

Planning Applications Sub-Committee – Additional Representations

DATE:		02/07/03	
Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
14	Land rear of 29 7 31 Goldstone Villas, Hove.	BH2003/875/FP	31 Goldstone Villas: Condition suggest that boundary wall between the site and 29 & 31 Goldstone Villas be increased in height to 2m. As owner of the wall, will not give consent for this. Response: Condition suggested to protect privacy. Applicant willing to built fence on their side of the site which would not disturb the wall. Objector informed of this and states that fence should be at least 1m from the wall to allow access for maintenance, and this would not increase screening.
24	3 Old Steine & land adjoining	BH2003/01151/FP & 01152/LB	Amended drawings received from agent illustrating an alternative sun screen at rooftop level. Response: It is considered that the amendment overcomes the concerns of architect’s panel and CAAG. The residential density of this development is 168 dwellings per hectare. Cllr. Simon Burgess feels proposal lacks the quality of design and sense of scale surely appropriate for this exceptional site. It will dominate its surroundings with no attempt to step back from narrow pavement on most sides. Feel proposal needs to be reduced and/or some incorporation of public space. Response : Design is of high quality fully supported by Architects Panel and English Heritage. Scale is comparable with surrounding buildings particularly to the north which are also set on the back edge of the pavement – a characteristic of the area. Scheme has evolved in discussion with Council officers and an agreed design brief for the site.
32	10-11 Old Steine	BH2003/01321/FP & BH2003/01322/LB	64 Rowan Way, Rottingdean (acting for and on behalf of Westminster Estate Limited) - Supports the proposal on the grounds of increased security to adjoining properties in the Old Steine. Applicant points out that withdrawn applications almost identical to these

			<p>and referred to in report (BH2003/00104FP & 00105/LB) contained letters of support from The Residents, Parochial Mews; 6&7, 8, 9 Old Steine.</p> <p>Response: The same applications also attracted letters of objection from 1, 2, 3 and 4 St. James's Place.</p> <p>Kingscliffe Society take issue with summation of comments attributed to them (following reading the initial report).</p> <p>i) 'No evidence has been submitted as part of this application to confirm this easement/right of way'. The Society did not make this comment and it has been incorrectly attributed to them. Response : Noted and accepted.</p> <p>ii) 'The boundary wall separating the rear of this row of terraces from adjoining garden land has been partially removed at 10 Old Steine'. The Society referred to this only insofar as it wished to correct the erroneous impression that may have been given in the report to 11th June committee that the Society stated that the entire wall separating the buildings from garden land to the rear of numbers 8 – 12 Old Steine had been demolished. Response : Noted</p> <p>iii) 'The wording of the decision notices relating to the reinstatement of the patio is unclear'. Society's letter dated 9th June did not say the wording was unclear. In contrast the decision notices are clear that the ground in the area of the alleyway should be different in appearance to the 'garden land' to the east in order to clearly distinguish between the two. Response : Noted</p> <p>iv) 'A split decision should be made'. The Society wish to make clear that in their view the whole application(s) should be refused. However if the committee does not refuse the proposal then the Society would prefer a split decision. Response : Noted</p> <p>In the event of any or all of the applications being approved urge committee to make clear that such decisions would not, in the Council's view, prejudice any existing rights of access. Whilst this may be self-evident to some it would be of comfort to those who are concerned lest future difficulties arise, following</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>any affirmative decision whereby locked gates remain or part of the alleyway is converted to an individual's garden use. Response : If granted permission would be under Planning and Listed Building Acts only and would not confer or deny any rights that may or may not exist under other legislation. It would be open to the beneficiaries of such rights to take such action against the applicant as they consider appropriate.</p>
37	14 Carden Avenue	BH2003/01558/FP	<p>Letters of objection have been received from Nos. 2 Carden Avenue, Maycroft, London Road (x2) and an additional letter from Bramble Cottage Retirement Home. A letter received from No. 8 Carden Avenue was summarised within the committee report but that address was mistakenly omitted.</p> <p>The letters state that the peace and tranquillity of adjoining gardens will be disturbed by 70 children. The application form gives opening hours of 08.00-19.00 Monday to Saturday but elsewhere Monday to Friday is stated. Conditions would not address this as just a few children would create disturbance. The use would generate up to 70 vehicles causing increased congestion, few children will travel on foot, the driveway would become blocked and parents would park on both sides of the road. The traffic management scheme is not enforceable. Commercial use in this residential area should be resisted. Alterations and modifications required would further detract from the character of the area.</p> <p>The letter from Bramble Cottage states that they have not received a consultation letter or seen a site notice and have not had time to discuss the application with Council officers. They also state that residents have had no time to voice their own objections. The letter requests that members visit the retirement home during their site visit, particularly to assess the impact on the garden.</p> <p>The second letter from Maycroft requests an adjournment of this application. Concerns are expressed that the report was drafted before the closing deadline for comments and some letters were not included in the report. Whilst the writer accepts that many objectors raise similar concerns, he</p>

Agenda item 25

			<p>feels that each new objector adds a new dimension. Pressure from central government should not be at the expense of consideration of objectors' views.</p> <p>Officer response: Most of the issues raised, including traffic and noise, have been fully addressed in the report. A condition restricting hours of opening to 08.00–18.00 Monday to Friday is recommended and the agent has confirmed that no weekend opening is proposed. No external alterations to the building are proposed.</p> <p>A consultation letter was sent to Bramble Cottage and the first letter received from the owners was written on 6 June. Officers consider that sufficient time was available between that date and the Sub-Committee meeting for the owners to speak to officers or consult their residents.</p> <p>A draft of the report was commenced prior to the expiry of the consultation period. However the report was only finalised following consideration of most letters received. The additional letters reported here have not raised new issues that would require a change in officer recommendation. Details of all objections received are contained within the report or this list, members are due to visit the site and officers do not consider that there is a need to defer this application.</p>
47	137-147 Preston Road	BH2003/00779/OA BH2003/00780/OA	<p>Amend description – the total car parking figure is 438, which includes 21 dedicated disabled spaces.</p> <p><u>Cllr. McCaffery (Ward Cllr.)</u> Is there a need for offices here when there are vacant office blocks on same road, this would be a perfect site for housing, there will be an increase in traffic generation, buildings should be maximum of 6 stories, design needs to be seriously considered, nothing has been done to the site despite all the previous approvals and the area is now looking derelict.</p> <p>All points covered in officer's report.</p>
58	141-147 Preston Road	BH2003/00226/OA BH2003/00227/OA	<p>Amend description – the total car parking figure is 274, which includes 14 dedicated disabled spaces.</p> <p><u>Cllr. McCaffery (Ward Cllr.)</u> Is there a need for offices here when there are</p>

Agenda item 25

			vacant office blocks on same road, this would be a perfect site for housing, there will be an increase in traffic generation, buildings should be maximum of 6 stories, design needs to be seriously considered, nothing has been done to the site despite all the previous approvals and the area is now looking derelict. All points covered in officer's report.
74	14 The Athenaeum, Salisbury Road	BH2003/01312/FP	The following words have been omitted from the recommendation. After RECOMMENDATION insert "Grant planning permission subject to the following conditions"
82	36 Cromwell Road (land rear of) Hove.	BH2003/1160/FP & 1161/LB	3a Cambridge Grove: Object for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – the proposal would be built butting up to our property , and prevent access for maintenance which is very important given the age of the building. – We would overlook the new building directly into the second floor. Response: Overlooking would be marginal. Maintenance to the rear of 3a would require scaffolding.
89	Intek House, Ellen Street	BH2003/01262/FP	This application has been withdrawn by the applicant.
99	267 Old Shoreham Road, Portslade.	BH2003/01327/CD/FP	Councillor Sue John: If there were a way of achieving the extension without disturbing the wall this would be greatly appreciated. It may be that a site visit could help Committee Members appreciate the difficulty of the current plans. The neighbour, Mrs Cox, has objected to the height of the extension. I trust that it would be no higher than the existing one. Response: Would probably be difficult to construct the extension without disturbing the existing joint boundary wall. Difficult to lower the proposed extension due to internal floor levels.
103	Rivervale, Victoria Road, portslade.	BH2003/00251/FP	Letter from 18 Victoria Court, Victoria Road – signed by 11 residents of this block of flats. Object to the proposal for following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increased volume of traffic, endangering children of nearby school. - increase in congestion, which would be further exacerbated if plans for

			<p>traffic calming humps are implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The commercial development would make the immediate area into an industrial estate. - Building would block out light to the residential part of Victoria Road. - For many years a flashing light from the premises shone into the flats. - A more suitable site would be on an industrial site, possibly the former Hosiedon Besson site. - Most of the residents of Victoria Court purchased their property to be close to shops and public transport, many are now disabled, blind or deaf, and too old to move. <p>Response: This is not a proposal for a new development but a redevelopment of existing premises. This side of the street is commercial/industrial. Traffic issues and effect on residential amenity are considered in the planning report. Deliveries on site, as opposed to the current on-street arrangement should greatly improve highway safety. Separate consent would be required for signage.</p>
112	191 Eastern Road	BH2003/01654/FP	<p>Applicant - Many other examples of pVCU windows fronting Eastern Road, especially at Church House. Energy conservation, sound proofing and tight sealing of windows against air pollution should be given the priority that is needed.</p> <p>Response: Not at the expense of the existing character of the building and the terrace as a whole. No independent evidence available that pvc windows are better in terms of energy conservation, sound proofing and resistance to air pollution compared to new timber sashes. Upvc itself is unsustainable compared to timber both in terms of its manufacture and disposal. Furthermore it cannot easily be repaired in the way timber can. Applicant appears not to have considered using one of the many specialist timber sash window repairers around.</p>
119	St Annes Institute	BH2003/01107/FP	<p>Additional letter from the Kingscliffe Society confirms their objection remains despite submission of additional supporting information. Reiterate point - why wasn't demolition considered necessary at time of original</p>

Agenda item 25

			application? Welcome the imposition of protective conditions to cover all the flint walls - particularly necessary for western wall. Walls do contribute to conservation area as they <u>can</u> mostly be seen from public viewpoints. Response: These matters are considered in the report.
134	White Horse Hotel	BH2003/01638/AD	Rottingdean Preservation Society, Rottingdean Parish Council – object to the size and proliferation of advertising material around the site. Clearly a hotel and therefore ‘quite unnecessary for so many illuminated signs to be erected.’ Council recently recognised the importance of this area and its relationship with the historic core in refusing the design for the proposed Tesco store. Similar considerations apply equally here. Number of signs proposed represent ‘garish clutter’ Response: These matters considered in report
138	133 Cuckmere Way	BH2003/01550/FP	A letter and 14 Photos received showing examples of extensions in and around Cuckmere Way. The applicant insists the proposal would be considerably smaller than the extensions shown in the photos. Officer Response: Raises no new issues – all covered in report.
147	121-123 Havelock Road	BH2003/00960/FP	<u>Cllr. McCaffery (Ward Cllr.)</u> Opposed to alterations which have been agreed in writing with a planning officer and without those affected being informed. If this is not the case, original plans should be reverted to. <u>Officer’s response:</u> All of the alterations are the subject of this planning application and all affected parties were consulted.
151	2 Hythe Road	BH2003/01386/FP	Additional plans giving daylighting assessments to the potentially affected windows at 2 Hythe Road and stating that the window at 4 Hythe Road is a kitchen window have been submitted. These details are satisfactory and show that the loss of light is minor and the recommendation is therefore changed from Minded to Grant Planning Permission to Grant Planning Permission .
158	Former ABC Cinema East Street	BH2001/01838/FP	This application has now been WITHDRAWN by the applicant.
173	Junction of Dyke	BH2003/01628/TA	Further copies of the letter of objection referred to in the main report, as well

	Road Avenue & The Beeches		<p>as another circular letter to the same effect and raising similar objections, have been received from: Nos.1, 2, 3, 4(2 occupants), 5, 7(2 occupants),8 ,9, 10(2occupants), 11a(2 occupants),12,14 (2 occupants), 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22(2 occupants), 23, 25, 26, 27(2 occupants), 28, 30 Hazeldene Meads, Nos. 2, 3, 4, 6(2 occupants), 7, 8, 9, 10(2 occupants),11,12, 14(2 occupants),15,16, 17(2 occupants), 18(2 occupants), 19, 21(2 occupants) The Beeches, Nos. 2(2 occupants), 3(2 occupants), 4(2 occupants) Ash Close, Nos. 21(3 occupants), 22(2 occupants), 23(2 occupants), 24, 25, 37(2 occupants) Dyke Road Avenue, Nos. 1(2 occupants), 2, 3(2 occupants), 4(2 occupants), 6, 7, 10 (2 occupants),12(2 occupants), 14, 15, 16(2 occupants), 18, 21(2 occupants), 22, 23(2 occupants), 30(2 occupants) Chalfont Drive.</p> <p>This means there have been, in total, over 100 objections to this effect.</p> <p>A separate letter of objection has also been received from 20 The Beeches, objecting on the grounds of: <i>Siting</i>, as the area is residential and the mast is situated close to an electricity sub-station; <i>appearance</i>, as it is an alien feature which will impact on the street scene and they feel there is no evidence that mast sharing has been sought; <i>health and safety</i>, pointing to Inspectors decisions which state that health and public concern can be a material consideration; and <i>policy</i>, as they feel that there will be an impact on amenity making the mast contrary to local and government planning policy.</p> <p>A letter of objection has also been received from Cllr Ann Norman on the grounds that there is a proliferation of masts in the area and that they are harmful to the local environment and streetscene. Also concerned about the health risks , especially in light of nearby retirement homes and nursery, and states that health grounds are a material consideration.</p>
180	182 Tivoli Crescent North	BH2003/01566/FP	Satisfactory amended drawings received. Change recommendation to Grant Planning Permission .

NB. Representations received within 24 hours of the start of the meeting will not be reported (Sub-Committee resolution of 16th January 2002).