



Seaford Town Council

Minutes of a meeting of Seaford Town Council's Planning & Highways on Thursday, 30th June 2022.

Held at the **Council Chambers, 37 Church Street, Seaford, BN25 1HG** on **Thursday 30th June 2022 at 7.00pm.**

Present:

Councillors L Wallraven (Chair), L Boorman (Vice-Chair), S Adeniji, D Argent, J Edson and R Honeyman.

Geoff Johnson, Planning Officer

There were seven members of the public in attendance.

P15/06/22 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors M Everden and J Lord and from the Town Clerk.

P16/06/22 Disclosure of Interests

Councillor L Wallraven declared a personal interest in application LW/22/0360 as a near neighbour of the applicant and site and confirmed that she would not speak or vote on that application.

P17/06/22 Public Participation

Speaker	Statement
<i>Resident A</i>	<i>As a near neighbour of the site raised a concern over the height of the proposed building compared to the buildings surrounding it.</i>
Town Council Response	Thanked for their contribution.
<i>Resident B</i>	<i>Emphasised the issue of the height of the building. Was surprised that no one had checked the height and that no members had been in contact with neighbouring residents to discuss their concerns about the development</i>
Town Council Response	Thanked the resident for their contribution.
<i>Resident C</i>	<i>The junction of the narrow lanes in the area which forms an informal open square to the north of the site should be</i>

	<i>designated a heritage site. The sarsen stone on the edge of this square close to the northern boundary of the site should be protected. The square is very vulnerable to the comings and goings of heavy goods vehicles and may be damaged during the construction of the proposed development.</i>
Town Council Response	The Committee could recommend that in the event of planning permission being granted the District Council should attach a condition requiring the applicants to agree a comprehensive Construction and Environmental Management Plan prior to commencement in order to regulate the construction works and protect the heritage aspects of the area.
<i>Resident D</i>	<i>Had looked on the Rightmove website and had found that there were 49 retirement flats in Seaford advertised there, mostly for sale. This showed that there was currently no need for this type of housing in the town Also the access to the site via Crouch Lane was very narrow and emergency services may have difficulties getting access during construction.</i>
Town Council Response	Thanked for their contribution.
<i>Resident E</i>	<i>Was amazed that the height of the proposed building had not been referred to before this meeting. It would be a massive intrusion. There would be more vehicular activity in the area and the number of U-turns at the bollards at the top of Crooked Lane would increase .It is houses that are needed there; not flats.</i>
Town Council Response	Thanked for their contribution.
<i>District Councillor Christine Brett</i>	<i>The numbers of retirement flats on the local market show that there is no current need for this class of accommodation. The town's health infrastructure was already under great strain would have great difficulty coping with a further influx of elderly residents many of whom would be over 80. The Prime Minister had recently stated that health services should be put in place to serve the occupiers of new developments. This was not happening. Many of the residents of the new flats would use mobile scooters around the Town Centre and these were already causing a hazard. The drainage system in the area was already over capacity.</i>

	<p><i>Five parking spaces provided for the Club would not be sufficient.</i></p> <p><i>The affordable housing contribution offered by the applicant was woefully insufficient.</i></p> <p><i>The application should be refused.</i></p>
Town Council Response	Thanked for her contribution.

P18/06/22 Planning Applications

LDC Planning Applications received in the week commencing 6th June 2022

[LW/22/0356](#) - **Seaford Constitutional Club, Crouch Lane** - Redevelopment to provide a part 3, part 4 storey building with habitable roof space to provide 40 retirement apartments, with associated communal facilities, parking and landscaping and replacement club.

Members considered the Planning Officer's report 42/22 on this application.

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

INFRASTRUCTURE AND SUSTAINABILITY

The objections to this application posted on the District Council's website express the major concerns in Seaford regarding the ability of town's health infrastructure to absorb an influx of elderly residents. The two existing surgeries are at full capacity and are struggling to meet the healthcare needs of current residents. New residents are being informed that the surgery registers are closed and there are long waiting times for face-to-face appointments. Members share those concerns.

The need for sufficient infrastructure to be in place prior to development taking place is referred to at para 7.14 of the Seaford Neighbourhood Plan and Core Policy 7 of the Joint Core Strategy 2016 (JCS) which states that:-

...land should only be released for development where there is sufficient capacity in the existing local infrastructure to meet the additional requirements arising from the proposed development.

The need for retirement living units stated by the applicants is not supported by current local circumstances. There are over 40 retirement units currently on the market in Seaford mostly for sale rather than for rent.

The guiding principle of the National Planning Policy Framework is that proposed development should be sustainable. Para 8 of the NPPF sets out relevant objectives which the planning system should adopt in order to achieve sustainable development. The proposed development by increasing the number of elderly residents in the town would be in breach of both the social and economic objectives in para 8 as well as contrary to Core Policy 7 of the JCS. It would therefore not be sustainable.

OVERDEVELOPMENT

Currently the Constitutional Club has a relatively low physical profile and has relatively little impact on the surrounding residential properties. The development of a part 3 floor, part 4 floor block of flats on the site will alter this profile significantly and that the increase in height and scale will have an unacceptable adverse impact on the quality and amenities of the area and the properties adjacent to the site.

HOUSING MIX AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING

The other principal concern of residents objecting to the application was that it does not meet the pressing local need for housing for young people and young families. Members also share these concerns

The Seaford Neighbourhood Plan refers in the plan's objectives at page 14 to the need to encourage the provision of a mix of housing and in particular, to support housing aimed at young people.

Core Policy 2 in the JCS refers to the objective of delivering homes for the needs of the district

This application does not meet these objectives

Core Policy 1 of the JCS also requires developers to provide 40% of units in developments as affordable housing. Where circumstances make it inappropriate for affordable housing to be provided on-site (as in this case) an alternative provision of a financial contribution towards off site housing will be sought.

The system designed to provide sufficient affordable housing is not working as developers, as in this application, are able to produce a financial assessment to show that full compliance with a policy requiring say 40% provision would make the proposed development unviable. These viability assessments are carried out in accordance with government guidance.

In the current application the viability assessment submitted concludes that only £22,000 is available as a contribution to off- site affordable housing. In view of the importance of this issue and the amount offered by the applicants , the Town Council requests the District Council to commission an expert appraisal to verify the assessment and its conclusions.

TRAFFIC AND PARKING

The Council disputes the traffic flow and parking assessments produced by the applicants. Categorising the Club as a Community Centre is misleading. Although the Club hosts a number of other local clubs the estimate of the daily traffic flows does not reflect the actual number of movements. It is considered that the applicant's conclusion that the proposed development would reduce the number of daily traffic movements is unreliable.

Members consider that the development would lead to an increase in traffic movements in an area where there are already hazards arising from the 'informality' of the road layout and the lack of pavements. The application site is on the direct route taken by large groups of students from Seaford Head Middle School to the town centre so highway safety is a major issue. The applicant proposes a pavement extension of 20 metres but there is no clear indication as to where this will be constructed and how it will contribute to highway safety. Members consider therefore that the proposed development would compromise highway safety in the area

The proposed provision of five parking spaces for the Club is also inadequate.

DRAINAGE

There are concerns that the scale of the development could overload the existing drainage system in the area.

CONDITIONS

If the District Council is minded to grant consent on the application the Town Council requests that two special conditions be imposed. Firstly, an Archaeological condition to protect the Sarsen Stone on the northern edge of the site and allow an investigation into the site's historical significance and secondly, given the restrictions in the road network around the site, a requirement for a comprehensive Construction and Environmental Management Scheme to be agreed before work commences.

FACILITIES FOR THE DISABLED

There had been a long-standing complaint from the local Access Group regarding the lack of a convenient disabled access to the Club and the lack of a disabled toilet. The rearrangement and reduction in size of the Club was an opportunity for the Club to comply with the requirements of the Equality Act and make the 'reasonable adjustments' necessary to provide these facilities

It was **RESOLVED** at 8.00 pm following the consideration of this application, to take a short break to enable members of the public to leave the Council Chamber. The meeting resumed at 8.05pm.

LW/22/0388 – 48 - 50 High Street - Air conditioning unit to side elevation for Fourth Hair and Beauty.

It was **RESOLVED** to raise **NO OBJECTION** to the installation of an air conditioning unit in principle but that the location proposed would have a detrimental effect on the character of the listed building and on the amenities of the neighbour due to its proximity to the neighbour's bedroom window.

LW/22/0384 - 36 Downsview Road - Installation of dormer to side.

It was **RESOLVED** to **SUPPORT** the application in principle but that a condition requiring obscure glazing to the proposed dormer should be attached to any consent to protect the neighbouring property from overlooking and loss of privacy.

LW/22/0367 - 14 Mason Road - Replacement of rear conservatory with single storey rear extension with roof lantern.

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

LW/22/0378 - Bishopstone Railway Station, Station Road - Variation of condition 1 (Plans) relating to approval LW/21/0496 and LW/21/0497 Improved usability and visual appearance to spaces - Change of lighting to community space from standard LED battens to Kingsway Halo (Separate condition discharge application submitted) - Change to the accessible toilet layout so it's more usable as a wheelchair user - Introduction of emergency lighting to all areas (Separate condition discharge application submitted) - Change of plasterboard product to ceilings - Omission of roller shutter behind internal double doors to community hub - Kitchen and toilet extracts to be wall mounted - Change of floor areas to community space.

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

LW/22/0386 - Beachlands Care Home, Marine Parade - Single storey rear extension to kitchen and reception area.

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

LDC Planning Applications received in the week commencing 13th June 2022

LW/22/0398 - 2 The Covers - Demolition of rear conservatory and replacement single storey extension with pitched roof, 4no. rooflights and additional side windows.

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

LW/22/0410 - 10 Salisbury Road - Hip and Valley to Jerkinhead ends roof replacement with raising of the roof height, 2No. front dormers, 2No. rear dormers.

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

Although it was acknowledged that there was very little uniformity in the scale and appearance of houses in the locality, the design and scale of the proposed roof extension and the significant increase in the height of the property would be overbearing as regards the two neighbouring properties, would constitute overdevelopment and would be over dominant in the street scene on this part of Salisbury Road contrary to policies DM 25 and DM 28 of the Lewes Local Plan Part 2.

[LW/22/0360](#) - 3A Antony Close, Bishopstone - Erection of conservatory to side.

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

**P19/06/22 Local Plan Updates: Lewes Local Plan and South Downs
Local Plan**

The Committee considered the report 43/22 of the Planning Officer updating the Committee on the progress of the Lewes Local Plan and review proposals for the South Downs Local Plan.

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

P20/06/22 Update Report

The Committee considered report 44/22 of the Planning Officer and the schedule of recent decisions made by Lewes District Council on applications previously considered by this Committee.

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

The meeting closed at 8.42pm.

Councillor L Wallraven

Councillor L Wallraven

Chair of Planning & Highways Committee