



Seaford Town Council

Minutes of a meeting of Seaford Town Council's Planning & Highways on Thursday, 9th June 2022.

Held at the **Downs Leisure Centre (Studio 2), Sutton Road, Seaford, BN25 4QW** on **Thursday 9th June 2022 at 7.00pm.**

Present:

Councillors L Wallraven (Chair)

Councillors D Argent, J Edson, M Everden, R Honeyman, J Lord and G Rutland.

Geoff Johnson, Planning Officer

Adam Chugg, Town Clerk

Georgia Raeburn, HR & Governance Manager

There was one member of the public in attendance.

P08/06/22 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors S Adeniji, L Boorman (G Rutland substituting) and M Everden.

P09/06/22 Disclosure of Interests

There were no disclosures of interests.

P10/06/22 Public Participation

There was no public participation.

P11/06/22 Planning Applications

LDC Planning Applications received weeks commencing Monday 16th May 2022

LW/22/0318 - Land West Of Bönningstedt Beach Huts, Marine Parade - Shipping container for use as an operations base for water sports and serving drinks F2(c) Areas or places for outdoor sport or recreation (not involving motorised vehicles or firearms) for Skipper Water Sports.

It was **RESOLVED** to **SUPPORT** the application subject to the following conditions:-

1. A suitable storm contingency plan being in place,
2. A 5-year temporary condition

3. Requirement for the container to be kept free from graffiti and in a neat and tidy condition.

[LW/21/0964](#) - **Seahaven District Scouts, Chichester Road** - Single-storey rear extension.

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

[LW/22/0327](#) – **5 Caroline Close** - Split level single storey and two storey side extension.

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

[LW/22/0317](#) - **28 Chyngton Road** - Erection of single storey side extension with 5no rooflights and single storey rear extension with 1no rooflight.

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

[LW/22/0358](#) - **42 Rookery Way, Bishopstone** - Prior Approval Under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) - Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA; for the enlargement of a dwellinghouse by construction of additional storeys to increase the total height from 4.85m to 7.40m.

It was **RESOLVED** to **OBJECT** to the application on the following grounds:-

The proposal to raise the height of the roof by over 2.5 metres would constitute overdevelopment of the plot and would create an unattractive eyesore which would also dominate the two neighbouring properties and cause unacceptable loss of light, privacy and general amenity for the occupiers of those properties.

[LW/22/0345](#) - **67 Saltwood Road** - Single storey rear extension with flat roof and alterations to fenestration.

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

3 x Applications for 3 Homefield Road:-

[LW/22/0337](#) – Swimming Pool to the side/rear.

A letter from the owner/occupier of the adjoining property, Star House, expressing concern about the ground levels shown on the plans was reported.

While it was acknowledged that in normal circumstances the development of a swimming pool in a private garden would be 'permitted development' in this particular instance, it was **RESOLVED** to **OBJECT** to the application on the following grounds:-

The siting of the pool would have an adverse impact on the amenities of the neighbouring Grade II listed property, Star House through noise and loss of privacy

If Lewes District Council was not minded to refuse consent, the neighbour's concerns regarding ground levels would have to be addressed prior to any consent being granted.

[LW/22/0336](#) - Demolition of existing boundary wall and construction of a new wall and gates.

It was **RESOLVED** to **OBJECT** to the application on the following grounds:-

The height of the wall would create an alienating feature in the street scene and would be out of character with the more open frontages of the other properties in the surrounding area

[LW/22/0314](#) – Single storey front extension.

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

[LW/22/0348](#) - **21 Grosvenor Road** - Variation to condition 1 (Plans) relating to approval LW/22/0096 - To make the roof hip to gable on both sides and to enlarge the dormer at the rear.

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

[LW/22/0357](#) – **8 Queensway** – Two-storey side extension.

It was **RESOLVED** to **OBJECT** to the application on the following grounds:-

The application appears to be a duplicate of the previously refused application LW/22/0166 which the Town Council objected to on the grounds that the extension proposed had the appearance of a separate dwelling rather than an extension and should be set back to appear as subservient to the main dwelling in line with the Seaford Neighbourhood Plan Design Guidelines para GB03

It was also noted that, as with the first application, the style and presentation lacked detail and the plans were extremely difficult to interpret. It was questionable whether the application should have been validated given the form of the plans posted on the website.

Applications received in the week commencing Monday 23rd May 2022

No applications notified.

Applications received in the week commencing Monday 30th May 2022

[LW/21/0967](#) - **83 - 89 (Odds) Sutton Road** - Redevelopment of the site to form 36no. retirement apartments including communal facilities, access, car parking and landscaping (AMENDED DESIGN)

It was **RESOLVED** to **OBJECT** to the amended application. It was acknowledged that the modifications to the central block on the frontage to Sutton Road had made a marginal improvement to the impact on the street scene but overall it was considered that the general objections to the original application LW/21/0660 still applied.

These objections, updated where appropriate, were as follows:-

a) The failure of the applicants to provide affordable housing units or an appropriate financial contribution is in direct contravention of Core Policy 1 in the Lewes Local Plan Part 1 of 2016. The conclusions of the viability report accompanying the application are unacceptable as they are based on the exceptionally high current existing use value of the site. Government advice on viability clearly states that :-'Under no circumstances will the price paid for land be a relevant justification for failing to accord with relevant policies in the plan'.

UPDATE: It has now been accepted by Lewes DC that the affordable housing contribution should be limited to £59,000

whereas on smaller developments in recent years the applicants have contributed £300,000 at Peacehaven and £500,000 at Fleet (in the appeal decision produced by the applicants in support of this scheme). Given the acute need for more affordable housing in the town and District the level of the contribution offered is extremely disappointing. It is considered that the viability calculation must have influenced by the premium residential value of the Sutton Road site in contravention of Government advice and should not prevent the applicants from increasing the affordable housing contribution in order to comply with the Core Policy.

(b) The proposals will have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of no 81 Sutton Road and the properties in Sutton Drove and Mill Drive to the rear of the site. The scheme, by projecting the building into what are currently the rear gardens of 83-89 and intensifying the use of the remaining open garden area will impact on the amenities and enjoyment of the rear gardens of these neighbouring properties through overlooking, loss of privacy, general noise and disturbance and loss of outlook.

UPDATE: This objection still stands in respect of the amended plans

(c) The fact that the proposed block takes up the entire width of the site, the proximity of the western boundary of the block to no.81, the three main elements of the block extending to three storeys, the continuous linked frontage and the projection to the rear, when considered together, clearly constitute overdevelopment of the site. The massing, height and scale of the proposed block which replaces four attractive detached houses on generous plots and with gaps in between and the general design is out of character with the area and will be detrimental to the current street scene. This would contravene Para 134 of the Page 7 NPPF and DM25 of the Local Plan Part 2 as well as the following Design Guidelines incorporated in the Seaford Neighbourhood Plan : GB01 – Building Lines;

SE01- Two storey linear buildings with generous front gardens; SE02- Views in Residential Areas; SE03 – Matching Heights and Appearances; and SE04 - Generously proportioned front and rear gardens.

UPDATE: This objection still stands in respect of the amended plans.

(d) The applicant's assumptions relating to the parking provision and traffic generation do not accord with the knowledge and experience of local residents. This is confirmed by the current problems arising from the under provision of parking and number of daily movements generated by Homeshore House opposite the application site. The increase in turning traffic from the additional deliveries, staff, visiting relatives and visits from doctors/nurses is bound to cause additional problems on an already busy stretch of the A259 .

UPDATE: This objection still stands.

(e) It is acknowledged that the applicants are having to develop higher priced units in this case in order to recoup the extremely high purchase price of the land and the general costs of development as well as extract their standard 20% profit. There are however currently numerous vacancies for accommodation of this type and quality at other similar schemes in the town including Hortsley, Stratheden and Eversley Courts and those operated by McCarthy and Stone. The evidence shows therefore that there is no pressing need for new accommodation in this category. What is required are units which are more affordable for older persons and couples wishing to downsize from 2 or 3 bed homes in a lower price bracket. This would enable more younger people to get on to the local housing ladder and would therefore be a far greater benefit for the town and its residents.

UPDATE: The current application LW/22/0356 from McCarthy and Stone for the development of 40 new retirement apartments at Crouch Lane, if granted, will lead to a significant further increase in this form of accommodation in the town.

(f) The town's health services are currently over-subscribed and under great pressure. Any significant increase in the number of elderly patients is bound to exacerbate the situation and place services under an even greater strain.

UPDATE: This objection still stands.

(g) There must be some doubt regarding the alleged level of sustainability and energy efficiency in the scheme. The development is not within convenient walking distance from

the Town Centre and local shops and given its location in the town, it does not receive the full and regular no12 bus service. Also there is no provision for solar panels, electric car charging points and other similar facilities in the proposed scheme This is contrary to the Design Guideline GB07 – Energy Efficiency – incorporated into the Seaford Neighbourhood Plan

UPDATE: This objection still stands.

(h) The measures to boost the ecology of the site in the long term are acknowledged but ,although policy dictates that the site should be treated as ‘brownfield’ ,in reality it is mostly ‘greenfield’, and the damage to the existing ecology on site in the short term at least will therefore be significant.

UPDATE: This objection still stands.

LW/22/0362 - 31 Bodiam Close - Alterations to garage including replacement rear window and installation of 1no front window and erection of storage box to front.

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

LW/22/0311 - Garden Flat, 12 Esplanade - Conversion of 1no 2 bed flat into 2no 1 bed flats.

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

LW/22/0361 – Sheps, Cuckmere Road - Erection of 1no two-storey and 2no single-storey rear extensions and installation of 2no roof windows to side.

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

South Downs National Park Authority Tree Works Application

SDNP/22/02486/TCA - Land adjacent to Bishopstone Manor, Manor Yard, Bishopstone Village - Proposal: T1 - Oak - Hard reduction and removal of 3-4m of growth
T2 - Sycamore - Re-pollard to lowest point.

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

P12/06/22 Appeal by Churchill Retirement Living re site at 83-89 Sutton Road (LW/21/0660)

The Committee considered the report 22/22 of the Planning Officer presenting details of the appeal submitted by Churchill Retirement Living regarding the site at 83 – 89 Sutton Road.

P12.1 It was **RESOLVED** to **NOTE** the contents of the report.

P12.2 It was **RESOLVED** to **AUTHORISE** the Planning Officer to submit representations on the appeal to the Planning Inspectorate based on the Committee’s previous objections resolved at the meeting on 21st October 2021 and the comments

discussed at this meeting on 9th June 2022, any other relevant issues arising from the applicant's Hearing Statement dated February 2022 and the amended plans referred to.

P13/06/22 Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill 2022

The Committee considered report 23/22 of the Planning Officer presenting a brief summary of the proposed planning reforms within the Government's recently announced Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill 2022.

It was **RESOLVED** to **NOTE** the contents of the report.

P14/06/22 Update Report

The Committee considered report 24/22 of the Planning Officer and the schedule of recent decisions made by Lewes District Council on applications previously considered by this Committee.

The Planning Officer updated on an error on the update report – Consent for the development at 6 Pelham Place (LW/22/0137) was granted by Lewes District Council, in line with the Town Council's support of the application.

It was **RESOLVED** to **NOTE** the report and the decisions notified within.

The meeting closed at 8.27pm.

Councillor L Wallraven

Councillor L Wallraven

Chair of Planning & Highways Committee