



**Brighton & Hove
City Council**

PLANNING COMMITTEE ADDENDUM

2.00PM, WEDNESDAY, 3 JUNE 2015

THE RONUK HALL, PORTSLADE TOWN HALL

ADDENDUM

ITEM

Page

Additional Representations

3rd June 2015 Planning Committee – Additional Representations

Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
13	The Brighton Wheel, Upper Esplanade, Daltons Bastion, Madeira Drive, Brighton	BH2015/00513	<p>Tourism: As has been stated, there is no way of verifying the figures of attendance provided by the Wheel, and tracking individual attractions is not something the Council does. The latest visitor survey in the summer of 2014 showed that of the 946 visitors interviewed, 28 said they visited the Wheel (equating to roughly 2.9%). In 2013 there were approx 11 million visitors to the City and 2.9% of these equates to 319,000 people. This is however a fairly inaccurate way of making assumptions based on under 1000 people being surveyed and many factors influence these numbers such as seasonality, weather, capacity of Wheel, price point etc. So, based on the applicant's year 2 figures for the wheel (180,000) divided by 365 days= 493 divided by 8 hours a day = 61 approx per hour.</p> <p>Officer response: Noted. The issue of visitor numbers is covered in the report. These (albeit very rough) figures would back up the assumption that 180,000 visitors per year may not be unrealistic. In the absence of robust evidence to suggest otherwise it is reasonable to accept the applicant's figures.</p> <p>Kingscliffe Society: Add to their comments to further emphasise that s73 (2) (b) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 specifically prevents re-application of a temporary nature and points towards the necessity of its conversion to an application for permanent use if the proposal has a long term validity as a planning gain. They also state that para5.9 Historic England's comment would naturally lead to a refusal if National Policy, T&CPA Section 73 paragraph (2) (b) and Local Policy were followed plus paragraph 5.22 Heritage (Local) would also point to a refusal.</p> <p>Officer response: The issue of why a further temporary permission is considered acceptable is covered in the report. The NPPF guidance on this is in line with the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. S73 of the 1990 Act allows the granting of permission with conditions differing from those attached to the original permission and that is what has been applied for in this case. The section does not prevent the grant of a further temporary permission. The Heritage Team and Heritage England are consultees and the Council is not obliged to follow their views if it is felt the proposal complies with the Development Plan or there are material considerations to justify otherwise. The merits of the proposal and why it is considered to have an acceptable visual impact, and preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, are covered in the report.</p>

43	68 Davigdor Road, Hove	BH2015/00439	<p>A further representation has been received from 70 Davigdor Road raising two additional matters not previously recorded in the officer report. The objector has submitted estate agent details to indicate that the first floor flat was marketed as a 3 bed unit. The second matter relates to the change in Ward Councillor.</p> <p>Officer response: The applicant has submitted several pieces of evidence which are considered to demonstrate use of the front room as the fourth bedroom. These include estate agents details indicating that the flat has been previously marketed as a four bed flat; floor plans submitted as part of other approved planning applications at nos. 66 and 76 Davigdor Road with the same layout as the application site (ref: BH2010/02349 and BH2010/00031); and, photographic evidence which indicates original fixtures in place on the fourth bedroom. The first floor flat is therefore considered to be a four bed unit and the new evidence submitted by the objector is not considered to outweigh the evidence already before the Local Planning Authority. Therefore the recommendation is unchanged.</p> <p>The previous Ward Councillor's objection is reproduced in full on the agenda and the matters raised in this representation have been addressed in the officer report.</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).