

# **PLANNING COMMITTEE ADDENDUM Late List/Additional Representations**

**2.00PM, WEDNESDAY, 8 JUNE 2022**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

Agendas and minutes are published on the council's website [www.brighton-hove.gov.uk](http://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 No.
6	<b>TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS</b>	<b>1 - 4</b>
I	BH2022/01015 - Hove Town Hall, Ground Floor Front, Church Road, Hove, BN3 4AH - Full Planning	5 - 8

## 8<sup>th</sup> June 2022 Planning Committee – Additional Representations

Item /Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
Item B, page 27.	St Catherine's Lodge	BH2022/00670	<p><b>Eleven further representations received, objecting to the scheme on the following grounds:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on the conservation area</li> <li>• Property value</li> <li>• Residential amenity</li> <li>• Noise and nuisance</li> <li>• Overdevelopment</li> <li>• Listed building</li> <li>• Design</li> <li>• Traffic</li> </ul> <p><b>One further representation received, supporting the scheme.</b></p> <p><b>Officer Response:</b> No further issues raised other than those already addressed in the Officer Report.</p>
Item F, page 102	16 Wilbury Villas, Hove	BH2021/03826	<p><b>Objections received from Ward Councillors Jackie O'Quinn and John Allcock (copies attached), raising the following concerns:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed works are overdevelopment and will create a dominating, overbearing appearance</li> <li>• The proposed three-storey extension will block a critical area of sky and sun to rear of no.18.</li> <li>• Single-storey rear extension is too large, results in loss of too much garden.</li> <li>• Loss of privacy and noise nuisance from balconies</li> <li>• Loss of light from balconies and associated screening</li> <li>• Environmental Health have not provided comments</li> <li>• The proposed works to the rear would create a cluttered appearance.</li> </ul> <p><b>Officer Response:</b></p>

Item /Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
Item F, page 102			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed works at ground floor level would not result in any significant or valuable area of biodiversity; this area is already overshadowed by the existing outrigger and has been paved over. No.16 would retain the majority of its rear garden space, and all valuable biodiversity.</li> <li>• The Environmental Health team is providing comments only when their technical expertise is essential (such as applications where land contamination is a factor), and it is not considered that this application meets the necessary criteria.</li> <li>• All other issues raised by the Councillors have been addressed within the Officer Report.</li> </ul>
Item I, Page 145	Hove Town Hall Ground Floor Front Church Road Hove BN3 4AH	BH2022/01015	<p><b>Comments from Conservation Advisory Group recommending planning permission be refused.</b></p> <p>[Note: comments were omitted from report in error]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Group agrees with the Heritage Officer's comments.</li> <li>• The drawings are poorly presented and conflict with the Design and Access Statement which illustrates the removal of several trees and shrubs but the proposed block plan shows all trees will remain.</li> <li>• The existing planting area, located between both the entrance to PLATF9RM, has been omitted from the existing block plan, and from the application. This area is where one of the proposed decking areas is to be constructed.</li> <li>• The decking and seating detract from the host building.</li> <li>• The Group regrets the proposed festoon lighting (light pollution).</li> <li>• The proposals would be harmful to the character of the conservation area.</li> </ul> <p><b>One further representation received, objecting to the scheme on the following grounds:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current use of part of Hove Town Hall is unlawful, as Platf9rm have not discharged one pre-commencement condition</li> <li>• Loss of public space</li> <li>• Loss of public seating</li> <li>• Fire safety, with regards to having timber decking adjacent to the building</li> </ul>

Item /Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
Item I, Page 145			<p><b>Eighteen further representations received, supporting the scheme on the following grounds:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improvement to visual amenity</li> <li>- The existing space is underused and not attracting people to the area nor supporting commercial activity.</li> <li>- The proposed development would encourage use of the square as a community hub.</li> <li>- The proposed development would improve the facilities of PLATF9RM</li> </ul> <p><b>Officer Response:</b></p> <p>The reported 'unlawful' use of part of Hove Town Hall as the business known as PLATF9RM has been forwarded to the Enforcement Team for further investigation. No further action is considered to be required with regards to this planning application. The erection of decking is considered on its own planning merits and the lawful status of PLATF9RM is not a determinative factor.</p> <p>The proposed development would result in the loss of an insignificant area of public space immediately next to the building; it is not considered that the viability of the square as a public space would be significantly impacted upon.</p> <p>The proposed development does not include the removal of any public seating. The two areas of decking do not displace any public seating. Although the submitted drawings do erroneously omit one or more items of street furniture, this is not determinative with regards to the erection of the areas of decking. As mentioned in the Officer's Report, the proposed use of the square for events is not considered to constitute development and is not under consideration.</p> <p>Fire Safety is not a planning matter, but it is noted that wooden decking is by no means an unusual feature next to buildings. In the event planning permission is granted, the development would be required to be constructed in accordance with Building Regulations.</p>



## **BH2021/03826 – 16 Wilbury Villas**

- **Alterations and extensions to existing building comprising 6 flats incorporating layout changes, front and rear extensions, rear balcony and roof terraces, rear dormer and new lightwells.**
- **Alterations to fenestration.**
- **New boundary wall, metal gates, planting, bin and cycle storage.**
- **Render rear and side elevations. | 16 Wilbury Villas Hove BN3 6GD**

I am objecting to application **BH2021/03826**.

Proposals to extend 16 Wilbury Villas to the rear of the building have been dismissed as having little relevance as it will not impact on the street scene. This is not the case. If the plans are realised the changes to the back of the building will impact significantly on residents.

This large extension will overshadow the surrounding area. The properties existing outrigger is already a substantial and further extension will reduce light to the garden of the basement flat and other flats at number 18.

The basement extension and the creation of terraces and balconies in addition to the planned three-storey extension to the outrigger are an over-development of this building.

Plans to extend the basement flat into the garden of the property are also considerable, requiring lightwells. The rear gardens of these properties contribute to the character, appearance of the area and biodiversity. Reducing the size of the extension would improve the shared garden and contribute to reducing the overdevelopment of number 16.

Three terraces are proposed in addition to the outrigger:

- One for the basement flat;
- One for the ground floor flat.
- One for the top flat, and
- One balcony on the first floor flat.

The terrace on the ground floor and the balcony of the first-floor overlook flats at number 18 and are located close to bedrooms in those flats.

This causes overlooking and loss of privacy and high potential for noise and disturbance.

The balconies and the 'screens' that are being introduced, will also add to light loss from the proposed extension of the outrigger, with specific impact on the basement flat at number 18.

Environmental Health has not assessed noise impact as apparently they are too busy to do so. The risk of noise is therefore important to consider pro actively in design.

These plans do not align with City Plan Part 1 and the Council's Supplemental Planning Document which relates to extensions and alterations that places importance on neighbour's private amenity and their rights regarding proposed works to an adjoining property.

In summary this planned development would have an adverse impact on neighbouring residents regarding their:

- privacy,
- loss of daylight,

- negative effect on their outlook, and
- potential for noise and disturbance that would come from the terraces and balcony proposed at 16 Wilbury Villas.

I would respectfully ask the committee to refuse this application and ask for an amended plan to be drawn up and submitted.

**Cllr John Allcock**

**Goldsmid Ward**

1<sup>st</sup> June 2022

Dear officer,

**Re: BH2021/03826 | Alterations and extensions to existing building comprising 6 flats incorporating layout changes, front and rear extensions, rear balcony and roof terraces, rear dormer and new lightwells. Alterations to fenestration. New boundary wall, metal gates, planting, bin and cycle storage. Render rear and side elevations. | 16 Wilbury Villas Hove BN3 6GD**

I am writing to object to the above application on behalf of local residents who have expressed their concerns to me. I know this road well and it is one of the most pleasant tree-lined roads in the ward. It is a mixture of flats and family occupied houses. I have paid a site visit to the property to gain an understanding of how this application will work in practice. I was concerned about the impact it will have on neighbouring residents regarding their privacy, their loss of daylight, the negative effect on their outlook, and the noise and disturbance that would come from the terraces and balcony proposed at no 16.

### **Extensions**

The proposal to make alterations and to extend the existing building will mainly affect the back of the building and this has thus been dismissed as of no relevance as it will not affect the street scene. However, it is the changes to the back of the building that most affect the residents living at no 18 and no 20. The significant 3 storey extension to the large outrigger at the back of the building, added to the significant extension of the basement and the creation of terraces and balconies are very much an over-development of this building, and it will thus dominate its surrounding area with its bulk and overbearing nature. The outrigger is already a substantial element of no 16 and to extend it further will block a critical area of sky and sun to the garden of the basement flat at no 18 and also to the other flats at no 18.

The basement flat of no 16 is being extended out to a significant degree – so much so that lightwells are needed to prevent the flat from dark and gloomy. It would be a welcome improvement if the plans for the basement were scaled back as the area of shared space in the garden at no 16 would benefit from this and it would also help in the reduction of the overdevelopment of the building.

### **Terraces and balcony – light and noise**

Three terraces are proposed, one for the basement flat, one for the ground floor flat and one for the top flat (which I understand will not be used), with a balcony on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor flat. The terrace on the ground floor and the balcony of the 1<sup>st</sup> floor overlook flats at no 16 and are located right next to bedrooms in those flats. There will be overlooking and loss of privacy and there will also be noise and disturbance. It has been argued that this is no more noise than from a garden, but there is already shared garden space at no 16

and thus the terrace and balcony are add-ons, and one wouldn't normally have a 'garden' next to bedrooms on the higher storeys of a property.

Light is already being lost from the extension of the outrigger and will suffer a further loss from the balconies and the 'screens' that are being introduced, once again this will particularly impact on the basement flat at no 18.

Environmental Health has not looked at the noise impact as I understand they are too busy at present. They have told the residents that they can go to Environmental Health if there do prove to be noise issues after the flats are built and occupied. This is just not good enough and noise needs to be considered by the committee.

There appears to be little adherence to the City Plan Part 1 and Brighton and Hove's Supplemental Planning Document which relates to extensions and alterations where much emphasis is placed on neighbour's private amenity and their rights regarding proposed works to an adjoining property. After looking at the backs of no 16 and no 18 as they are presently it can be argued that the proposed plans would create a very cluttered and overdeveloped appearance.

I would ask that the committee refuse this application and ask for an amended plan to be drawn up and submitted.

Kind regards

Jackie O'Quinn

Goldsmid Ward Councillor.