



**Brighton & Hove
City Council**

PLANNING COMMITTEE ADDENDUM

2.00PM, WEDNESDAY, 27 APRIL 2011

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

ADDENDUM

ITEM	Page
273. TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS ON THE PLANS LIST	1 - 6

27th April 2011 Planning Committee – Additional Representations

Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
15	331 Kingsway Hove	BH2011/00227	Confirmation from 23 Brittany Road that the objection letter received and reported within the Committee report relates to a different planning application on Kingsway (BH2010/03739)
73	227 Preston Rd	BH2011/00336	<p>1 letter <u>objecting</u> on grounds of poor delivery arrangement requiring the emptying of the car park for every delivery, the lack of overflow parking, and the lack of detail for the second unit. A delivery dry run is required.</p> <p>1 letter (copied to councillors and all 3 MPs) <u>objecting</u> on grounds that it will be harmful to local business, particularly the newsagents in the local parade.</p> <p>1 letter from Cllrs Ann and Ken Norman <u>objecting</u> attached to this list.</p> <p>Officer Comment: Issues raised are covered in the report.</p>
113	Daltons Bastion. Madeira Drive	BH2011/00764	<p>Additional/Amended information sent by applicant</p> <p>3 additional verified views have been submitted showing the proposal from locations suggested by the council's Design and Conservation team - Pavilion Gardens, the Old Steine and St James St/Madeira Place.</p> <p>Officer Comment: These indicate that the proposal will have little if any impact from Pavilion Gardens, a modest impact from the Old Steine and a greater impact from Madeira Place, and thus broadly affirms the Design and Conservation team's preliminary assessment as set out in the report from page 124.</p> <p>2 sets of amended plans have been received showing a new railing design (to match existing) and new contemporary kiosk design to address the requirements of recommended conditions 7 and 8.</p> <p>Officer Comment: These are considered an improvement, and if the Design and Conservation team are able to assess these revisions before the meeting, Members will be updated verbally. If assessment can take place before the Section 106 is signed and the decision issued, (and the plans are deemed acceptable), it is recommended the conditions are re-worded to secure implementation in accordance with the amended plans – otherwise it is recommended that conditions 7 and 8 remain (although they will need to be slightly re-worded to reflect the receipt of amended plans).</p>

Amended plans of the base plinth have been submitted as originally they were slightly inaccurate - the plinths in the side elevations are now slightly less long (by about 2 metres) and now correspond with the base plan.

An additional plan showing a vehicular swept path analysis has been submitted to demonstrate compliance with recommended condition 10, which seeks to secure adequate access to the beach. The Sustainable Transport team advise that it appears that the analysis does not account for the largest type of service vehicle (such a refuse collection vehicle) that needs to access the beach.

Officer Comment: It is recommended that this condition remain.

Additional information regarding the economic benefit of the scheme has been submitted which states that London Eye is London's number one paid for attraction and confirms its partnership and links with hotels and tourist marketing. Also information has been submitted including a summary of survey results from tourists and other tourist attractions highlighting importance of wheels to York and Belfast city in terms of boosting visitor numbers to those cities.

Officer Comment: Noted

Additional representations:

4 letters of objection from **5 Charles Street, Brighton Seafront Regeneration Ltd, 126 Marine Parade, 4 Royal Crescent.**

Officer Comment: The main objections raised have been covered in the report. Concerns regarding the number of 'unresolved issues' to be dealt with by condition (and thus under delegated powers) are noted.

20 letters of support/no objection from **HR Developments 96-98 Church Rd, 45 Wilbury Road, 45 Woodside Road, 70 Midhurst Rise, Chair of Brighton and Hove Hotels Association 17 Upper Rock Gardens, The New Steine Hotel 10-12a New Steine, South Down Solar 59 High Street, 9 Hood Close(x2), 19 Seaview Estate, 3 New Row Tanyard Lane, 13 Second Avenue, The Cavalaire Guest House 34 Upper Rock Gardens, 7 Charlotte Street, 2 Atlingworth Street, Strawberry Fields, 9 Oriental Place, Fairlands Finchmead Lane, 19 Simmons Way (and 1 email, no address given).** On grounds as expressed within the report.

Officer Comment: No new material planning considerations raised.

A letter of comment and support from **saveHOVE** stating: during previous

			<p>application for Brighton O, saveHOVE lobbied for a site east of the pier on regeneration grounds and is more commercial in nature, wheel is compatible with contemporary Van Alen and American Express buildings and the local vistas viewed from Brighton Pier, starburst feature at centre is perhaps overdone but realise is off the peg design – if design could be tweaked to soften appearance would be immense benefit, absolutely no competition with or adverse impact on historic Kemptown area, site well located to encourage visitors and greater use of seafront east of pier and arches occupants would benefit from increased footfall, was previously a ferris wheel on eastern beaches so is a precedent, not a ferris wheel - pods enclosed and offer views, will encourage café culture on beach, will encourage use of Volks Railway and Marina, adequate toilet facilities should not be overlooked as will not be any serious regeneration if insufficient.</p> <p>A letter of <u>objection</u> has been received from the Kingscliff Society on grounds that proposal will have wide ranging implications on appearance of East Cliff Conservation Area, strategic views of the coastline and the local residential neighbourhood. Concern about dispersal of people leaving the site, noise, insufficient toilets or rubbish bins to support facility, unattractive and unsympathetic to area, in adequate consideration of impact to local residents.</p> <p>A letter of <u>support</u> and <u>comment</u> has been received from the Brighton Society on grounds of regeneration of the area east of the Palace Pier though should only operate up until 10.00pm, and have no accompanying music. Proposal will not adversely affect the Kemp Town Estate.</p> <p>Officer Comment: to 3 above Amenity Societies:_No new issues or planning considerations raised.</p> <p>Drawing numbers The drawing numbers (in condition 2) will be updated on the final decision notice to reflect all the late information received.</p> <p>An additional representation has been received from Poppies Childcare, 8 West Way (the current occupant of the ground floor nursery). The representation confirms that the nursery would not operate during construction works and there have been no discussions with the applicant in relation to reopening and using the premises post-construction. The existing nursery employs 11 staff, provides childcare to 72 families and has children on the special education needs register.</p>
147	8 West Way, Hove	BH2010/03486	

159	14 Shirley Road	BH2010/03983	<p>Officers Comment: The issues raised in the representation are in the Committee Report.</p> <p>Amended plans have been received, showing the tree to be retained and the dressing room window obscurely glazed and fixed shut. A section has also been submitted.</p> <p>Recommendation: Amend condition 2: The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings no. 0118 PL.001, 0118.EXG.001 received on 22 December 2010; drawing no. 0118.PL.002 B, 0118.PL003 C, 0118.PL004 A received on 13 April 2011.</p>
-----	-----------------	--------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

NB. Representations received after midday the Friday before the date of the Committee meeting will not be reported (Sub-Committee resolution of 23 February 2005).



PLANS LIST – 27 APRIL 2011

Brighton & Hove COUNCILLOR REPRESENTATION
City Council

Adrian Smith - Planning Officer
Brighton and Hove City Council.
Environmental Services.
Norton Road,
HOVE
cc Jane Richardson

Date: April 9th 2011

Application number: BH2011/00336 Application type: Full planning
Address: 227 Preston Road Brighton
Description: Change of use of car showroom/ workshop (SG04) to 2 number retail units (A1) incorporating installation of external condenser unit, air conditioning units and an ATM Cash Machine.

Dear Mr. Smith,

We are writing as Withdean Ward Councillors in connection with the planning application as detailed above, the location of which is situated in the Preston Park Conservation area. This site, previously occupied by Caffyns PLC, is situated on a busy section of Preston Road. We have received a very large number of representations in connection with this application, both supporting the application and opposing the application.

However, we wish to represent the residents living close to the application site who have expressed understandable concerns relating to noise, pollution from vehicles entering and exiting the site, related road safety issues from vehicles entering and exiting the site, large delivery vehicles which will make daily delivery drops to the Sainsbury's outlet and the existing constraints on Preston Road at this location where the road narrows from two to one lane of traffic. Parking in the immediate vicinity of the proposed store, particularly in Cumberland Road, Home Road, Lauriston Road and Knoyle Road is virtually at saturation point and there are very real concerns that vehicles will drive slowly around this area, causing additional pollution whilst seeking a place to park.

There is also concern expressed for the future viability of the existing convenience store which is popular and well used by many local residents although we do appreciate that this is not a planning consideration. An additional concern is that the occupant of the proposed second retail unit has yet to be confirmed.

We have received expressions of support for the application from a number of residents of Withdean Ward who welcome the possibility of having the greater selection of shopping opportunities that even a small Sainsbury's unit such as this would provide in an area which is a considerable distance from any other major retail provider. It has also been pointed out by a number of residents that they would be able to walk to this location instead of having to travel by car or bus, thereby reducing pollution.

However, we believe that the concerns of the residents likely to be most closely affected as detailed above, are very significant and for this reason only, we believe that this application should be rejected.

Should the Planning Committee be minded to recommend this application for approval, we request that conditions be applied to the hours of operation of the store and the times when deliveries are made to the store.

We request that this letter be included in the agenda for the appropriate meeting of the Planning Committee.

Yours sincerely,

