

Delegated Officer Report - 26/06/2024

App.No: 240357 (NMC)	Decision Due Date: 17 July 2024	Ward: St Anthony's
Officer: Chloe Timm	Site visit date:	Type: Non-Material Change
Site Notice(s) Expiry date:		
Neighbour Con Expiry:		
Press Notice(s):		
Over 8/13 week reason:		
Location: 21 Lottbridge Drive, Eastbourne		
Proposal: Non-Material Amendment application to Unit 02 to amend the orientation of the EV parking substation orientation, plant enclosure and holding area size and layout amended, entrance/exit omitted from shopfront glazing to Elevation A, new canopy included to main entrance and building mounted signage to reflect changes within this application in relation to planning application 210772 granted on appeal 23/5/2023		
Applicant: Alastair Bell		
Recommendation: Issue		

Proposed development:

The NMA seeks to alter the following:

- EV parking substation orientation rotated.
- Unit 02 - Plant enclosure and holding area size and layout amended. Plant enclosure to be open with no overhead canopy.
- Unit 02 - Entrance/exit omitted from shopfront glazing to Elevation A.
- Unit 02 - New canopy included to main entrance to suit tenant door requirements.
- Unit 02 - Minor amendments to building mounted signage to reflect above changes.

NON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT OFFICER CHECK LIST

	YES	NO
1. Would the proposed amendment result in development that is significantly different in terms of its scale (height, bulk, massing etc.) when compared to the approved development?		X
2. Would the interests of any third party or body who participated in or were informed of the original decision be disadvantaged in any way?		X

3. Would the proposed amendment be contrary to the Development Plan, Government guidance or any policy of the Authority?		X
4. Would the proposed amendment significantly alter the location of any windows and/or the outlook or view from the building in relation to neighbouring sensitive windows, when compared to the approved development?		X
5. would the proposed amendment alter the control of any restrictive condition on the original approval?		X
6. Would the proposed amendment significantly change the on-site coverage, levels, or relationship with any adjoining development?		X
7. Would the proposed amendment have any impact on existing trees and/or any approved landscaping scheme?		X
8. Would the proposed amendment result in any significant change to the impact on the amenities of adjoining occupiers when compared to the approved development?		X
9. Would the proposed amendments significantly alter the design or external appearance of the approved development, such that it would be significantly different to the approved development?		X
10. Has the Council previously agreed amendments to the scheme which would, cumulatively with the proposed amendment, result in a significantly different development to the approved?		X
11. Would the amendment materially alter the approved development as a result of any other material considerations identified in the original officer report?		X
12. Would the proposed amendment result in any alteration to ground levels or groundwork that would in itself constitute an 'engineering operation' or would result in potential loss of privacy or visual amenity?		X