



**Brighton & Hove
City Council**

PLANNING COMMITTEE ADDENDUM

2.00PM, WEDNESDAY, 4 JUNE 2014

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

ADDENDUM

| ITEM | | Page |
|------|---|-------|
| 7. | TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS | 1 - 6 |

4th June 2014 Planning Committee – Additional Representations

| Page | Site Address | Application No. | Comment |
|------|---|-----------------|--|
| 23 | Hove Park Depot The Droveaway, Hove | BH2014/00922 | <p>Correction: Page 44: ‘Transport contribution of £202,800’ is corrected to read ‘Transport contribution of ‘£150,000’.</p> <p>A representation has been received from ‘saveHOVE’ <u>objecting</u> to the application on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed bilingual school for 630 children plus 50+ staff amounts to a massive overdevelopment • A development brief should be prepared which should allocate the site for the following options: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The site should be incorporated into the park and made public rather than being developed. b) Part or all of site should be incorporated to the Engineerium site. c) The site should be utilised for an expansion of City Park. • There is a need for a Condition which restricts school activity to within the nursery and which disallows school activity to take place within the park which is public amenity space. • Noise from plant within the City Park site would disturb and possibly frighten children. • Putting a school of 630 children beside City Park is unfair and would interfere with the smooth operation of business in the park. • The school could make operation of the Engineerium as a museum difficult. Activity associated with the school adjacent to the Engineerium museum and facility would create disturbance and reduce the viability of the Museum and its future. |

- The Drove way cannot take proposed school use. Pressure would inevitably build for a re-opening of vehicle access across Hove Park and this must not be allowed or encouraged.
- Pressure of parking by parents on Goldstone Crescent residents would be unreasonable. Parents will also use Orchard Road, Orchard Gardens, Orchard Ave, Park View Road, and indeed Neville Road too.
- Children may harm the Listed boundary wall of the site.
- The setting of the Engineerium would be harmed. The proposed school violates HE6 as it absolutely does not and cannot preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Engineerium Conservation Area.
- The proposed development and associated activity may deter birds.
- The design of the proposed building is not acceptable. It is redolent of a rundown 1960's inner city council estate area and not remotely fitting to sit so visibly within Hove Park or beside the Listed Engineerium within the Engineerium Conservation Area.

Officer response: The majority of the above points are addressed in the committee report. There is no proposal for the school to use the public park for school activities on a regular basis. It is not considered that the proposed school use would compromise the functioning of City Park or the Engineerium. It is not considered that noise from plant at City Park would cause significant harm to pupils of the proposed school. It is considered unlikely that children would cause physical harm to the listed boundary wall.

A representation has been received from no. **4 Queen Victoria Avenue Hove** objecting to the application for the following reasons:

- The proposed development will cause additional traffic and parking.
- There is no suitable play area proposed for the pupils of the school.

| | | | |
|----|---------------------------------------|--------------|---|
| | | | <p>Officer response: These points are addressed in the committee report.</p> <p>A representation has been received from no. 59 Vale Avenue Brighton <u>supporting</u> the application.</p> |
| 59 | City College, Wilson Avenue, Brighton | BH2014/00459 | <p>A BREEAM pre-assessment report has been submitted which indicates a score of 'Excellent' with 51.8% in the energy section and 77.7% in the water section. SPD8 'Sustainable Buildings' requires schemes of this size to meet a rating of 'Excellent' with a minimum of 60% in both the energy and water sections. The applicant has been asked for provide further justification regarding why 60% in the energy section cannot be achieved.</p> <p>A Rainwater Harvesting and Grey Water Feasibility Report has been submitted. The applicant is proposing rainwater harvesting which would be collected from the Proposed Construction Skills Centre, stored in an underground tank and then pumped to an elevated cistern and fed by gravity to the point of use (W.Cs in the new Construction Skills Centre). The feasibility report discounts grey water recycling due to high maintenance and treatment costs and high energy consumption.</p> <p>The Council's Sustainability Officer recommends a post construction condition requiring evidence that the rainwater recycling system has been installed.</p> <p>Soakways are also proposed and the Council's Flood Risk Engineer has commented that the proposed surface water drainage details are acceptable.</p> <p>Therefore it is proposed to amend condition 16 to the wording below: 16) Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, the surface water drainage system shall be fully installed in accordance with the details contained within the Flood Risk Assessment July 2013 and Drainage Layout Plan referenced Dr01 which were received on the 12 February 2014. Reason: <i>To ensure the existing infrastructure can facilitate the development and to reduce the risk of flooding and to comply with policies SU3 and SU15 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.</i></p> <p>It is also proposed to add a new condition 30 specifically regarding the installation of</p> |

| | | | |
|----|---|--------------|---|
| | | | <p>the rainwater harvesting system:</p> <p>30) Prior to the Construction Skills Centre being first occupied, details and evidence regarding the installation of the rainwater harvesting system detailed within the Rainwater Harvesting & Grey Water Recycling Systems Feasibility Study received on the 27 May 2014, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Rainwater Harvesting System shall be implemented fully in accordance with the approved details prior to the Construction Skills Centre first being brought into use and unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority shall be retained as such thereafter.</p> <p>Reason: to ensure that the Rainwater Harvesting System is installed and to comply with policies SU2, SU3 and SU15 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.</p> |
| 95 | 18, 24 28 & 30 Kingsthorpe Road, Hove | BH2013/01646 | <p>Correction: Page 95: 'Outline application all matters reserved' is corrected to read "Outline application all matters reserved other than scale".</p> <p>Page 104: Condition 1 is amended to read:</p> <p>The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission or two years from the approval of the last of the reserved matters as defined in condition 9 below, whichever is the later.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the Local Planning Authority retains the right to review unimplemented permissions.</p> <p>Condition 2 is amended to read:</p> <p>The proposed development shall not commence until a scheme for the details of the provision of 10 units of affordable housing of the 26 units proposed (or an equivalent proportion should a different number of units be proposed), as part of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The affordable housing shall be provided in accordance with the approved scheme which shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the timing of the construction of the affordable housing and its phasing in relation to the occupancy of the market housing; ii. the tenure, mix and location of the affordable units; iii. the arrangements for the transfer of the affordable housing to an affordable |

| | | | |
|-----|--|--------------|---|
| | | | <p>housing provider;</p> <p>iv. the arrangements to ensure that the affordable housing remains as affordable housing for both first and subsequent occupiers of the affordable housing; and</p> <p>v. the occupancy criteria.</p> <p>For the purposes of this condition 'affordable housing' has the meaning ascribed to it by the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the provision and retention of an appropriate amount of affordable housing in accordance with policy HO2 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.</p> <p>Page 109: Condition 25 is amended to read:</p> <p>No development shall commence until full details of the construction programme have been submitted and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The programme shall specify that the commercial (Class B1) element shall be built to shell and core prior to occupation of the residential units. The scheme shall be implemented fully in accordance with the agreed details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: So as to ensure the implementation of the entire scheme and to comply with policies TR1, TR2, TR4, TR7, TR14, TR18, TR19, SU2, QD1, QD2, QD3, QD4, QD5, QD6, QD15, QD16, HO2, HO3, HO4, HO5, HO6 and HO13 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and CP3 of the Brighton & Hove Submission City Plan Part One.</p> |
| 113 | Anston House, 137-139 Preston Road, Brighton | BH2014/00596 | <p>Six (6) additional representations have been received:</p> <p>42 Dyke Road Drive <u>objects</u> on the basis that the application would set a precedent for further buildings in the area that would have a similarly detrimental impact on the amenities of properties along Dyke Road Drive by way of overlooking and loss of light.</p> <p>Flat 10 Preston Mansions, Preston Park Avenue and Unknown address <u>object</u> to the use of black cladding.</p> <p>28 Dyke Road Drive and 5 Cornwall Gardens <u>comment</u> that the quality of balcony materials and finishes should be high and the cladding should complement the area. The use of obscure glazing to the rear and balcony screens is welcomed.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>Brighton Society and the Preston & Patcham Society <u>comment</u> that cladding samples should be tested onsite and agreed by condition.</p> <p>Officer response: The application has been previously amended to remove the black cladding originally proposed and to introduce measures to minimise overlooking from the existing building.</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).