

PLANNING COMMITTEE ADDENDUM 1

2.00PM, WEDNESDAY, 8 JULY 2020

Agendas and minutes are published on the council's website www.brighton-hove.gov.uk. Agendas are available to view five working days prior to the meeting date.

Electronic agendas can also be accessed through our meetings app available through [ModernGov: iOS/Windows/Android](#)

This agenda and all accompanying reports are printed on recycled paper

ADDENDUM

ITEM

Page

Late/Additional Representations List and additional Member Letters

8th July 2020 Planning Committee – Additional Representations

Item	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
A	19-24 Melbourne Street Brighton	BH2019/01820	<p>1. Correction - Paragraph 5.3 of the report should read – 43 (forty-three) objections NOT 49 objections were received against the proposed development between 11th April to the 4th June.</p> <p>2. Late representations</p> <p>3 (three) late letters of <u>objection</u> have been received after the 11th June 2020 on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in footfall • Additional traffic • Inappropriate height • Too close to boundary • overdevelopment • Overshadowing • Restriction of view <p>1 (one) late letter of <u>support</u> have been received after the 11th of June 2020 on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A positive and genuinely inclusive community service • Great hub • A city jewel • Regenerate the whole part of the community <p>3. A car club letter from Enterprise has been submitted detailing the agreement with the applicant and the provision of a car club for the proposed 83 co-living units.</p>

→

4. Transport Comments (5th response) following revisions are as follows:

Since our last response, dated 26th May 2020, the applicant has submitted revised plans including a ground floor plan and basement plan to address the reasons for refusal. Having reviewed the additional information submitted we have the following comments.

Cycle parking

The previous scheme raised several issues in relation to the quantum and design of cycle parking spaces. A total of 60 spaces were previously proposed which was an under provision of 12 spaces. In accordance with SPD14 this development is required to provide 9 spaces for the office use (7 long stay and 2 visitor) and 63 for residential use (55 long stay and 8 visitor spaces). This would equate to a total of 72 (70 long stay and 10 visitor) spaces. The revised proposals include 72 spaces in the basement and 4 visitor spaces on the ground floor. Whilst the proposals do include an element of visitor parking, the quantum does not meet the minimum standards for visitor parking and would therefore still require the basement store to be used by residents, visitors and/or commercial users, which raises significant security concerns.

For the visitor spaces on the ground floor, 1 of the spaces is too close to the building and therefore this would only allow for 3 cycle spaces. The applicant has suggested that 8 spaces could be accommodated but may require some widening of the pavement or setting back of the wall closer to the stairs. We would require designs to be submitted for the 8 space arrangement before we are able to comment further. However, we would not wish to constrain the carriageway width any more than necessary as any resultant pinch point could prejudice a future highway scheme, for example implementation of a contraflow cycle lane.

The revised basement plan that has now been submitted shows 72 cycle parking spaces which is an increase of 12 spaces compared to the previous proposal. Notwithstanding this, the increase in the provision of cycle spaces has resulted in

			<p>the basement store appearing more cramped and exacerbates several of the previous concerns raised including the size of the lifts/ lobby areas and the narrow widths of the corridors as it would result in more people using these areas. Additionally, high level locker areas appear to have been proposed in the cycle store. It is unclear how high these lockers would be and concern is raised over how accessible these would be with cycle stands below. Furthermore, if they are too high people may not be able to use them and if too low there is the risk of people hitting their heads. For the disabled cycle spaces, it seems very unlikely that they would be able to reach the lockers at a high level.</p> <p>As such, in light of the above we will be upholding our recommendation for refusal on cycle parking quantum and related design issues.</p> <p><i>Overspill parking</i></p> <p>In our previous response, we outlined that the development has the potential to result in an overspill parking of 17-20 vehicles. It was suggested that car club could be explored as a potential to mitigate any overspill parking. Whilst we welcome this commitment, we would need to see a letter from the car club operator confirming their willingness to provide vehicles in this location. This has not been provided. It should also be noted that the predicted overspill would be from the employment use and visitor spaces and therefore would not necessarily be effective in mitigating this overspill. Consequently, we would still consider there to be a shortfall. Therefore, whilst securing a car club bay would be an improvement, we would still be recommending refusal on parking overspill and amenity issues.</p> <p>5. Applicants response to above transport comments:</p> <p><i>“The team has worked closely with officers over the past months to address the concerns raised by Highways, including provision of parking surveys and testing of multiple options to improve the cycle facilities and minimise the risk of overspill parking. Officers agree that on a very constrained allocated site the scheme presented offers a good balance between transport matters, and the quality and</i></p>
--	--	--	--

			<p><i>quantity of residential and employment spaces.</i></p> <p><i>In summary:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>The likelihood of overspill car parking is minimal:</i><ul style="list-style-type: none">- <i>This is a car-free development in a highly sustainable location, with good access to public transport on Lewis Road and amenities within a very short walk.</i>- <i>Residents and co-workers will not be able to obtain parking permits.</i>- <i>2 car-club spaces on Melbourne Street itself, with a s106 to secure the offer of membership to residents.</i>- <i>The risk is reduced further by the unusual nature of the development, i.e. all residents will have the right to use the co-working space, thereby reducing vehicle trip numbers.</i>• <i>The team has worked extensively with officer to provide a compelling offer to encourage cycling:</i><ul style="list-style-type: none">- <i>72 cycle spaces within the basement store and a further 3 to the front of the building at ground level. This is more than required by policy. Several options have been tested for accommodating more spaces at ground floor level, but officers concluded that the trade-off with employment space was not preferred.</i>- <i>The cycle store doors are located directly in front of the two lifts and cycles can access the store without using corridors (cyclists can access the building through the main entrance directly into the lifts, and from the lifts through a single set of double doors to the store). Additionally, two sets of stairs can be used to bring bikes from the street to cycle store.</i>- <i>In a post Covid-19 world, people are likely to work more flexibly between home, co-working space and traditional office. The growth in e-scooters (rental scooters have now become legal on the roads) will add an additional sustainable option.</i> <p><i>In conclusion, the quantity and quality of cycle parking, measures to reduce car use and framework Travel Plan makes the development highly sustainable and maximises the potential uptake of sustainable forms of transport”.</i></p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>6. Travel plan to be secured by Section 106 Agreement: A Travel Plan is proposed to be secured by section 106 legal agreement rather than by condition 19 as initially proposed. The Travel Plan will include a residential and commercial travel plan package. Including the following financial incentives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • interest-free loans to employees for the purchase of bus and rail season tickets and bicycle purchase • Providing residents with 1 or more years of free or heavily subsidised tickets/memberships local public and shared transport services • ≥£150 to go towards the cost of purchasing a bicycle 																																																				
B	295-305 Portland Road	BH2018/01622	<p>List of plans for Condition 1.</p> <p><u>Conditions:</u></p> <p>1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings listed below.</p> <p>Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Plan Type</th> <th>Reference</th> <th>Version</th> <th>Date Received</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Block Plan</td> <td>A.005</td> <td></td> <td>17 June 2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Location Plan</td> <td>A.001</td> <td></td> <td>5 July 2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed Drawing</td> <td>D.001</td> <td>C</td> <td>2 May 2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed Drawing</td> <td>D.02</td> <td>D</td> <td>2 May 2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed Drawing</td> <td>D.003</td> <td>B</td> <td>2 May 2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed Drawing</td> <td>D.004</td> <td>B</td> <td>2 May 2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed Drawing</td> <td>D.005</td> <td>B</td> <td>2 May 2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed Drawing</td> <td>D.008</td> <td>B</td> <td>2 May 2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed Drawing</td> <td>D.09</td> <td>B</td> <td>17 June 2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed Drawing</td> <td>D.10</td> <td>B</td> <td>17 June 2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed Drawing</td> <td>D.11</td> <td>C</td> <td>20 March 2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed Drawing</td> <td>D.14</td> <td>B</td> <td>18 January 2019</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received	Block Plan	A.005		17 June 2020	Location Plan	A.001		5 July 2020	Proposed Drawing	D.001	C	2 May 2020	Proposed Drawing	D.02	D	2 May 2020	Proposed Drawing	D.003	B	2 May 2020	Proposed Drawing	D.004	B	2 May 2020	Proposed Drawing	D.005	B	2 May 2020	Proposed Drawing	D.008	B	2 May 2020	Proposed Drawing	D.09	B	17 June 2020	Proposed Drawing	D.10	B	17 June 2020	Proposed Drawing	D.11	C	20 March 2020	Proposed Drawing	D.14	B	18 January 2019
Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received																																																				
Block Plan	A.005		17 June 2020																																																				
Location Plan	A.001		5 July 2020																																																				
Proposed Drawing	D.001	C	2 May 2020																																																				
Proposed Drawing	D.02	D	2 May 2020																																																				
Proposed Drawing	D.003	B	2 May 2020																																																				
Proposed Drawing	D.004	B	2 May 2020																																																				
Proposed Drawing	D.005	B	2 May 2020																																																				
Proposed Drawing	D.008	B	2 May 2020																																																				
Proposed Drawing	D.09	B	17 June 2020																																																				
Proposed Drawing	D.10	B	17 June 2020																																																				
Proposed Drawing	D.11	C	20 March 2020																																																				
Proposed Drawing	D.14	B	18 January 2019																																																				

			<p>Additional representations received.</p> <p>Two further letters of <u>objection</u> and one letter of <u>support</u> have been received.</p> <p>The issues that have been raised have been considered fully in the report.</p>
H	Girton House, 193 Kingsway, Hove	BH2020/01101	<p>1. Insert comment following section 4.1 of the report from Conservation Advisory Group: The Group recommends APPROVAL with 9 votes for approval, 1 vote for refusal and 2 abstentions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some concern was expressed about the outriggers being of different heights and the height of the proposed outrigger in relation to the host building and to the houses in Walsingham Road, the proportions of the proposed windows and the position of a west facing dormer. <p>2. The applicant has provided a statement in support of their application. The following points are raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant has spent considerable time reviewing the previous refusal to respond to the reasons for refusal. • Key change is the removal of one flat. • Removal of 2nd flat improves outlook and sense of enclosure for existing residents over the previous scheme. • Addition of windows improves visual impact by breaking up unrelieved areas of masonry. • Additional windows also improves living conditions for future occupiers of the new flat. • There is no objection from Heritage Team • The Council is in need of housing.

James Ing

From: Steph Powell
Sent: 24 July 2019 22:42
To: Mick Anson; Planning Applications; Paul Vidler
Cc: Elaine Hills; David Gibson
Subject: Objection: RE: BH2019/01820

Switch-MessageId: 41c307bc09e24405b4eb5a71d3f6b7be

Dear Mick Anson and the Planning Dept,

RE: BH2019/01820 19-24 Melbourne Street Brighton BN2 3LH, Hanover & Elm Grove Ward

As Ward Councillor, I write to object in the strongest possible terms, to the proposed plan as set out for the above development in the above application. Whilst I support redevelopment for this area, this current plan is NOT the solution.

I have visited the site along with fellow ward councillors, and have met with the developers. I have also, more importantly, responded to some of the residents who live in the opposite Viaduct Lofts.

I therefore object for the following reasons:

1. The height of the development is totally wrong for such a narrow and short street. As such it will impact on the privacy on local residents who live opposite, who have sent me photos to prove how near this development will be to them.
2. Being so high, it will also impact on Viaduct Loft's light. The current buildings on the site are much lower, and neighbours opposite can currently see the trees behind the garages, and enjoy natural light, both of which will be lost if this proposal goes ahead.
3. All the windows of this proposed development face south, and will look directly into Viaduct Lofts: into bedrooms, kitchens and living spaces, all in close proximity.
4. Worryingly, this proposed build is set to attract high-density, short-term tenants, on an extortionate rent of (I believe) about £1000 per month, per unit. This will create a transient population in the area. The city desperately needs more affordable, and more social housing. This is what local residents in my ward of Hanover and Elm Grove want. I have not seen any evidence of need in this ward, and in particular in this street, for short-term lets on this scale.
5. There will be an increase of street noise and traffic, and this will mean a significant loss of amenities for local residents in Melbourne Street, which is a busy, narrow, and one-way residential road.
6. There is no mention of designated green spaces for nature in the proposal, therefore Melbourne Street will simply become a concrete jungle.

If this application is not refused by officers, then I would like the application to be heard at committee, where I can attend and voice my objection in person.

Thanks and best wishes,

Cllr Steph Powell
Green Party Councillor
Hanover & Elm Grove

E: steph.powell@brighton-hove.gov.uk

M: 07795335967

T: @steffingtonheg

Drop-in ward surgery every 2nd Saturday of the month, 10.15-11.15am, at Elm Grove Primary School

Green Group Opposition Spokesperson on the Neighbourhoods, Inclusion, Communities & Equalities Committee

Member: Health, Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Green Group lead on the East Sussex Fire Authority



PLANNING COMMITTEE LIST
COUNCILLOR REPRESENTATION

Cllr. Lizzie Deane
BH2020/00440 - 26 Gloucester Road

20th March 2020:

I write in my capacity of ward councillor in support of local residents and the North Laine Community Association in their objection to this planning application.

I would request that this application is refused under delegated powers and that, should officers be minded to grant, it comes before Planning Committee for consideration by elected members.

