 2no. roof lights, addition of window on front elevation and alterations to windows on side elevation for S Staines.

[LW/22/0011 – Dane Lea, Dane Road](#) - Conversion of dwellinghouse into 4no flats with single storey rear extension for Mr N Moffett.

[LW/22/0007 – 6 Hawth Close](#) - Creation of rear dormer with access to first floor terrace on top of proposed single storey rear extension for Mr M Brunet.

[LW/22/0001 – 9 Beacon Road](#) - First floor flat roof rear extension with skylight for Mr S Cole.

[LW/21/0981 – 31 Broad Street](#) – Single storey rear extension for Greatglen Estates.

LDC Planning Applications received in week commencing 17<sup>th</sup> January 2022

[LW/21/0951 – 7 Firle Close](#) - First floor rear balcony with alterations to rear first floor and ground floor windows for Mr L Ayres.

## Tree Works Application

[TW/22/0004/TCA – Land adj. to 154A Chyngton Lane](#) - T1 (Group)- Native Broad Leaf - Removal of dangerous trees, respacing, thinning, underplanting in gaps over 3-year period. Intention of restructure to create mixed broadleaf woodland and increase biodiversity whilst maintaining continuous cover for Miss Hannah Pickard.

## **6. [Exceat Bridge Update](#)**

To consider report 168/21 of the Planning Officer on the recent update on the progress of this application received from East Sussex County Council (pages 13 to 15).

## **7. [Proposed Road Closures](#)**

To consider report 169/21 of the Planning Officer on applications for temporary road closures for 1) a Queen's Platinum Jubilee Street Party in Sandore Road on Sunday 5<sup>th</sup> June 2022 and 2) Street Markets in Church Street, fortnightly on Saturdays from May to December 2022 (pages 16 to 17).

## **8. [Update Report](#)**

To consider report 170/21 of the Planning Officer and the schedule of recent decisions made by Lewes District Council on applications previously considered by this Committee (pages 18 to 21).

## **AGENDA NOTES**

For further information about items on this Agenda please contact:

Adam Chugg, Town Clerk, 37 Church Street, Seaford, East Sussex, BN25 1HG

Email: [admin@seafordtowncouncil.gov.uk](mailto:admin@seafordtowncouncil.gov.uk)

Telephone: 01323 894 870 *(please note that due to working from home, this phone line is not currently manned, so please leave a voice message and this will be picked up and forwarded to the relevant member of staff to deal with)*

Circulation:

All Town Councillors, Young Mayor, Deputy Young Mayor and registered email recipients.

Public Access:

Members of the public looking to access this meeting will be able to do so by:

1. Attending the meeting in person.

Due to health and safety restrictions, the number of public in attendance will be limited (exact number to be confirmed). The Town Council therefore asks that you

contact [admin@seafordtowncouncil.gov.uk](mailto:admin@seafordtowncouncil.gov.uk) or 01323 894 870 to register your interest in attending at least 24 hours before the meeting.

Spaces will be assigned on a first come, first served basis.

Please note that if you don't register and just attempt to turn up at the meeting, this could result in you not being able to attend if there is no space.

OR

2. Watching the recording of the meeting on the [Town Council's YouTube channel](#), which will be uploaded after the meeting has taken place.

#### Public Access to the Venue:

If you are attending the meeting in person, please arrive for 6.55pm where you will be shown into the meeting for a 7.00pm start.

#### Public Participation:

Members of the public looking to participate in the public participation section of the meeting must do so in person, by making a verbal statement during the public participation section of the meeting.

Below are some key points for public participation in the meeting:

1. Your statement should be regarding business on the agenda for that meeting.
2. You will only be able to speak at a certain point of the meeting; the Chair of the meeting will indicate when this is.
3. You do not have to state your name if you don't want to.
4. If you are unsure of when best to speak, either query this with an officer/councillor ahead of the meeting or raise your hand during the public participation item of the meeting and ask the Chair – they will always be happy to advise.
5. When the Chair has indicated that it is the part of the meeting that allows public participation, raise your hand and the Chair will invite you to speak in order.
6. Statements by members of the public are limited to four minutes and you don't automatically have the right to reply. The Chair may have to cut you short if you overrun on time or try to speak out of turn – this is just to ensure the meeting stays on track.
7. Where required, the Town Council will try to provide a response to your statement but if it is unable to do so at the meeting, may respond in writing following the meeting.
8. Members of the public should not speak at other points of the meeting.
9. A summarised version of your statement, but no personal details, will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.

## Public Comments

Members of the public looking to submit comments on any item of business on the agenda can do so in writing ahead of the meeting and this will be circulated to all committee members. Comments can be submitted by email to

[planning@seafordtowncouncil.gov.uk](mailto:planning@seafordtowncouncil.gov.uk) or by post to the Town Council offices.

## Covid-safety Measures:

While Covid restrictions are no longer mandated, in most situations, the Town Council wishes to stay vigilant and mindful of the health and safety of its meeting participants by continuing to observe the following:

1. Do not attend the meeting if you are displaying any Covid-19 symptoms; a high temperature, a new continuous cough or a loss or change to your sense of smell or taste (source **NHS website**); or if there is any reason to believe you have been in contact with someone with Covid-19.
2. You are encouraged to wear a mask at the meeting, in particular when moving around the venue.
3. The Town Council would encourage anyone attending the meeting in person to have carried out a rapid lateral flow coronavirus test before attending. These are tests taken at home, giving you an instant result, and ordered for free from the **Gov.uk website** or by calling 119 (open 7am to 11pm, calls are free).
4. If you test positive, do not attend the meeting; you will need to self-isolate immediately and follow the advice on the **NHS website**.
5. Touch as few shared surfaces as possible when at the meeting and bring your own supplies (reusable water bottles, pens, tissues, copies of agendas etc).



## Seaford Town Council

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Report No:</b>         | <b>167/21</b>  |
| <b>Agenda Item No:</b>    | <b>4</b>   |
| <b>Committee:</b>         | <b>Planning &amp; Highways</b>   |
| <b>Date:</b>              | <b>3<sup>rd</sup> February 2022</b>  |
| <b>Title:</b>             | <b>Application LW/21/0705 – 3 Homefield Road</b>   |
| <b>By:</b>                | <b>Geoff Johnson, Planning Officer</b>   |
| <b>Purpose of Report:</b> | <b>To present an update on the decision taken by Lewes District Council on Application LW/21/0705 – 3 Homefield Road</b> |

|   |
|---|
| <b>Recommendations</b>  |
| <b>The Committee is recommended:</b>  |
| 1. When all the information has been considered, to decide which, if any, issues should be referred to Lewes District Council through a formal complaint, a request for further information or simply as a comment. |

### 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Members will be aware of the background to this application. It was the third in a series of applications (LW/21/0119 /0278 and /0705) considered at four different Committee meetings through 2021.
- 1.2 The applicant's main proposal was for a large side extension at lower ground, ground and first floor level to the east of the property adjacent to 5 Homefield Road. A proposal for a garage and rebuilding of a flint wall to the west of the property was dropped after the refusal of application LW/21/0278 on 10<sup>th</sup> September 2021.
- 1.3 The Committee has raised strong objections to all the schemes it considered. The objection to LW/21/0705 passed at the meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> October 2021 was :-

- 1.4** *'The proposed extension, taking into account the size, scale massing and design would dominate the street scene in this part of Homefield Road. Although it is acknowledged that the proposals relating to the garage and wall in LW/21/0278 have been removed and the area has no special designation, it adjoins the East Blatchington Conservation Area and this part of Homefield Road derives a clear architectural rhythm from houses built of traditional materials set back from the road in large plots.*
- 1.5** *The proposed building would have an unacceptable impact on this street scene and, contrary to the Seaford Design Guidelines, it would dominate the existing property rather than being subservient to it. The extension would also have an overbearing impact on the smaller property adjoining at no. 5 with significant overlooking and loss of privacy issues arising from the proximity and height of the extension and the proposed additional windows at first floor level. The proposals are therefore contrary to para 134 of the NPPF, Local Plan policy DM28 (ii) and (iv) and to paras SW01 and GB03 of the Design Guidelines incorporated in the Seaford Neighbourhood Plan.'*
- 1.6** There was also concern about the environmental problems which would arise if consent were to be granted. The extensive excavations required for the lower ground floor accommodation, the difficulties in accessing the site and the proximity to no.5 would mean that a comprehensive Construction Management Plan would be an essential requirement. This request was forwarded with the objection.

## **2. THE DESIGN and CONSERVATION OFFICER'S REPORTS**

- 2.1** The earlier applications had had a critical response, initially from a Design and Conservation Consultant instructed by Lewes District Council (LDC) and subsequently from a newly employed Design and Conservation Officer (DCO). The DCO first gave advice on the refused application LW/21/0278. In that case their view on the two storey side extension element was :-
- 2.2** *The extension has been somewhat reduced in size in this third iteration. However, although the building will not fill the entire plot as some other buildings do, the building frontage is considerably taller and wider than other houses in the street and a large additional two bay extension which extends considerably beyond the principal plane of the street frontage will result in the adjacent buildings being dwarfed creating a visually*

*imbalanced street scene. Extending the two-storey almost to the depth of the L shaped front extension (more typically seen to the rear of a building) reinforces the atypical nature of the elevation fronting the street.*

- 2.3** On the basis of this advice and criticisms of other elements of the application it was refused under delegated powers on the 10<sup>th</sup> September 2021, on the general grounds that it would be visually dominant. The grounds did however only refer specifically to the adverse impact of the proposed garage and wall on the Conservation Area to the west and the neighbouring listed building 'Star House'
- 2.4** In the application considered at the LDC's Planning Applications Committee on 12<sup>th</sup> January 2022 the proposals for the garage and wall had been removed.
- 2.5** That application was submitted on 1st October 2021 following the refusal of /0278.
- 2.6** The advice of the DCO was sought and they reported their comments back sometime in late October/early November. We know that their comments were sent by email to the applicant as they responded, in detail, on 15<sup>th</sup> November. Unfortunately however, although seven extracts from the DCO's report are quoted in the applicant's submission, the full report has never been posted on the LDC website.
- 2.7** It is clear from these extracts that the DCO was still opposed to the application. However, on 16<sup>th</sup> November, the day after the applicant had submitted their detailed criticisms of the DCO's report, the DCO changed their view and in few brief paragraphs, came to the conclusion that the proposals would have a neutral effect on the street scene and the general area. This was the main factor behind the eventual recommendation to the Planning Applications Committee meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> January and its decision to grant consent. Unlike the DCO's initial comments this report dated 16<sup>th</sup> November, was posted on the LDC website
- 2.8** A detailed complaint was submitted to LDC by a large group of objectors a week before the Committee meeting pointing out this U turn by the DCO and the fact that the initial report had never been posted on the LDC website. The main element of the complaint was not accepted. The view of



LDC, stated by the officer presenting the application at the meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> January, was that the DCO was entitled to change their mind.

- 2.9** At that meeting, the main reason given by LDC's members for granting consent were that the application property was already an imposing property compared to the other properties in this part of Homefield Road and that the extension and alterations would improve its appearance in the street scene by providing new windows to break up the bare walls on the existing frontage.

### **3. THE PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT ISSUE**

- 3.1** The applicant's main criticism of the DCO's initial report was that it had not been taken into account that the ground floor element of the side extension was within 'permitted development' (PD) limits.
- 3.2** However it is not possible to sever different parts of a scheme and analyse them in this way. The scheme as a whole, lower ground, ground and first floor, has to be assessed and the PD issue is therefore irrelevant
- 3.3** This error must have influenced the DCO's change of mind. Of the seven extracts from the undisclosed report commented on in the applicant's submission of 15<sup>th</sup> November, the PD issue is the first mentioned and is the only factual issue they refer to. The other six extracts all relate to subjective matters which had already been discussed. The DCO prefaced their comments in the 16<sup>th</sup> November report by stating that :-
- 3.4** *'The flat roof extension as proposed ....is PD and as such this element will not be considered'*
- 3.5** The issue also influenced the Case Officer who refers to it prominently in the report to the Committee.
- 3.6** The error was subsequently acknowledged by the Officers following the formal complaint referred to above and was 'corrected' in the Supplemental Report published on the morning of the Committee meeting.

### **4. TRANSPARENCY**

- 4.1** The website states that LDC is committed to being open and transparent about how the authority works.
- 4.2** In this case that commitment has not been met for a number of reasons.
- 4.3** The Chair of LDC's Planning Committee, relating the missing DCO's report, was quite open in their criticism of the failure of the officers to provide the

members with all the information required for them to determine the application. Immediately prior to taking the vote the Chair stated that :-‘

- 4.4** *‘I found it very uncomfortable that we didn’t receive all this historical information. I am a person who believes that we should have everything in front of us. This I find a little awkward’*
- 4.5** In my statement to the Committee on behalf of the Town Council, I made a formal request for a deferral of the application to the next meeting so that all the information could be made available but despite the Chair’s reservations, that request was never discussed and there was no response provided. The Officers and the majority of the Committee seemed determined to get the application through at all costs.
- 4.6** As mentioned above, despite the fact that the officers were made aware of the PD error by the objectors a week before the meeting, it was only brought to members’ attention in a short paragraph in a supplementary report published a few hours before. Given that this error first came to light when the agenda was published on 22<sup>nd</sup> December, it was in place for three weeks and could have been relied on by members in concluding that the application should be granted. Again the proper course of action would have been to withdraw the flawed report and prepare a corrected report for the February meeting.
- 4.7** Finally, it was clear at the meeting that major issues relating to the application had been discussed at a private briefing for members a few days before. There is no record of what was discussed. This meeting is intended simply as a means of explaining applications to members and for members to seek clarification. However all interested parties to an application, including the applicant, have a right to know what advice is being given to members on applications in addition to the Committee report. If this information is not recorded by some means and made generally available, it represents another flaw in the process and a potential breach of the Environmental Information Regulations, the planning equivalent of the Freedom Of Information (FOI) legislation.

## **5. HERITAGE ISSUES**

- 5.1** Application LW/21/0712 was submitted by the applicant at the same time as /0705. It was for broadly the same set of proposals, differing only by the

insertion of two turrets in the north-west and south-west corners overlooking no. 5. These turrets were acknowledged as creating a greater impact on the frontage and street scene.

- 5.2** /0712 was refused by LDC under delegated powers on 6<sup>th</sup> January 2022 a few days before the granting of consent on /0705 at the meeting on the 12<sup>th</sup> January.
- 5.3** The grounds of refusal stated (inter alia) that the proposals would be contrary to Local Plan policy DM33 (Heritage Assets) because the turrets would be visible from and have an adverse impact on the adjacent Conservation Area.
- 5.4** There is no record of the DCO's views on the heritage issues in relation to either application as the full report has not been disclosed, as mentioned above.
- 5.5** The extension granted under /0705 is also visible from the Conservation Area so an assessment by the DCO of the proposals vis a vis DM 33 is an important consideration but again this is missing from the information available both to the Committee members and the general public.

## **6. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT PLAN**

- 6.1** The requirement for the applicant to submit a Construction Management Plan (CMP) prior to work commencing is in Condition 4 attached to the consent. In the Officer's report the CMP is mentioned as having to cover matters such as parking, storage of plant and dust mitigation but NOT the days and hours of working. Residents are, understandably, extremely concerned that the days and hours of working should be included as a priority. Representations should therefore be made to ensure that suitable restrictions are included.

## **7. CONCLUSIONS and RECOMMENDATION**

- 7.1** There were clearly several serious flaws identified in the processing and determination of this application. The processing, through six sets of plans and four different applications, was long and troublesome. Several of the leading objectors who have been closely involved for the last year are likely to speak at the Town Council's meeting on 3<sup>rd</sup> February and could raise additional issues.

7.2 When all the information has been considered, members should decide which, if any, issues should be referred to LDC through a formal complaint, a request for further information or simply as a comment.

**8. Financial Appraisal**

8.1 There are no direct financial implications as a result of this report.

**9. Contact Officer**

The Contact Officer for this report is Geoff Johnson, Planning Officer.

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| Planning Officer |  |
| Town Clerk       |  |



## Seaford Town Council

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Report No:</b>         | <b>168/21</b>   |
| <b>Agenda Item No:</b>    | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Committee:</b>         | <b>Planning &amp; Highways</b>                          |
| <b>Date:</b>              | <b>3<sup>rd</sup> February 2022</b>                     |
| <b>Title:</b>             | <b>Exceat Bridge Update</b>                             |
| <b>By:</b>                | <b>Geoff Johnson, Planning Officer</b>                  |
| <b>Purpose of Report:</b> | <b>To consider the update provided on Exceat Bridge</b> |

|   |
|---|
| <b>Recommendations</b>  |
| <b>The Committee is recommended:</b>  |
| 1. To agree that East Sussex County Council is contacted for a response on the issues raised by the Town Council at its Planning & Highways Committee on 25 <sup>th</sup> May 2021. |

### 1. Information

- 1.1 On Tuesday 25<sup>th</sup> January 2022, the Town Council received the following update from East Sussex County Council (ESCC) on the progress of the scheme to widen the A259 Exceat Bridge :-
- 1.2 *'I have just come from the project board meeting so I am now able to update you on progress with the Exceat bridge project. Since submission of our planning application in April last year and consultation by the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA), a number of new requirements have arisen. Notably, we've been advised that the ecology compensatory area (to mitigate the small land-take required for the new bridge) now needs to be located outside the SSSI area and therefore not close to the bridge as previously identified in the planning application. We are working with SDNPA and Natural England to identify a piece of land within the Cuckmere valley suitable to upgrade to compensate for the land loss required for the bridge.*

- 1.3** *The SDNPA has also asked for a clear indication of whether or not the bridge improvement will cause an increase in traffic along the A259 and our engineers are exploring ways to demonstrate that this doesn't require lengthy traffic modelling. Importantly we will want to highlight that a new bridge will reduce traffic through Jevington, Litlington and Alfriston as motorists will no longer have to use these routes to avoid the queues at Exceat.*
- 1.4** *We are also working to alleviate SDNPA's concerns about the visual impact of the new bridge and our engineers are considering our response, including the creation of specific visualisation drawings. The SDNPA has made further comments on the landscaping and planting proposals.*
- 1.5** *Our design consultant, traffic engineers and ecology team are working hard to address the concerns raised by the SDNPA, but unfortunately these necessary requirements are adding considerably to the overall programme, and we feel construction won't now start until next year.'*
- 1.6** When the Committee considered ESCC's application at the meeting on 25<sup>th</sup> May 2021 the following points were put forward for consideration :-
- Consideration of the provision of a controlled pedestrian crossing
  - Further consideration to separation of cyclists and pedestrians
  - Weight restrictions on the bridge so as to prevent use by HGVs and ensure that HGVs use the designated route to and from Newhaven Port via the A26 and A27.
  - Longer term considerations to be given to a shuttle bus service from Seaford Station to promote the use of rail transport for visitors, relieve the number of cars travelling to and from the Country Park from Seaford and relieve congestion in Seaford town.
  - Welcoming not having bus laybys in order to provide a form of traffic calming and to ensure the free flow of buses
  - Consideration of a 20mph speed limit rather than 30mph, on account of number of pedestrians and cyclists attracted to area in interests of highway safety
- 1.7** It is not clear from the update whether these points have been considered and incorporated in the scheme. The need for separation of cyclists and

pedestrians and two-way provision for cyclists across the new bridge was a particular concern.

- 1.8 It is therefore recommended that ESCC is contacted for a response on these and other issues raised at the May meeting.

## 2. Financial Appraisal

- 2.1 There are no direct financial implications as a result of this report.

## 3. Contact Officer

The Contact Officer for this report is Geoff Johnson, Planning Officer.

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| Planning Officer |  |
| Town Clerk       |  |



## Seaford Town Council

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Report No:</b>         | <b>169/21</b>   |
| <b>Agenda Item No:</b>    | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Committee:</b>         | <b>Planning &amp; Highways</b>  |
| <b>Date:</b>              | <b>3<sup>rd</sup> February 2022</b>   |
| <b>Title:</b>             | <b>Proposed Road Closures</b>   |
| <b>By:</b>                | <b>Geoff Johnson, Planning Officer</b>  |
| <b>Purpose of Report:</b> | <b>To consider the road closure applications relating to the Sandore Road Jubilee Street Party and the Seaford Street Markets</b> |

|  |
|--|
| <b>Recommendations</b>   |
| <b>The Committee is recommended:</b>   |
| 1.To consider the applications and forward any comments to Lewes District Council. |

### 1. Information

- 1.1 Lewes District Council has received applications for temporary road closures for the following events:
  - (a) Sandore Road Jubilee Street Party – Sunday 5<sup>th</sup> June 2022
  - (b) Seaford Street Markets – May to December 2022
- 1.2 The closure for the street party will cover nos.3-23 in the cul-de-sac section of Sandore Road from 0900 to 2300.
- 1.3 The closure requested for the street markets covers Church Street from the junction with West Street to outside the Crypt Gallery from 0700 to 1700 on Saturday 14<sup>th</sup> May 2022 and subsequently on a Saturday every fortnight through to Christmas Eve 2022.
- 1.4 Members are requested to consider the applications and forward any comments to Lewes District Council.



## 2. Financial Appraisal

2.1 There are no direct financial implications as a result of this report.

## 3. Contact Officer

The Contact Officer for this report is Geoff Johnson, Planning Officer.

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| Planning Officer |  |
| Town Clerk       |  |



## Seaford Town Council

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Report No:</b>         | 170/21  |
| <b>Agenda Item No:</b>    | 8   |
| <b>Committee:</b>         | Planning & Highways   |
| <b>Date:</b>              | 3 <sup>rd</sup> February 2022   |
| <b>Title:</b>             | Update Report   |
| <b>By:</b>                | Geoff Johnson, Planning Officer   |
| <b>Purpose of Report:</b> | To notify the Committee of decisions taken by Lewes District Council on applications previously considered by the Committee |

|   |
|---|
| <b>Recommendations</b>                  |
| <b>The Committee is recommended:</b>    |
| 1.To note the report and the decisions. |

### 1. Information

- 1.1 The attached schedule lists the decisions taken by Lewes District Council since the last Committee meeting on applications previously considered by this Committee.
- 1.2 The Committee is recommended to note the report and the decisions set out in the Schedule.

### 2. Financial Appraisal

- 2.1 There are no direct financial implications as a result of this report.

### 3. Contact Officer

The Contact Officer for this report is Geoff Johnson, Planning Officer.

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| Planning Officer |  |
| Town Clerk       |  |

## Report 170-21 Appendix A

### **SCHEDULE OF DECISIONS TAKEN BY LEWES DISTRICT COUNCIL SINCE THE COMMITTEE'S LAST MEETING ON 13<sup>th</sup> JANUARY**

#### **Approvals – Objections from STC**

**LW/21/0922 – 8 Stafford Road** – Front Extension. Reasons: Although front extensions would normally be resisted there was no architectural rhythm to the properties in the area. The application property already stood out as totally different from surrounding properties so the extension would not have any adverse impact.

**LW/21/0827 – 58 Vale Road** -Two storey side and rear extensions and covered car port. Reasons : Only 27% increase in footprint so not regarded as overdevelopment. Wide variation in character of surrounding properties so extended property would have limited impact on street scene.

**LW/21/0709 – 70 Vale Road** – Retrospective consent for annex at rear. Reasons : It was not agreed that the annex could be severed from the host property and used as a separate unit and it was sufficient to impose a condition requiring the use to remain ancillary to the main dwelling.

**LW/21/0615 – 23 Fairways Road** - Erection of garage and two-storey side extension annex – lower ground floor, ground floor and first floor extension including internal first floor alterations.

**LW/21/0705 – 3 Homefield Road** - lower ground floor, ground floor and first floor extension including internal first floor alterations - See report at Item 5 on this agenda.

#### **Approvals – No Objections from STC**

**LW/21/0756 – Avondale Hotel 4-5 Avondale Road** -Single-storey rear extension to an existing HMO to provide a one-bedroom flat AMENDED SCHEME - width of extension increased by 3 metres.

**LW/21/0899 – 7 Kingston Close** - Single storey front extension with porch entrance.

**LW/21/0897 – 18 Lexden Road** - Change of use from Sui Generis (Take away) to Class E (Retail Shop) combining with existing Retail Shop, with internal and external alterations.

**LW/21/0890 – 12 Sovereign Close** – Single-storey side and rear extensions.

**LW/21/0877 – Seaway Marine Parade** -Single storey rear annexe extension.

**LW/21/0876 – 4 Cradle Hill Industrial Estate** - Cladding to create parapet to give the appearance of flat roof to all elevations, removal of first floor windows, new signage and parking spaces to front.

**LW/21/0874 – 42 Farm Close**- Single storey rear extension, garage conversion & replacement lean-to.

**LW/21/0863 – Gorse Bank 81 Firle Road** - Single storey rear extension, garage conversion & replacement lean-to.

**LW/21/0862 – 25 Cornfield Road** - Erection of single storey mono-pitch rear extension, erection of first floor side extension above existing garage and new first floor terrace to the rear; installation of dormer to the front plane of the roof.

**LW/21/0856 – 6 Hawth Hill** - Demolition of existing rear conservatory and replacement single storey rear extension with 2no lantern rooflights to the rear and garage.

**LW/21/0901 – St Martins 51 Steyne Road – Listed Building Consent** - External alterations including replacement of existing gas boiler for air source heat pump and replacement of existing double rear doors with single door and infill with brick to match existing wall.

**LW/21/0619 – 53 Kingsmead** – Two-storey extension at rear.

**LW/21/0844 – 15 Firle Close** - Single storey side extension & garage conversion.

**LW/21/0900 – 17 Albany Road** - Conversion of existing residential dwelling house into 2no. flats with associated parking to front.

#### **Refusals – Objection from STC**

**LW/21/0712 – 3 Homefield Road** - lower ground floor, ground floor and first floor extension including internal first floor alterations with two corner turrets

Reasons for Refusal: Impact of the turrets would increase the massing of the property, harming its status as a heritage asset and would have an unacceptable impact on street scene.

#### **Refusals – No Objection from STC**

**LW/21/0794 – 40 Etherton Way** - Replacement of rear window with glazed doors, erection of raised rear decking area and replacement fence with trellis above.

Reasons for Refusal – The proposed decking would be out of character with the neighbourhood, unneighbourly and insufficiently screened.

**Tree Works Applications approved**

**TW/21/0085 – 53 Willow Drive - T1 & T2- 2 x Beech - cut back overhanging branches /remove the new growth (shoots) around 2m - No deferral of work required.**