

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

**12.30PM, WEDNESDAY, 5 OCTOBER 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.
46	TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS	1 - 10

## 5<sup>th</sup> October 2022 Planning Committee – Additional Representations

Item	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
A	Palmer And Harvey House 106-112 Davigdor Road Hove BN3 1RE	BH2021/02014	<p><u>Additional Note on Access relating to 9.27 and 9.28 of the Report</u> As set out within the report, level access to the site would be via the existing Davigdor Road site entrance, which would include a new segregated 1.2m pedestrian footpath. This would provide level access to the south of the building and onto the building entrances, cycle store and bin store. Internally, a lift would serve all floors (including the first floor wheelchair accessible units) with dimensions indicated to meet Part M of the Building Regulations. Disabled parking is proposed and indicated to serve the proposed accessible units and office space (see 9.67 of the report on Vehicle Parking). Details of disabled parking facilities are required by condition.</p> <p>Two further letters of representation from <b>Councillor John Allcock and Councillor Jackie O’Quinn</b> <u>objecting</u> to the application.</p> <p>Copies of their representations are attached to the Additional Representations List.</p> <p><u>Officer Response:</u> The issues raised in the additional objections are addressed in the officer report.</p>
C	Former Dairy, 35-39 The Droveaway	BH2022/00456	This application has been withdrawn from the agenda
D	Saltdean FC	BH2021/04508	<p><b>South Downs National Park Authority</b> <u>Final comments:</u></p> <p><u>No objections</u> - Overall concerns raised in previous SDNP responses have been taken account of and addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It has been confirmed that the application site does not include land within the National Park.</li> <li>• Viewpoints have been assessed and conclude that landscape and visual impact would not be significant as agreed by the County Landscape Architect.</li> <li>• Linear arrangements of new tree planting have been amended to be more informal.</li> </ul>

- The clubhouse glazing will have darkened glass and a canopy to minimise upward glare. The wider site will have minimal low level external lighting.
- County Ecologist satisfied that no increased light spill towards adjacent Local Wildlife Site (LWS).

Officer response: The scheme amendments have addressed the SDNP concerns which is welcomed.

**Highway Authority:** Final comments:

- Access to and around the clubhouse for mobility and visually impaired acceptable.
- Seek improvements to bridleway for users and post construction following pre-construction survey.
- Seek amendments to group of 6 informal parking spaces layout for safety reasons. Could be conditioned. Tandem parking acceptable with stewarding and could accommodate minibuses.
- Refuse collection and deliveries and servicing arrangements acceptable.
- Disabled bays acceptable. Cycle parking to south potentially isolated.

Officer response:

In response to the final comments from the Highway Authority, the applicants have confirmed that the bridleway is in private ownership and, as stated in the report, it is outside of the application red line boundary. The owner has legal responsibility for its maintenance. It would be unreasonable and disproportionate to require the club to make improvements to an asset which they have no control over and which is used by a number of public interests. The considerations in the report (para 9.50) still hold. Conditions 15 and 18 would address the comments regarding the informal parking layouts and safety.

**Environmental Protection:** No objections:

**Amendments to Conditions:**

Condition 1

List of documents and drawings added below:

<b>Plan Type</b>	<b>Reference</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Date Received</b>
Site Location Plan	XX-DR-A-01000	PO3	18 <sup>th</sup> August 2022
Proposed Site Layout	XX-DR-A-01020	P11	18th August 2022
Proposed Clubhouse Plans	ZZ-DR-A-01020	PO6	18th August 2022
Proposed Spectator Stand	ZZ-DR-A-01110	PO3	18th August 2022
Proposed Clubhouse Elevations	ZZ-DR-A-1200	PO7	18th August 2022
Tree Retention and Protection Plan	2476-ARB-DWG-002	05	18th August 2022
Landscape Masterplan Strategy	2476-LAN-DWG-001	08	18 <sup>th</sup> August 2022

Condition 8.

Add part f) to stipulate tinted or darkened glazing to be used for first floor glazing and internal pelmet or fascia.

Notwithstanding any details shown on the approved plans, no development above ground floor slab level of any part of the development hereby permitted shall take place until samples of all materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, including (where applicable):

- a) Samples/details of all brick, render and tiling (including details of the colour of render/paintwork to be used)
- b) samples of all cladding to be used, including details of their treatment to protect against weathering
- c) samples/details of all hard surfacing materials
- d) samples/details of the proposed window, door and balcony treatments

e) samples/details of all other materials to be used externally including fences, gates, walls, posts, railings and any boundary, screening or protective treatments

f) samples of darkened or tinted glazing to first floor clubhouse and internal pelmet or fascia

Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.  
Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to comply with policies QD14/HE6 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and CP12/CP15 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One.

Condition 15  
Amendments inserted for clarity and precision.

Prior to occupation, a scheme shall be submitted in writing to the satisfaction of the local planning authority showing the numbers and layout of the informal parking areas shown on the approved plans together with the installation of 900mm high timber bollards ~~posts~~ with reflective strips alongside the boundary of the Local Wildlife Site and the South Downs National Park Authority boundary. The scheme shall be implemented thereafter and retained.

Reason: In order to provide a safe parking layout and to protect and enhance the natural landscaping and ecology and the setting of the National Park and to comply with policies TR7 and QD18 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and policies SA5 of Brighton and Hove City Plan Part 1 and Submission Brighton and Hove City Plan Part 2 policies DM20; DM22; DM36 and DM37.

Condition 18

Wording amended for clarification that a single plan is required.

Within three months of the date of first occupation a Travel Plan and a Match Day Stewarding Plan for the development ~~has been~~ shall be submitted to and approved in

			<p>writing by the Local Planning Authority. The <u>Travel Plan</u> and <u>Match Day Stewarding Plan</u> shall thereafter be fully implemented in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> To ensure the promotion of safe, active and sustainable forms of travel and to minimise noise and disturbance to neighbouring residents and to comply with policies TR4 and QD27 of the Brighton &amp; Hove Local Plan, CP9 of the Brighton &amp; Hove City Plan Part One and DM20 of Brighton &amp; Hove City Plan Part Two.</p> <p><u>New Condition 30</u></p> <p>Prior to occupation of the clubhouse, the accessible toilets on both floors shall be fitted with and include provision of changing facilities including fold down tables suitable for all and shelving for equipment. The facilities shall be retained and maintained thereafter.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> To ensure inclusive, adaptable and accessible provision of suitable facilities to the clubhouse and ground for all visitors and spectators and to comply with policies CP12; CP16; CP17 of the Brighton &amp; Hove City Plan Part One.</p>
F	64, 66, 68 And 68A Old Shoreham Road	BH2022/01629	<p>An <u>objection</u> from <b>Peter Kyle MP</b> has been received raising the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overlooking</li> <li>• Impact on amenity of residents along Old Shoreham Road, Caisters Close and The Drive.</li> </ul> <p><u>Comment:</u> Matters raised have been considered in the officer report.</p>
G	55 Auckland Drive Brighton BN2 4JD	BH2022/01630	<p>Removal of condition 2: 'The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> To ensure that the Local Planning Authority retains the right to review unimplemented permissions.'</p> <p>Works have already commenced on site.</p>

I	Land Adjacent Hillside Ovingdean Road Brighton BN2 7AA	BH2022/00287	Amendment to paragraph 2.1 to read " <i>However, it is noted that four were unlawfully felled on 11 July and 21 were damaged by chainsaws.</i> "
L	9 Dyke Road Avenue, Hove, BN3 6QA	BH2022/01786	One further representation has been received <b>objecting</b> to the proposed development.  <u>Comment:</u>  No concerns have been raised that are not already covered within the Officer Report.
M	3 Sunnysdale Avenue, Brighton	BH2022/01927	Application withdrawn from Planning Committee agenda at applicant's request on 27 September in order to allow them more time to try and overcome proposed reasons for refusal.
N	Parkside Mansions 34 Preston Park Avenue	BH2022/00026	Description updated as application reference was incorrect:  Conversion of residential care home (C2) to 5no two bedroom and 1no one bedroom flats (C3), incorporating two storey rear extension, revised fenestration and associated alterations (retrospective) to address non-compliance with the plans approved in relation to planning permission <u>BH2019/02007</u> , with amendments to the parking allocation and to the red line boundary.  Amend the recommendation to <b>Minded to Grant</b> from <b>Grant</b> subject to clarification on condition 5.
O	34 Preston Park Avenue	BH2022/00027	Amend the recommendation to <b>Minded to Grant</b> from <b>Grant</b> subject to clarification on conditions 10 and 17.



## **Cllr John Allcock - Objection to BH2021/02014**

### **Palmer and Harvey House, 106-112 Davigdor Road, Hove**

Erection of eight storey building on land to rear of P&H House comprising residential flats (C3) and commercial/office floorspace (Class E) at ground floor, with associated landscaping works. Proposal is for 39 flats

#### **1. The proposed development would have an adverse effect on neighbourhood amenity.**

With 8 floors and 39 flats, the excessive height and scale of the proposed development will result in an overbearing and significant harmful impact on the neighbourhood. Location and site characteristics require a development proposal that respects the Goldsmid neighbourhood amenity, community and residents' homes.

The proposed design is poor, and height of the development is inappropriate and overbearing in relation to Montefiore hospital and Preece House. This is not in line with City Plan policies. The hospital is locally listed as a heritage asset. The Council recognise Montefiore Hospital's architectural distinction and importance to the City.

I believe City Plan policies support the principle of preserving the setting of heritage assets and amenity of public spaces.

#### **2. Access and egress from the site.**

The increased traffic from the site is a major safety concern. There are several large developments under construction in the immediate area with limited access and egress. **Reference: NPPF paragraphs 110 b) and 112 c) and City Plan policy DM33.**

#### **3. Affordable Homes**

The local authority currently has approximately 7,500 people on the housing waiting list. Decent and truly affordable housing is in desperate need in the city and a priority for Brighton and Hove City Council. This development will do nothing to contribute to addressing the shortage of housing for local people.

A policy compliant scheme should provide 16 affordable homes on this development (based on 40% of 39 units). The committee report identifies that under S106 Heads of Terms Affordable Housing on-site provision of 7 Affordable Rent Units and 3 Shared Ownership Units or as a commuted sum in lieu of onsite provision. This falls well below the number of affordable homes required.

#### **4. Local Consultation**

The developers have been not undertaken any public pre-planning consultation with residents or ward Councillors. The developer and their consultants are not local and appear to have ignored the community in developing their plans.

In my view this proposal:

- Does nothing to *'Raise the standard of architecture and design in the city.'*
- Does not achieve: *'excellence in sustainable building design and construction.'*
- Does not: *'enhance the city's built and archaeological heritage and its settings;'*  
and
- Ignores the requirement to *'Protect or enhance strategic views into, out of and within the city.'*
- Does not provide the required level of affordable housing the city desperately needs

I would respectfully ask the committee to reject this application for the reasons outlined above.

**Cllr John Allcock**

**29 October 2022**

29<sup>th</sup> September 2022

Dear officer,

I am objecting to the planning application listed below:

**BH2021/02014**

**Palmer and Harvey House, 106-112 Davigdor Road, Hove**

Erection of eight storey building on land to rear of P&H House comprising residential flats (C3) and commercial/office floorspace (Class E) at ground floor, with associated landscaping works. Proposal is for 39 flats

There have been a number of applications from Palmer and Harvey House in the last few years and there has been no attempt to consult with local residents on any of them nor have a public exhibition, as did Crest Homes and Amex regarding their applications in Lyon Close. Local residents fought against those applications, especially the Crest application but somewhat lost heart after losing as they felt that the planning laws were heavily stacked against them. It was difficult to object to some of P & H's applications as they were for permitted development. However, the present development is certainly one which is unwelcome in an area that is already being heavily overdeveloped.

At 8 storeys high the development is too high for this location as it affects the amenity of a number of residential properties nearby in a very negative way, in particular Russell House, which is to the north-east of the development. The 'mutual overlooking' between the windows and balconies of nearby residential units is deemed to be the price to pay for gaining residential units that will assist the city in adding towards the 5 year housing supply. The proposed tower block is also right next to the locally listed Montefiore Hospital and will adversely affect it as well as the locally listed Coptic church. The massing of the south-east corner of the building so close to the Montefiore Hospital is also regarded as an issue but because of iterations/amendments elsewhere it is deemed it should be accepted. The proposed tower block does not raise the standard of architecture and design in the city as it should do under City Plan Part 2. It seems to be the view that just because you can't see all of the building from the road that it doesn't matter what it looks like, not really a view one would expect from the planning department.

The units being built are 23x2no bedrooms (59%) and 16x1no bedroom (41%) so the development is heavily skewed towards smaller units. This is not an acceptable balance of accommodation as stated in planning policy, especially when one considers that according to the recent census the population of 0-4-year-olds in the city has dropped by 22% as against the national average of 7%. The main reason for this is the lack of family sized accommodation and lack of affordability. Once again, the argument presented is that 'the significant benefits of the housing units being provided outweigh this provision of smaller units – the size of the units is also only just above the recommended minimal amount.

The report talks about the various buses that serve Davigdor Road. To my knowledge there is only one, the number 7, which has been struggling significantly in the last few months and there are often long waits and then two come along together. The report mentions overspill parking, and this will be a considerable issue at all times, as the area is at saturation point. Has the parking of cars in the area related to the Coptic Church been considered as in itself it creates major problems in an area which has severely limited parking? There will be considerable amounts of cars turning into Lyon Close and P & H developments and this will make for a dangerous situation for both drivers and pedestrians.

My last point is the commercial space which it has been designated to be office space. I find this interesting as P & H received permission for Permitted development of the adjacent tower block because they stated there was no demand for office space in the area.

I would ask that the committee please Refuse this application as it has so little merit to it.

Regards

Jackie O'Quinn

Goldsmid Ward Councillor