



'Five Sites' under attack

As you will all be very aware, due to the greed of the landowners and developers, Sovereign Harbour has been grossly over-developed. Apartments that should never have been built are standing empty, and developers, so desperate to realise a return on their investment, have resorted to selling them off at auction. Consequently, the very last thing the harbour needs is even more high-density residential development.

So, what have Sovereign Harbour Ltd, the company responsible for trying to foist a massive B&Q warehouse on the harbour done? They've put in two totally inappropriate planning applications for further high-density residential development. Does their greed know no bounds?

The outline planning consent given to Sovereign Harbour Ltd for the development of the harbour gave the developers almost *carte blanche* to build whatever they wanted, wherever they wanted; the EBC must take responsibility for this. They never ensured that social infrastructure was built into developments and, by the time they realised how much damage this had caused, it was almost too late to rectify the situation. Consequently, a study by Humbert Leisure, was commissioned to examine the uses to which the remaining development land for which no planning consent exists could be put, and to see what could be done to redress the balance in favour of the residents by taking an overall view of the situation. The conclusions of this study, although contested by the SHRA, were accepted by the Planning Committee, and land covered by it became known collectively as the 'Five Sites'. In discussions with the SHRA, the EBC, and Nigel Waterson, have consistently agreed that these five sites should be treated as a single entity for planning purposes. That makes the two planning applications particularly inappropriate, and seems to hold both the EBC. and residents in contempt.

SHL are submitting these applications under the original outline consent for the harbour. However, this consent only gave permission for a maximum of 2,500 dwellings, and this has already been exceeded. The fact that the developers chose to build the properties for which they had consent more densely, and not use all of the development land available, does not mean that they have an automatic right to planning consent on the remaining land. As the provision of the outline consent has now been fulfilled, this application should be rejected out of hand by the planning department. However, should it go before the planning committee, they have a duty to refuse it, and must do so, at least until Carillion's 'end game' for the remaining harbour development land is revealed.

The details of the applications are as follows:

Reference number EB/2006/0092

This application is for:

8, two bed apartments, 8, one bed apartments, 3, four bed houses and 4, three bed houses with associated parking. To be erected on the waterfront site by the side of the 'Harvester'

Reference number EB/2006/0100

This application is for:

18, two bed apartments, with associated parking. Plus 42 berth holders' parking spaces at lower ground floor level. To be erected in the berth holders' car park in Atlantic Drive, opposite Daytona Quay.

Both of these applications are for single structures, on four floors, with very high pitched roofs.

Full details, with plans, can be found on the EBC website, www.eastbourne.gov.uk/planning

If there is to be any chance of getting the social infrastructure, so vital to the future of the harbour, it is essential that these applications are refused. If you agree, it is essential that you send your objection, in writing, to:

The Development Control Manager
68 Grove Road
Eastbourne BN21 4UH

Or, e-mail planning@eastbourne.gov.uk

If you wish to speak at the planning meeting, you must include the request in your letter. We hope that as many of you as possible will request to speak, as this will greatly strengthen our case.

The consultation period for this application ends on 16th March. We believe that, considering the importance of these applications, and the implications for harbour residents, this is far too short, especially as the case officer is on holiday, and therefore, unavailable for much of the period. We have, therefore, requested that it should be extended.

Look out for the March issue of Waterlines and the website <http://www.shra.co.uk> for updates.

If you would like updates by e-mail, write to: communications@shra.co.uk

