



**Brighton & Hove
City Council**

PLANNING COMMITTEE ADDENDUM

2.00PM, WEDNESDAY, 8 MARCH 2017

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL, NORTON ROAD,
HOVE, BN3 3BQ**

ADDENDUM

ITEM		Page
121	TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS	1 - 4
C	BH2016/05893 - Medina House, 9 Kings Esplanade, Hove - Full Planning Demolition of existing building and erection of a single residential dwelling (C3) with associated hard and soft landscaping. RECOMMENDATION – MINDED TO GRANT	5 - 6
123	INFORMATION ON PRE APPLICATION PRESENTATIONS AND REQUESTS	7 - 8

8th March 2017 Planning Committee – Additional Representations

Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
1	113 Trafalgar Road, Portslade	BH2016/01784	<p>Correction of site address to 113-115 Trafalgar Road, Portslade</p> <p>Amend Condition 2 to read: 2. The applicant has not committed to complying with the requested developer contributions, towards affordable housing, open space and indoor sport, sustainable transport, and the Council's local employment scheme, and has not justified this through a financial viability assessment of the scheme, contrary to Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One policies SA6, CP2, CP7, CP9, CP16 <u>and CP20</u>.</p>
17	23A Third Avenue, Hove	BH2016/05687	Application has been withdrawn by the applicant.
31	Medina House, 9 Kings Esplanade, Hove	BH2016/05893	<p>Following re-consultation of the revised plans and documents received on 9th and 13th February 2017 Twenty One (21) further representations of <u>objection</u> have been received. Additional points of objection raised are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unable to determine precisely what the amendments are, • Loss of daylight/sunlight, overshadowing, loss of privacy and overlooking to neighbouring properties. Proposal does not comply with BRE Guidelines, • Dismissal by developer of some objections due to lack of proximity to site, • Damage/disturbance/disruption to neighbouring properties/local residents during demolition/construction, • Where is the evidence to support proposed ground floor height increase due to 'wave overtopping', height should be challenged in an effort to yield more height reduction, • Pavement outside development is not part of the Freehold of the developer, pavement material should match existing, • Impacts on local roads traffic flow and pedestrian safety from demolition/construction vehicles Amended height remains too high and amendment is an inadequate reduction, the light gained will not be noticeable, • The extension is not beneficial to the area and gives no cultural/historical reference to the original building,

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Putting Medina House on a 'platform' would detract for the character of the building, • Allowing demolition sets a dangerous precedent • Loss of existing Medina House which is a historic building. Replacement building is higher so affects the proportions of the front elevation, which affects the ascetics and look so will look different and be out of place, • Materials should be in keeping with existing building especially on front elevation. Colour of brick should be decided prior to application being determined as is an essential part of proposal, • Proposal not sympathetic to area, • Impact on skyline, • Parking concerns. Object to any proposal to alter or re-site parking spaces in Sussex Road, • Eastern wing could be reduced in height and scale with accommodation moved into main section of dwelling, • Previous owner has allowed building to become dilapidated through misuse and neglect. Demolition has previously been refused, viability of renovation should be considered by an independent body before any permission for demolition approved, • Proposal does not accord with 2013 Planning Brief or planning policies, • Disappointed that the heritage Community is now supporting the build despite the only change being a small reduction in height, • Amendments are inadequate, represent a purely cosmetic change and do not address original concerns, <p>Following re-consultation of the revised plans and documents received on 9th and 13th February 2017 Six (6) further representations of <u>support</u> have been received for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no negative reasons not to support the application, • It will enhance/improve the area which has been an eyesore for many years, • Impressed with proposed plans, will be of high quality design, • Existing building not worth retaining. Proposal will retain the character of Medina House while giving it a modern feel and will be an asset and will show strong respect to the site history, • The Texaco development was approved despite significant overshadowing to
--	--	--	---

			<p>neighbouring properties so see no reason to delay consent for a project which retains the architectural character of the bathhouse using sympathetic materials.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst overall support the application, this development , Rocco homes and King Alfred should have strictly timelines for implementation to avoid creating 5+ years of continual disruption to this small neighbourhood, <p>Following re-consultation of the revised plans and documents received on 9th and 13th February 2017 one (1) further representations of <u>comment</u> has been received for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 5.25 of the committee report does not consider impact on light levels to the rear patio areas of properties on Victoria Cottages, • Requests Committee Members visit the twitten access to the rear of properties on Sussex Road and Victoria Cottages and no. 13 Sussex Road in order to assess impacts upon these neighbouring properties, • The white brick is crucial to realisation of the design. Morrocco's is rendered and painted cream/white as are the Sussex Road dwellings. Nothing in the area exists to justify red brick being used. Same brick is used on the Magistrates Court Building in Lansdowne Road, • The S106 refers only to footpath improvements, there is supposed to be a public streetlight attached to the rear area of Medina House which should also go in the S106, • Local residents should have input into conditions, • Loss of light to neighbouring properties, <p>Councillor Wealls: Further <u>objection</u>. Copy attached.</p> <p>Officer comment: Matters regarding damage to neighbouring properties during demolition/construction are beyond the remit of planning controls. Point 5.25 of the committee report refers to heritage issues only and therefore does not mention impact of the proposal upon levels of light to neighbouring properties. The other material planning considerations raised are covered in the committee report.</p>
--	--	--	--

173	Russell House, Russell Mews, Brighton	BH2016/05662	<p>Additional condition:</p> <p>6. Prior to first occupation of the building, the central panes of the bay windows in the south elevation of the development hereby permitted shall be obscure glazed and non-opening, unless the parts of the window/s which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed, and thereafter permanently retained as such.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the privacy of the occupiers of the adjoining property and to comply with policies QD14 and QD27 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.</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).

Planning Application - BH2016/05893

Comment reference number: 1059526

I object to the Planning Application

Sender's details

Councillor Andrew Wealls
Hove Town Hall, Norton Road
BN3 3BQ

Comment

Please note my continued objection to the revised application BH2016/05893 at Medina House, King's Esplanade. I request a site visit, particularly if possible from the interior of affected properties noted below.

My initial submission was principally concerned with loss of light to properties to the rear of the proposed development, particularly the height of the rear eastern 'wing'. The revision reduces the height of this wing by 42cm, and the parapet is lowered by 32cm. The dormer is removed. This has had no meaningful impact on the reduction in light. Unfortunately the Revised Daylight and Sunlight Survey of 13th February 2017 confirms that the impact on the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) of the changes on 13 Sussex Road is so negligible as to be within margins of error. The VSC losses there remain substantial. The incorrect designation of a lounge as a LKD remains. The detailed analysis of VSC which was not provided in the 17/1/17 letter shows significant losses at; 13 Sussex Road (2 KD windows with VSD losses of over 30% and one bedroom window with a loss of 29.8%) 8 King's Esplanade (three bedrooms with losses 33-41% and an unknown use room -32.6% 3 Victoria Cottages (Conservatory -22.5%) Similarly the Daylight Analysis at the above properties shows significant losses; 13 Sussex Road (up to 21.4%) 8 King's Esplanade (bedrooms up to 30.8%) 3 Victoria Cottages (Conservatory -10%) And lastly the Revised daylight Distribution Analysis shows significant loss of amenity at these properties; 13 Sussex Road (DDA improvements are insignificant) 8 King's Esplanade (data shows negative impact is significant in all bedrooms, dining room) 3 Victoria Cottages (more modest losses at bedroom and attic room. Given the revisions to the development make no meaningful improvement to the negative on the amenity of the residents of these neighbouring properties, I remain opposed.'

Information on Pre-application Presentations and Requests 2017

Date	Address	Ward	Proposal	Update
TBC	King's House, Grand Avenue, Hove	Central Hove	Part demolition, conversion and construction of new buildings to provide 180 residential units.	
TBC	St Aubyns School, 76 High Street, Rottingdean	Rottingdean Coastal	Re-development of school campus and part of school playing field.	
7th February 2017	189 Kingsway, Hove (former Sackville Hotel)	Westbourne	Construction of 8 storey residential block.	Awaiting submission of application.
7 th February 2017	60-62 & 65 Gladstone Place, Brighton	Hanover & Elm Grove	Redevelopment to provide mixed, student and residential scheme.	Awaiting submission of application.
10 th January 2017	West Blatchington Primary School, Hangleton Way, Hove	Hangleton & Knoll	Redevelopment to provide new secondary school and junior school.	Awaiting submission of application.
13 th December 2016	Preston Barracks/Mithras House/Watts Car Park, Lewes Road, Brighton	Hollingdean & Stanmer and Moulsecoomb & Bevendean	Mixed use development comprising research laboratory, student accommodation, University teaching facilities, residential, retail and parking.	Application BH2017/00492 submitted – being validated.

NOTE: The Pre Application Presentations are not public meetings and as such are not open to members of the public. All Presentations will be held in Hove Town Hall on the date given after scheduled site visits unless otherwise stated.

11 th October 2016	Hollingbury Industrial Estate – Units 2 & 8, Crowhurst Road, Brighton	Patcham	Northern part of site - demolition of existing building & construction of a two storey car dealership building. Southern part of site – conversion into a single or a series of trade counter and/or builders merchants.	Awaiting submission of application.
13 th September 2016	Life Science Building, Sussex University	Hollingdean & Stanmer	17,000sqm teaching space and café.	Application BH2016/05810 minded to grant at Planning Committee 08/02/17.
13 th September 2016	Boots, North Street/Queen's Road, Brighton	St Peters & North Laine	Demolition of existing building and construction of new retail store.	Awaiting submission of application.
2 nd August 2016	Medina House, 9 Kings Esplanade, Hove	Central Hove	Demolition of existing building and construction of a new dwelling.	Application BH2016/05893 under consideration at Planning Committee 08/03/17.

NOTE: The Pre Application Presentations are not public meetings and as such are not open to members of the public. All Presentations will be held in Hove Town Hall on the date given after scheduled site visits unless otherwise stated.