



**Brighton & Hove  
City Council**

# **PLANNING COMMITTEE ADDENDUM**

**2.00PM, WEDNESDAY, 15 MAY 2013**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**



# ADDENDUM

**ITEM** Late Representations List



15<sup>th</sup> May 2013 Planning Committee – Additional Representations

Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
31	Richmond House Richmond Road, Brighton	BH2013/00197	<p><b>Nineteen (19)</b> letters of representation have been received from <b>32 Baden Road, 2 Brangwyn Crescent, 72 Brookside Avenue, 42 Burlington Gardens, Chyngton Close Chyngton Place Seaford, 14 Cissbury Road, 43 Coleman Avenue, Courtenay Tye Courtenay Terrace, 249A Dyke Road, 35 Friar Road, 6 Goldstone Close, Flat 4 28 Granville Road, 37 Hangleton Road, 10 Quarry Hill (x2), Spinning Wood, Unit 15 The Granary Whiteways Lane Rodmell, 29 Tongdean Road and Flat 306 BN2 9WR</b> <u>supporting</u> the application on the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is a continual problem finding suitable accommodation for students on interns or work experience,</li> <li>• The provision of new, high quality student accommodation in a secure location is a great idea,</li> <li>• Bringing students together in this way will assist with the impact of local residents in other areas and allow full time permanent residents of Brighton the ability to live peacefully in their own homes,</li> <li>• Understand how useful the proposed accommodation would be from personal experience,</li> <li>• The Council is wrong in trying to restrict the provision of student housing,</li> <li>• A well designed scheme using mostly un-used land which will help and support the university and students studying which is a vital income stream for the City,</li> <li>• Perfectly sensible and necessary development,</li> <li>• Would be a great idea,</li> <li>• Existing office building is horrible to work in. Would have thought it would have been redeveloped ages ago, the new proposed building will be built on top of the old Lewes Road Station. Of course the station was built around 1860, before the residential area sprung up. The station had “had its day” long ago and the same can be said of the old factory, which was built on the site of the old station, however it is now out of place. Much better to develop it into some much needed accommodation and one suitable for the area as it is now,</li> <li>• Coldean has gradually experienced a negative impact due to the student accommodation situation in the estate. The occupancy profile of the typical household in Coldean has changed in a significant way over the years with many family homes being brought for investment purposes by being let to students. This has tended to</li> </ul>

			<p>lead to a fragmentation of the local community. Instead of encouraging young families to move into the estate and building a stronger supportive community, the result of bringing in students on a 'as and when' basis has caused greater isolation particularly to the elderly homeowners. House prices have been driven artificially high again weakening the opportunities for young families to move into an estate that was designed for that very purposes. Parking has also become an increasing headache particularly for those along Coldean Lane,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More student housing is needed urgently,</li> <li>• Is an ideal location with good proposed facilities for the students,</li> <li>• The site is near the main bus routes to the main campus as well as handy for the sites on the Lewes Road, and</li> <li>• Students are better off in proper student accommodation where there is chance of meeting and socialising with other students.</li> </ul> <p><b>Four (4) letters of representation have been received from 54 Princes Road and 32, 40A and 84 Richmond Road <u>objecting</u> to the application on the following reasons;</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Round Hill is a quiet residential area which is also a Conservation Area. The height, scale, material and architectural detailing of the planned building ignore completely the design statement about Round Hill. The design will be dominant and obtrusive. The proposed buildings are very dull blocks with no care or attention to detail and how it will merge in with surrounding buildings,</li> <li>• The quality of life will be greatly diminished,</li> <li>• The noise pollution alone from 144 to 185 students in such a small and secluded residential area will have serious long term affects for residents,</li> <li>• The application does not provide for the transport demands it makes. The roads surrounding the building are double yellow lines, due to the fact it is situated on a blind bend. These lines are covered by SPGBH4 and does not allow for drop off or pick up. It would make parking nigh on impossible for families with young children to park close to their homes with the additional vehicles 144 students may bring with them each term,</li> <li>• The building should be used for the purpose it was built for, and rented out to small businesses. The existing building is suitable for small businesses and was recently occupied up until December 2012. With some investment the building could be occupied again, this would minimise the environmental damage caused by such a vast project,</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--

- Would decrease property values,
- Is absurd to assume that all the students will ride bicycles,
- Fails to take into account that the main entrance road would be shared with articulated lorries, this will result in accidents,
- Noise during construction and poor access on the residential streets for heavy goods vehicles,
- The studio living accommodation is small and some rooms very poor,
- There is only one small laundry room, how would this accommodate 144 people's washing,
- The amount of rubbish produced on a daily basis would be fast, there is only one refuse room, would this incorporate recycling? How often would this be collected?, The narrow residential streets are already a struggle for refuse lorries, and
- In the Conservation Area residents cannot change frontages, sash windows or cut a tree without permission yet a new building, not in character and has a detrimental effect on the conservation premise is considered. If planning is accepted it will make a mockery of the regulations associated with Conservation and a case is then open for many other developments within a very tiny, densely, over populated area.

**One (1)** letter of representation received from **Councillor West** objecting to the application. Copy of letter attached.

**Five (5)** letters of representation to Councillors from **three unknown addresses, Chair of Round Hill Society and 17 D'Aubigny Road** objecting to the application.

**One (1)** Letter from **applicant** stating that it is disappointing that there has been no discussion with the Case Officer on the submitted scheme bearing in mind the NPPF has shifted the planning emphasis onto encouraging economic development. Also understand that the City is 'open for business' and wants to see development brought forward not sufficient though to discuss proposals. Assumes this is because it is considered that there are fundamental reasons that cannot be overcome. The comments mainly rely in the merging City Plan which is contested in respect of the policies referred to.

Find it hard to understand why students in controlled and confined accommodation can be considered more problematic than students spread throughout the residential community, including Round Hill, in homes owned by landlords whose main interest is to collect the

			rent. <b>Officer response:</b> No new issues raised.
81	1 Manor Road, Brighton	BH2012/03364	<p>A further letter from <b>Bristol Nurseries Residents Association</b> has been received detailing the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We have discovered that there are Restrictive Covenants still in place on the Convent site land. The conveyance dated 27th March 1895 states that '<i>not more than one house with necessary stable and other outbuilding shall be built on the said piece of land</i> ' The conveyance dated 31st May 1895 states '<i>that not more than two principal dwelling houses with necessary outbuildings and stabling shall at anytime hereafter be built on the said piece of land hereby conveyed</i>'</li> <li>• We have recently submitted two nominations for local listing to the conservation department. One on behalf of the Convent site at 1 Manor Road and one for the First Marquess of Bristol Estate</li> </ul> <p><b>Officer response:</b> In relation to the restrictive covenants this is a civil matter between the two parties and not a material planning consideration.</p> <p>In relation to the nominations to the local list, these will not be finalised until later on within the year, however issues in relation to the impact of the development upon the locally listed buildings and historic character of the site are considered within the report.</p>
129	33 Mighell Street & 70a Carlton Hill, Brighton	BH2012/04086	<p>1. Additional condition to be added: No development shall take place until detailed drawings showing the levels of the site and proposed development related to the levels of adjoining land and highways to OS Datum have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in strict accordance with the agreed details. <b>Reason:</b> In order to ensure the accuracy of the development and to comply with policy QD1, QD27 and HE6 of the Brighton &amp; Hove Local Plan.</p> <p>2. Amended plans received removing balconies on the south elevation condition 3 amended to incorporate new plan numbers: The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings listed below.</p>



**Reason:** For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received
Location plan	No number		24/12/12
Block plan	1201/01		24/12/12
Existing site plan	1201/02		24/12/12
Existing elevations	1201/03		24/12/12
Existing elevations	1201/04		24/12/12
Lower ground floor	1201/05	A	10/02/13
Ground floor plan	1201/06	A	10/02/13
First floor plan	1201/07	B	13/05/13
Second floor plan	1201/08	A	10/02/13
Third floor plan	1201/09	A	10/02/13
Proposed elevations	1201/10	C	13/05/13
Proposed elevations	1201/11	A	13/05/13
Contextual elevations	1201/12	B	13/05/13
Contextual elevations	1201/13	A	13/05/13
Proposed elevations street view	1201/14	C	13/05/13
Entrance details	1201/05	A	27/02/13

163 Land to Rear of 67-81 Princes Road, Brighton

BH2013/00139

**Correction:** The following item (omitted in error) is added to Section 3 of the Committee Report (Planning History):

**BH2012/01583:** Application to extend time limit for implementation of previous approval BH2009/00847 for the construction of 4no. two storey, two bedroom terraced houses with pitched roofs, solar panels and rooflights. Provision of private and communal gardens, waste and refuse facilities and erection of a street level lift gate-house with cycle store. Approved 16/08/2012.

**Correction:** Informative 5 of Section 11 of the report is corrected to read:

*The applicant is advised that the scheme required to be submitted by Condition 7.*

Condition 6 is referenced in error.

			<p><b>Three (3)</b> letters have been received from <b>8 Daubigny Road Brighton, 'Simon Biddell' Prince's Road Brighton and 55 Prince's Road Brighton</b> <u>objecting</u> to the application for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed development would cause increased parking pressure.</li> <li>• The proposed construction works would cause disruption.</li> <li>• The proposed development represents 'garden grabbing'.</li> <li>• Who would buy one of these houses if built?</li> <li>• The increase in height in comparison to the approved scheme is not acceptable to near neighbours.</li> <li>• Six houses is too many, four houses as a car-free development is all this land and neighbourhood can sustain.</li> <li>• Planning Inspectors have previously stated that the application site is not in a suitable location for car-free development.</li> <li>• The recommended car-free condition is not appropriate; this should not be considered and the application should be refused.</li> <li>• Demand for on-street parking is at its heaviest in the evening; the CPZ will not control parking after 20.00.</li> <li>• The introduction of the CPZ will result in an overall reduction in the amount of available parking spaces.</li> <li>• An up to date parking survey has not been submitted as part of the application submission.</li> </ul> <p><b>Officer response:</b> These matters are addressed within the committee report.</p>
229	Second & Third Floor Flat, 11 Powis Road, Hove	BH2013/000947	<p>2 additional emails have been received from the occupiers of <b>60 St Leonards Gardens, Hove</b> and <b>First Floor Flat, 11 Powis Road</b> <u>objecting</u> to the application on the following grounds;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• loss of light</li> <li>• how the dormer would be maintained</li> <li>• disruption and damage from the building works and scaffolding</li> <li>• how will water run off from the dormer</li> <li>• materials</li> <li>• financial impact to the building an landlord</li> </ul> <p>1 additional email has been received from the occupier of <b>22 Oriental Place</b> in <u>support</u> of the application.</p>

			<b>Officer response:</b> The issues raised regarding the impact upon the amenity of the adjoining occupiers and the proposed materials for the scheme are fully assessed within the report. The issues regarding the maintenance, disruption during construction, water run off and financial impact upon the Landlord do not form material planning considerations.
--	--	--	--

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).

Councillor Pete West  
St. Peter's 7 North Laine Ward  
c/o King's House, Hove

7 May 2013

Dear Planning Committee,

**Re: Richmond House, BH2013/ 00197**

May I first of all offer my apology for presenting my objection to the above application through the late list. This is entirely due to an unfortunate timing oversight on my behalf.

You have received an objection from Annie Rimmington, Chair of the Round Hill Society and near neighbour of the site. Annie makes a comprehensive and well argued case for refusal, and has made a tremendous contribution to developing a well informed response from local residents.

In pursuit of a fuller understanding of the details of the application Annie and I met with the case officer Liz Arnold, and I must thank Liz for the very professional and patient assistance offered.

As you will know, a great many other objections, over 200 now, have been received from residents of Round Hill expressing their deep concerns about the many impacts this unwelcome development will have upon their quiet residential neighbourhood and Conservation Area. As a ward councillor I have had a great of deal of correspondence with local residents on this, and I couldn't be more certain that the views I am hearing are not only heartfelt but eminently correct in their deduction.

I am also troubled that a number of key consultees, ranging from the Police, Southern Water and City Clean and CAG, have all expressed concerns about the poor consideration and appropriateness of the proposal,

I am pleased that the case officer has agreed with so many of these concerns and troubled to set out a detailed and very compelling case recommending the application be refused.

I would commend members to support those recommendations, but if there is any doubt that this is the correct course, may I briefly emphasize some key concerns as I see them:

- loss of employment space, with highly suspicious qualification offered for redundancy of use;
- inappropriate location for this use;
- the over-bearing scale, mass and bulk of the development in relation to neighbouring and existing development;
- unacceptable impact on residential amenity from noise, overlooking and overshadowing;
- impact on Round Hill of service, employee, student, visitor and end of term traffic and parking
- inability of Hughes Road to safely support proposed transport arrangements, inevitably leading to further impact on Round Hill
- impact on character, appearance and distinction of the Conservation Area

I am mindful of the significant contribution the education sector makes to the livelihood and well being of the city, and the growing need for well managed purpose built student accommodation. However this ill considered and inappropriate proposal is not the right way forward, and I rather fear it has only served to frustrate the good relationship between one of our host local communities and the education sector. I hope in the light of the response of residents to this and other recent applications, we will now see a more considerate approach taken by developers that is in tune with the aspirations of our local communities.

And finally can I say, it would be very welcome if the request now coming from Round Hill residents to help in developing a design brief for Richmond House is given good consideration.

With best regards

Pete West

