





**Brighton & Hove
City Council**

Planning Committee

Title:	Planning Committee
Date:	10 September 2008
Time:	2.00pm
Venue	Council Chamber, Hove Town Hall
Members:	<p>Councillors:Hyde (Chairman), Wells (Deputy Chairman), Barnett, Carden (Opposition Spokesperson), Davey, Hamilton, Kennedy, McCaffery, K Norman, Smart, Steedman and C Theobald</p> <p>Co-opted Members: Mr J Small (CAG Representative) and Mr R Pennington (Brighton & Hove Federation of Disabled People)</p>
Contact:	<p>Penny Jennings Senior Democratic Services Officer 01273 291065 penny.jennings@brighton-hove.gov.uk</p>

	The Town Hall has facilities for wheelchair users, including lifts and toilets
	An Induction loop operates to enhance sound for anyone wearing a hearing aid or using a transmitter and infra red hearing aids are available for use during the meeting. If you require any further information or assistance, please contact the receptionist on arrival.
	<p>FIRE / EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE</p> <p>If the fire alarm sounds continuously, or if you are instructed to do so, you must leave the building by the nearest available exit. You will be directed to the nearest exit by council staff. It is vital that you follow their instructions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You should proceed calmly; do not run and do not use the lifts; • Do not stop to collect personal belongings; • Once you are outside, please do not wait immediately next to the building, but move some distance away and await further instructions; and • Do not re-enter the building until told that it is safe to do so.

AGENDA

76. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

- (a) Declaration of Substitutes - Where Councillors are unable to attend a meeting, a substitute Member from the same Political Group may attend, speak and vote in their place for that meeting.
- (b) Declarations of Interest by all Members present of any personal interests in matters on the agenda, the nature of any interest and whether the Members regard the interest as prejudicial under the terms of the Code of Conduct.
- (c) Exclusion of Press and Public - To consider whether, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted, or the nature of the proceedings, the press and public should be excluded from the meeting when any of the following items are under consideration.

NOTE: Any item appearing in Part 2 of the Agenda states in its heading the category under which the information disclosed in the report is exempt from disclosure and therefore not available to the public.

A list and description of the exempt categories is available for public inspection at Brighton and Hove Town Halls.

77. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

1 - 14

Minutes of the meeting held on 20 August 2008 (copy attached).

78. CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS

79. PETITIONS

No petitions had been received by the date of publication of the agenda.

80. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

(The closing date for receipt of public questions is 12 noon on 3 September 2008)

No public questions received by date of publication.

81. DEPUTATIONS

(The closing date for receipt of depositions is 12 noon on 3 September 2008)

No depositions received by date of publication.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

82. WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

No written questions have been received.

83. LETTERS FROM COUNCILLORS

To consider any letters received from Councillors in addition to those appended to the Plans List.

84. NOTICES OF MOTION REFERRED FROM COUNCIL

No Notices of Motion have been referred.

Ward Affected: All Wards

85. TO AGREE THOSE APPLICATIONS TO BE THE SUBJECT OF SITE VISITS

86. TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS ON THE PLANS LIST DATE 10 SEPTEMBER 2008

(copy circulated separately).

87. DETERMINED APPLICATIONS - TO NOTE APPLICATIONS DETERMINED AS SET OUT IN THE PLANS LIST DATED 10 SEPTEMBER 2008

(copy circulated separately)

88. APPEAL DECISIONS

15 - 42

(copy attached).

89. LIST OF NEW APPEALS LODGED WITH THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE

43 - 46

(copy attached).

90. INFORMATION ON INFORMAL HEARINGS/PUBLIC INQUIRIES

47 - 52

(copy attached).

Members are asked to note that officers will be available in the Council Chamber 30 minutes prior to the meeting if Members wish to consult the plans for any applications included in the Plans List.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

The City Council actively welcomes members of the public and the press to attend its meetings and holds as many of its meetings as possible in public. Provision is also made on the agendas for public questions to committees and details of how questions can be raised can be found on the website and/or on agendas for the meetings.

The closing date for receipt of public questions and deputations for the next meeting is 12 noon on the fifth working day before the meeting.

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.

Meeting papers can be provided, on request, in large print, in Braille, on audio tape or on disc, or translated into any other language as requested.

For further details and general enquiries about this meeting contact Penny Jennings, (01273 291065, email penny.jennings@brighton-hove.gov.uk) or email democratic.services@brighton-hove.gov.uk

Date of Publication - Tuesday, 2 September 2008

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

2.00pm 20 AUGUST 2008

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillors Hyde (Chairman), Wells (Deputy Chairman), Carden (Opposition Spokesperson), Mrs Cobb, Davey, Hamilton, Hawkes, Kennedy, K Norman, Pidgeon, Smart and Steedman

Co-opted Members Mr J Small (CAG Representative) and Mr R Pennington (Brighton & Hove Federation of Disabled People)

PART ONE

60. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

60A. SUBSTITUTES

60.1	<u>Councillor</u> Pidgeon Hawkes Cobb	<u>For Councillor</u> Mrs Theobald McCaffery Barnett
------	--	---

60B. Declarations of Interest

60.2 Councillor Norman declared a personal but not prejudicial interest relative to application BH00565, Stammer Park Access Road, by virtue of his attendance at Brighton & Hove Albion Football Club matches. Councillor Smart declared a personal but not prejudicial interest relative to Application BH2008/01326, 18 Bishops Road. During the site visit it had become apparent that a resident of one of the neighbouring properties was known to him but not as a close acquaintance. Councillor Davey also declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in Application BH2008/01326, 18 Bishops Road. The architect associated with the project was known to him but not as a close acquaintance.

60C. Exclusion of Press and Public

60.3 The Committee considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of any items contained in the agenda, having regard to the nature of the business to be transacted and the nature of the proceedings and the likelihood as to whether, if members of the press and public

were present, there would be disclosure to them of confidential or exempt information as defined in Section 100A (3) or 100 1 of the Local Government Act 1972.

60.4 **RESOLVED** - That the press and public not be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of any items on the agenda.

61. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 30 JULY 2008

61.2 **RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the meeting held on 30 July 2008 be approved and signed by the Chairman.

62. CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS

62.1 The Chairman explained that details relating to fire safety (including hydrants and access for fire engines) as covered by the Building Regulations (Part B of Schedule 1) had been circulated to Members for their information. This had been requested at the previous meeting of the Committee.

62.2 **RESOLVED** - That the position be noted in respect of all of the above.

63. PETITIONS

63.1 There were none.

64. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

64.1 There were none.

65. DEPUTATIONS

65.1 There were none.

66. WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

66.1 There were none.

67. LETTERS FROM COUNCILLORS

67.1 There were none.

68. NOTICES OF MOTION REFERRED FROM COUNCIL

68.1 There were none.

69. TO CONSIDER THOSE APPLICATIONS TO BE THE SUBJECT OF SITE VISITS

69.1 There were none. However, the Development Control Manager stated that site visits would be arranged for major applications on the agenda for consideration at next scheduled meeting of the Committee on 10 September 2008.

70. PLANS LIST APPLICATIONS, 20 AUGUST 2008**(i) TREES**

- 70.1 The Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendations set out in Paragraph 7 of the respective reports and resolves to grant consent subject to the conditions set out in the reports in respect of the following :

BH2008/02444, University of Brighton, Lewes Road, Brighton ;
BH2008/02387, Balfour Junior School, Balfour Road, Brighton

(ii) SUBSTANTIAL OR CONTROVERSIAL APPLICATIONS OR APPLICATIONS DEPARTING FROM COUNCIL POLICY

- 70.2 **Application BH2008/1569, The Wellsbourne Centre, Whitehawk Road, Brighton** – Demolition of derelict wing of existing Wellsbourne Centre. Construction of Primary Health Centre to accommodate two doctors' surgeries (existing Whitehawk and Broadway) and ancillary pharmacy. Extension to existing parking facilities (community car park), together with new pedestrian access (paths and graded walkway) .
- 70.3. It was noted that the application had formed the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.
- 70.4 The Planning Officer gave a detailed presentation setting out the constituent elements of the scheme.
- 70.5 Councillor Kennedy requested sight of the detailed elevational drawings and confirmation regarding materials and finishes to be used. She supported the application if completed as indicated but had concerns however regarding the "unfinished" appearance of the neighbouring children's centre to white a white render finish was to have been applied. To date this work had not been carried out.
- 70.6 Councillor Steedman requested that the implementation of conditions on the Children's Centre building should be followed up. Whilst on site it had been noted that render and a green roof had not been implemented. The Planning Officer agreed to do this.
- 70.7 Councillor Wells sought confirmation regarding the proposed cladding material. At various locations in the City where cedar had been used this had not weathered well. It was explained that larch was to be used in this instance and the Chairman explained that this material which had been used in construction of the children's centre was weathering in an acceptable manner, as had been seen on the site visit.
- 70.8 Councillor Hawkes sought clarification regarding use of the sum set aside towards sustainable transport measures . The Planning Officer explained this was to be used for the provision of Kassel kerbs at the north and southbound

St David's Hall bus stops.

- 70.9 Mr Pennington, Brighton & Hove Federation of Disabled People and councillors Hawkes and Pidgeon queried the number of disabled parking bays to be provided (2), which seemed too few bearing in mind the potential number of patients to be covered by this new combined facility. Councillor Hawkes was of the view that this appeared inconsistent as other newly opened comparable centres, elsewhere in the city appeared to include a larger number of such bays.
- 70.10 The Development Control Manager explained that the number of spaces included fell within the standard set out in Supplementary Planning Guidance 4 (Parking Standards). This number could be amended subsequently in the light of operating experience. In answer to questions of Councillor Norman regarding whether the number of spaces could be revised by the Committee at that meeting, the Development Control Manager explained that this would be an amendment to the scheme which would require amendments to the application. In consequence the Committee was required to determine the application as put before them.
- 70.11 Mr Pennington, Brighton & Hove Federation of Disabled People considered it a significant failing that whilst dropped kerbs were to be provided within and at the immediate perimeters of the scheme a wider survey taking in the likely route of travel of those using the centre had not been carried out. The Highway Authority Officer explained that this was not required of the applicant relative to the size of the scheme proposed. The Development Control Manager confirmed that the scheme would be fully compliant with SPG4 and would also need to meet the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act.
- 70.12 Councillor Steedman whilst supporting the scheme considered that it would be more appropriate for a "brown or green roof" rather than green sedum roof to be provided as this would be more sustainable and would support a greater level of biodiversity. He proposed that a condition to that effect be added to any planning permission given. Members concurred in that view and agreed thereon when voting in respect of this application.
- 70.13 A vote was taken and Members voted unanimously that minded to grant permission be given in the terms set out below.
- 70.14 **RESOLVED** - (1) That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in paragraph 8 the report and resolves that it is minded to grant planning permission subject to the completion of a Section 106 Obligation to secure a financial contribution of £30,000 towards the Sustainable Transport Strategy and (to be used for the provision of Kassel kerbs at the north and southbound St. David's Hall bus stops) and to the Conditions and Informatives set out in the report and to addition of the following condition and informative:

No development shall take place until details of a green roof have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme

shall be implemented as part of the development and shall be retained as such thereafter. Reason: To ensure that the development is sustainable and makes efficient use of energy, water and materials and in accordance with policies S1 of the East Sussex and Brighton & Hove Structure Plan 1991-2011 and SU2 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.

Informative:

Green or Biodiverse roofs: support biodiverse vegetation and **are designed to support species-rich habitats such as chalk grassland. Brown Roofs use recycled rubble to support specialist plant communities. For more information see www.livingroofs.org**

(2) Minded to refuse if the Section 106 Obligation is not signed by all parties by 4 September 2008.

(iii) DECISIONS ON MINOR APPLICATIONS WHICH VARY FROM THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AS SET OUT IN THE PLANS LIST (MINOR APPLICATIONS) DATED 20 AUGUST 2008

- 70.15 **Application BH2008/01485, 25 The Ridgeway, Woodingdean** – addition of new first floor storey with rooms in the roof, single storey extension, front oriole windows and entrance canopy.
- 70.16 The Planning Officer gave a detailed presentation setting out the reasons for the Officers' recommendations.
- 70.17 Mr Hughes spoke on behalf of the applicant in support of their application displaying examples of similar treatments which had been effected in the immediate vicinity, some of them granted under delegated authority. The applicant had sought to ensure that the proposal was not detrimental to neighbouring properties and that the roof height would not read as being higher than its neighbours when viewed within the street scene.
- 70.18 Councillor Simson spoke in her capacity as a Local Ward Councillor in support of the application. She stated that it was rare for her to support a proposal which ran contrary to Officers' recommendations. However, in this instance she did not consider that the development would be too bulky or detrimental to the street scene. She considered that it needed to be considered within the context of the Ridgeway itself where there was no uniformity of building styles and infill development had taken place. A number of bungalows had been converted into two storey dwellings and this did not appear to be at variance with them. The applicant had sought to address the previous grounds for refusal and to respect the amenity of its neighbours, both of whom supported the application. She considered it was acceptable and should be supported.
- 70.19 The Planning Officer explained that one of the nearby properties referred to by the applicant's agent was currently the subject of a complaint which could result in enforcement action being taken. The Development Control Manager stated that each application had to be assessed on its individual merits, whether dealt with under delegated authority or determined by the Committee.

- 70.20 Councillors Norman and Wels stated that they considered the design and height of the proposed development to be acceptable and mirrored the height and elevational levels of other similar conversions nearby. There were a number of taller properties in The Ridgeway flanked by bungalows and in their view this was no different from any of them. They considered the application to be acceptable and that permission should be granted.
- 70.21 A vote was taken and on a vote of 6 to 3 with 3 abstentions planning permission was granted on the grounds set out below. Councillor Carden queried the outcome of the first recorded vote. A second vote was therefore taken and agreed upon by Members and it is the outcome of that vote which is set out below.
- 70.22 **RESOLVED** - That the Committee resolves to grant planning permission subject to the following conditions.
1. standard time condition
 2. materials to match existing

Reason: the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the streetscene and makes a positive contribution to its visual amenity.

[**Note 1** : A vote was taken and on a vote of 6 to 3 with 3 abstentions Members voted that planning permission be granted on the grounds set out above].

[**Note 2**: Councillor Wells proposed that planning permission be granted. This was seconded by Councillor Norman. A recorded vote was then taken. Councillors Hyde(the Chairman), Cobb, K Norman, Smart, Pidgeon and wells voted that planning permission be granted. Councillors Carden, Davey and Kennedy voted that planning permission be refused. Councillors Hamilton, Hawkes and Steedman abstained. Therefore on a vote of 6 to 3 with 3 abstentions planning permission was granted on the grounds set out].

(iv) OTHER APPLICATIONS

- 70.23 **Application BH2008/00565, Stanmer Park Access Road (off A270 Lewes Road)** – upgrade and widening by up to 1 metre of Stanmer Park access road. To join with approved link road into Sussex University. This is an additional application to the approved Falmer Community Stadium application (ref: BH2001/02418).
- 70.24 It was noted that this application had formed the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.
- 70.25 The Planning Officer gave a detailed presentation relative to the proposals.
- 70.26 Mr Gapper spoke on behalf of neighbours and residents of Stanmer Village who had raised objections to the scheme. It was considered that the proposal would result in a significant increase in the number of vehicles driving through the park to access the university and the football stadium on match days to

the detriment of other users. Conflicting movements by cyclists, pedestrians and other vehicular traffic would result in a greater risk of injury accidents, given that there would be blind corners and the separation of the different users would not be clearly delineated. There would be traffic build up, tail backs and congestion adjacent to the lodges and removal / cutting back of vegetation would result in loss of amenity and privacy to the residential dwellings.

- 70.27 Mr Perry spoke representing the applicant in support of their application. He explained that the proposal was a vital link in a series of measures to facilitate implementation of the community football stadium at Falmer. The existing access road to the university would be closed and this would then be the main access / egress route, and would be brought up to an adoptable standard which would be safe for use by an increased volume of traffic.
- 70.28 Councillor Smart expressed concern regarding an increased number of traffic movements at weekends when use of the park was likely to be at its greatest. The Highway Authority Officer explained that at those times and on other occasions when football matches were being played, the Club's traffic management plan would be enforced and stewarding arrangements would be in place.
- 70.29 Councillors Cobb, Davey and Steedman expressed concern that the crossing point would be delineated by dropped kerbs alone. The applicant explained that all of these traffic management measures requested by the Council had been included in the application. Councillor Davey queried whether given the level of bicycle use by those at the University whether "Sustrans" had been consulted. The Highway Authority Officer explained that "Sustrans were part of the working group".
- 70.30 Councillor Wells was in agreement that it was appropriate to close the existing access road into the university which resulted in the need for traffic to approach from a fast moving lane via a blind bend. He considered however that a suitable road surface would need to be provided and that the amenity of those dwelling in the lodges should be protected.
- 70.31 Councillor Kennedy stated that whilst she supported the Falmer location of the football stadium and whilst also not wanting a proliferation of urban street signage within the park she considered that a greater degree of separation was needed between pedestrians, cyclists and other vehicular traffic.
- 70.32 Councillor Norman stated that he considered that the proposals were acceptable and had regard to measures which needed to be in place when the road was likely to be at its most heavily trafficked. Councillor Smart concurred. Councillor Hamilton considered that the increase in traffic overall was not such that the improved road network would be unable to support it. In answer to further questions the Highway Authority Officer explained how the proposed network dovetailed with other traffic management proposals intended relative to the wider (and separate) scheme.

- 70.33 A vote was taken and on a vote of 7 to 4 with 1 abstention planning permission was granted in the terms set out below .
- 70.34 **RESOLVED** - That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for recommendations set out in Paragraph 8 of the report and resolves that it is minded to grant planning permission subject to the submission of satisfactory details regarding the design subject to the submission of a satisfactory details regarding the design of the proposed access road, surface water disposal, works upon the Lower Lodges listed buildings and measures to ensure availability of the footpath and cycleway for the duration of the works and subject to the Conditions and Informatives set out in the report,
- 70.35 **Application BH2007/04674, 68 - 70 High Street, Rottingdean** – Redevelopment of site to provide 9 three bedroom town houses with integral garages, built in 2 blocks, with accommodation on four floors (Amendment to previously approved scheme BH2007/00617 omitting the 4 visitor parking spaces)
- 70.36 It was noted that this application had formed the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.
- 70.37 The Planning Officer gave a detailed presentation and explained that notwithstanding that the previous application had been granted contrary to Officers' recommendations the current scheme which sought to remove four parking spaces, which were identified as visitor spaces was still considered to be unacceptable on the grounds set out and refusal was therefore recommended .
- 70.38 Mr Carter spoke on behalf of the applicant in support of their application . He explained that the proposed use would generate far fewer traffic movements than arose from the existing use . it was considered the development had been well designed and was not at variance with the surrounding conservation area notwithstanding that it would not be visible from outside the site itself . In answer to questions he explained which elements of the neighbouring site were in the applicant's ownership and which were not . Removal of four parking spaces was required in order to enable the neighbouring premises (fronting the High Street) to be extended by the applicant to provide a restaurant with accommodation above. This would form the subject of a separate application.
- 70.39 Mr Pennington , Brighton & Hove Federation of Disabled People enquired regarding the manner in which bathrooms would be configured within the development and whether the units would be fully wheelchair accessible. The Planning Officer explained that the submitted plans did not include details of the intended internal layout, although these rooms appeared to be very small.
- 70.40 Councillor Steedman queried the fact that following the previous application details of sustainability measures and relating to demolition and construction waste minimisation had not been included. Mr Carter explained that these details could be provided if requested and measures taken to ensure that a very good BREEAM / Ecohomes rating would be achieved as a minimum.

- 70.41 Councillor Steedman also enquired why two separate applications were to be submitted. It was explained that the scheme relating to the proposed restaurant had not been worked up at the time the previous application had been made.
- 70.42 Councillor Kennedy stated that she was of the view that the submitted drawings were poor, lacked detail and the development was not of a design appropriate to its proposed location. Notwithstanding that the recommendation for refusal had been overturned relative to the previous application; she considered that this application should be refused in accordance with the Officers' recommendations.
- 70.43 Mr Small (CAG) stated that although the Group's comments had not been included, they had been submitted with the earlier report. CAG remained of the view that the application should be refused on the grounds of its design and location within a conservation area. In his view none of the Group's previous objections had been overcome
- 70.44 Councillor Hamilton stated that as the extant permission was already in place it could be built as per that permission. As the only element of difference related to the removal of four car parking spaces it was on that basis that the application needed to be considered. In his view the four visitor should be retained as they formed an integral part of the scheme. He concurred with the views submitted by Rottingdean Parish Council set out in the report.
- 70.45 Councillor Wells stated that he considered the proposal to be acceptable as Rottingdean was of high density and the development would be no more closely spaced with its neighbours than properties elsewhere in the village. As there was a public car park nearby he did not consider the loss of four parking spaces to be significant .
- 70.46 A vote was taken and on a vote of 7 to 3 with 2 abstentions planning permission was refused on the grounds set out below.
- 70.47 **RESOLVED** - That the committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation and resolves to refuse planning permission for the following reasons :
- (1) The proposed development, by reason of design, layout, excessive scale, limited separation to boundaries and between terraces, dominance of vehicle manoeuvring area and garage doors, and lack of landscaping would be prominent over development of a poor design that would have a detrimental relationship with and be out of character with surrounding development and the Rottingdean Conservation Area . The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Brighton & Hove Local Plan policies, QD1, QD2, Qd3, QD15, H04 and HE6;
- (2) the proposed development would result in extensive overlooking between the two terraces, and the end houses would be exposed to overlooking from users of the neighbouring school property, which is elevated above the application site level. The small rear gardens would not provide adequate

usable amenity space for future occupiers, and the high boundary walls and limited separation between the terraces would result in an overall sense of enclosure. The proposed development would therefore provide poor living conditions for future occupiers, contrary to Brighton & Hove Local Plan policies QD£, QD27, HO4 and HO5;

(3) The proposed development would result in the loss of an existing commercial site, which in the absence of demonstration to the contrary, is considered suitable for continued employment use. The loss of this commercial use would be detrimental to employment and economic opportunities, contrary to Brighton & Hove Local Plan policy EM3;

(4) The proposed development would result in enclosure and overlooking of No 56 High Street, causing detriment to the living conditions of that residential property, contrary to Brighton & Hove Local Plan policy QD27 ;

(5) The proposed development, by reason of excessive height and scale and unsympathetic design, would be overbearing on the neighbouring Grade II listed buildings and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of these listed buildings, contrary to Brighton & Hove Local Plan policies QD, QD2 and HE3 ;

(6) The applicant has failed to submit any information with respect to achieving a minimum of very good BREEAM/Ecohomes rating or equivalent and as such the proposed development would therefore fail to meet the minimum requirements of Brighton & Hove Local Plan policy SU2 and demonstration of efficiency in the use of water, energy and materials, and SPGHB Note 16 : Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Developments ;

(7) The proposed development has failed to provide adequate detail of demolition and construction waste minimisation measures, contrary to Brighton & Hove Local Plan policy SU13 and RG P - W5 ; and

(8) The application excludes parcels of land that appear to be part of the overall site and, in the absence of justification to the contrary, it appears that this has been done to circumvent policies and requirements related to the provision of affordable housing, and contributions towards educational facilities and the recreational open space contrary to Brighton & Hove Local Plan policies HO2 and QD28 and Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 9 "A Guide for Developers on the Provision Of Recreational Space".

Informatives :

1. This decision is based on the unnumbered plans of existing floor layout and elevations, block plan showing proposed site layout, floor plans and elevations submitted on 20 December 2007.

70.48 **Application BH2008/01574, Hove Rugby Club, Recreation Ground, Shirley Drive, Hove** – Extensions to clubhouse to provide additional changing rooms, new clubroom and entrance porch,

- 70.49 The Senior Planning Officer gave a presentation explaining that confirmation had been obtained from the applicants relative to the actual size of the hard standing around the clubhouse and revised plans had been submitted reflecting this. Reference was also made to further late objections and photographs from Councillors Bennett and Brown relative to illegal parking of taxis and private cars believed to be associated with events taking place at the Rugby Club.
- 70.50 A vote was taken and Members voted unanimously that permission be granted.
- 70.51 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in paragraph 8 of the report and resolves to grant planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives set out in the report.
- 70.52 **Application BH2008/01326, 18 Bishops Road, Hove** – First floor extension and alterations to convert bungalow to two - storey house (re-submission)
- 70.53 It was noted that this application had formed the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting .
- 70.54 The Senior Planning Officer gave a presentation setting out the proposals in detail . The main concern related to loss of aspect to one window of the neighbouring property at no 20. This was not however of such significance to warrant refusal.
- 70.55 Councillor Steedman stated that should permission be granted it would be appropriate for a green roof to be provided of materials which would support biodiversity
- 70.56 A vote was taken and on a vote of 9 to 1 with 2 abstentions planning permission was granted on the grounds set out below .
- 70.57 **RESOLVED -** That the committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in paragraph 8 of the report and resolves to grant planning permission subject to Conditions and Informatives set out in the report and to the following amendment/additions.

Condition 5: Amend the word “sedum” to “green”

Add a new condition:

No development shall take place until details of the green roof have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented as part of the development and shall be retained as such thereafter. Reason: To ensure that the development is sustainable and makes efficient use of energy, water and materials and in accordance with policies S1 of the East Sussex and Brighton & Hove Structure Plan 1991-2011 and SU2 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.

Add an informative:

Green or Biodiverse roofs: Support biodiverse vegetation and **are designed to support**

species-rich habitats such as chalk grassland. Brown Roofs use recycled rubble to support specialist plant communities. For more information see www.livingroofs.org

- 70.58 **Application BH2008/01813, 20 Tivoli Crescent, Brighton** – partial change of use from residential basement (C3) to community use (D1) to allow x4 weekly pre- school music classes (retrospective).
- 70.59 The Senior Planning Officer gave a presentation detailing the proposals and setting out the reasons for the recommendation.
- 70.60 Councillor Smart sought clarification regarding configuration of the site, and that the property dropped down to basement level at the rear. Councillors Norman and Wells whilst supporting the use in principle had concerns regarding the need to ensure health and safety requirements relative to the ratio / number of adults and children on site when the basement was used for music classes.
- 70.61 Councillor Hawkes considered that it was important that adequate toilet facilities were provided and that this resource complied with similar standards to those to be met elsewhere across the City for example at the Council's own events run in libraries etc. councillor Hawkes was also of the view that it was important for the relevant Officers of the Council to be made aware of this resource which would also enable information regarding this facility to be included on their data base.
- 70.62 The Development Control Manager explained that matters relative to health and safety requirements were not a planning consideration but that an informative could be added to any planning permission granted. She also agreed to write to the relevant department/ officers of the Council on the Committees' behalf making them aware of this resource . Councillor Cobb expressed concern regarding noise levels generated by the use, which although faint and intermittent appeared to be impacting adversely on neighbouring residents .
- 70.63 Councillors Carden , Kennedy and Smart expressed their support for the proposal .
- 70.64 A vote was taken and on a vote of 7 to 1 with 2 abstentions planning permission was granted.
- 70.65 **RESOLVED** - That the committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in paragraph 8 of the report and resolves to grant planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives set out in the report.

(v) DECISIONS ON APPLICATIONS DELEGATED TO THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT

- 70.66 **RESOLVED** – Those details of the applications determined by the Director of Environment under delegated powers be noted.

[**Note 1:** All decisions recorded in this minute are subject to certain conditions and reasons recorded in the Planning Register maintained by the Director of Environment. The register complies with the legislative requirements].

[**Note 2 :** A list of representations, received by the Council after the Plans List reports had been submitted for printing had been circulated to Members on the Friday preceding the meeting. (For copy see minute book). Where representations were received after that time they would be reported to the Chairman and Deputy Chairman and it would be at their discretion whether these should (in exceptional cases), be reported to the Committee. This in accordance with resolution 147.2 of the then, Sub Committee held on 23 February 2005].

71. DETERMINED APPLICATIONS

71.1 The Committee noted those applications determined by Officers during the period covered by the report.

72. SITE VISITS

72.1 There were none. However, the Development Control Manager stated that site visits would be arranged for major applications on the agenda to be considered at the Committees' next scheduled meeting on 10 September 2008.

73. APPEAL DECISIONS

73.1 The Committee noted letters received from the Planning Inspectorate advising on the results of planning appeals which had been lodged as set out on the agenda.

74. APPEALS LODGED

74.1 The Committee noted the list of Planning Appeals, which had been lodged as set out in the agenda.

75. INFORMATION ON INFORMAL HEARINGS/PUBLIC INQUIRIES

75.1 The Committee noted the information set out in the agenda relating to information on Informal Hearings and Public Inquiries.

The meeting concluded at 5.55pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

APPEAL DECISIONS

	Page
A. STANFORD WARD	
Application BH2007/02762, 53 Hill Brow, Hove. Appeal against refusal to grant planning permission for demolition of the existing bungalow with redevelopment of 2 new 3 storey houses. APPEAL DISMISSED (Delegated) (copy of the letter from the Planning Inspectorate attached).	17
B. STANFORD WARD	
Application BH2007/03293, 16 Hill Drive, Hove. Appeal against refusal to grant planning permission for new 3 bedroom single storey Carbon neutral eco home set in rear garden of no. 16 Hill Drive and new garden walls around 16 Hill Drive. APPEAL DISMISSED (Delegated) (copy of the letter from the Planning Inspectorate attached).	21
C. ST PETERS & NORTH LAINE WARD	
Application BH2008/00033, Block J, Brighton Station Site. Appeal against refusal to grant planning permission for the temporary use of land as a car park (105 spaces) for 12 months. APPEAL DISMISSED (Delegated) (copy of the letter from the Planning Inspectorate attached).	25
D. PATCHAM WARD	
Application BH2007/03164, 14 Petworth Road, Brighton. Appeal against refusal to grant planning permission for the demolition of the existing single storey garage and the construction of an attached 2 storey house. APPEAL DISMISSED (Delegated) (copy of the letter from the Planning Inspectorate attached).	27
E. PATCHAM WARD	
Application BH2007/03992, 159 Ladies Mile Road, Brighton. Appeal against refusal to grant planning permission for roof extensions. APPEAL DISMISSED (Delegated) (copy of the letter from the Planning Inspectorate attached).	31
F. ROTTINGDEAN COASTAL WARD	
Application BH2007/04354, 1 Marine Close, Saltdean, Brighton. Appeal against refusal to grant planning permission for the conversion of the bungalow to a 2 storey house including first floor extension, new roof with balconies and lower ground garage extension. APPEAL ALLOWED (Committee) (copy of the letter from the Planning Inspectorate attached).	33

G. ROTTINGDEAN COASTAL WARD

Application BH2007/03120, 29 Nevill Road, Rottingdean. Appeal against refusal to grant planning permission for loft conversion with single rear dormer. **APPEAL ALLOWED** (Delegated) (copy of the letter from the Planning Inspectorate attached). **37**

H. WOODINGDEAN WARD

Application BH2007/04235, 26 Chalkland Rise, Woodingdean, Brighton. Appeal against refusal to grant planning permission for ground floor extension to rear and room in the roof. **APPEAL DISMISSED** (Delegated) (copy of the letter from the Planning Inspectorate attached). **41**



The Planning Inspectorate

Room: 3/04
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

Direct Line: 0117-372-8377
Switchboard: 0117-372-8000
Fax No: 0117-372-8443
GTN: 1371-8377

<http://www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk>

Appeals Officer
Brighton and Hove City Council
Development Control
Hove Town Hall
Norton Road
Hove
E Sussex
BN3 3BQ

Your Ref: BH2007/02762
Our Ref: APP/Q1445/A/08/2069721/WF
Date: 20 August 2008

Dear Sir/Madam

**Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Appeal by The Grenville Homes
Site at 53 Hill Brow, Hove, BN3 6DD**

I enclose a copy of our Inspector's decision on the above appeal.

Leaflets explaining the right of appeal to the High Court against the decision, our complaints procedures and how the documents can be inspected are on our website – www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk/pins/agency_info/complaints/complaints_dealing.htm - and are also enclosed if you have chosen to communicate by post. If you would prefer hard copies of these leaflets, please contact our Customer Services team on 0117 3726372.

If you have any queries relating to the decision please send them to:

**Quality Assurance Unit
The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square, Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN**

Phone No. 0117 372 8252

Fax No. 0117 372 8139

E-mail: complaints@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Yours sincerely

Christopher Salmon

COVERDL1



*You can now use the Internet to submit documents, to see information and to check the progress of this case through the Planning Portal. The address of our search page is - <http://www.pcs.planningportal.gov.uk/pcportal/casesearch.asp>
You can access this case by putting the above reference number into the 'Case Ref' field of the 'Search' page and clicking on the search button*



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 August 2008

by **J M Trask BSc (Hons) CEng MICE**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
20 August 2008

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/A/08/2069721 **53 Hill Brow, Hove BN3 6DD**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Grenville Homes against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
- The application Ref BH2007/02762, dated 18 July 2007, was refused by notice dated 13 September 2007.
- The development proposed is the demolition of the existing bungalow with redevelopment of 2 new 3 storey houses.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and the provision of cycle parking.

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies within the Woodlands character area. Although the existing building on the site is single storey, the dwellings in the area are predominantly large detached houses set in generous plots. As a result of the slope in the land, the dwellings on the same side of the road as the appeal site are set above road level while those on the opposite side of the road are at a lower level. The dwellings vary in size and design to some extent but are set back from the road by a similar amount with most front gardens laid to lawn with some planting. Accordingly the area has a reasonably regular character and appearance, albeit with some limited variation.
4. The proposed houses would have 3 storeys and, as a result of the proposed excavation to road level, these would be evident from the street. The apparent height of the proposed houses would be unusual in the area and while other nearby properties have garage accommodation at road level and houses at a higher level, the height of the front elevations and massing of the proposed development would make it stand out from others. This effect would be particularly noticeable for the house on plot B, given its proximity to the low level dwelling at 51 Hill Brow. The reduced ground level at the front of the appeal site would also be incongruous in the area.

5. The materials proposed for the external surfaces would differ from others nearby and this, together with the large area of hardstanding proposed, would increase the prominence of the proposed houses. Some landscaping at the front of the site is indicated on the drawings but it has not been demonstrated that this could be sufficient to ensure a degree of continuity with others along the frontage or that it would be of high quality. These matters are fundamental to the success of this scheme and therefore it would not be reasonable to require them by imposition of a condition. Few details and no assessment of the trees that would be lost have been provided and this adds to my concerns.
6. While the area could accommodate some degree of variation, the combination of the massing and unusual features of the proposal, together with the lack of mitigating landscaping, would result in it being a prominent development that would detract from regularity of the area. The proposal would conflict with Policies QD1, QD2, QD15 and QD16 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan.
7. No provision for secure cycle storage is indicated although I am content that there would be room for this and therefore this is not a reason to dismiss this appeal.
8. The appellant has referred to the efficient use of previously developed land for housing in accord with national and local guidance. However, I have seen no evidence of a need for housing sufficient to outweigh the harm and the conflict with the development plan that I have identified.
9. Despite my conclusion in respect of cycle storage, I consider that my conclusion on the effect on the character and appearance of the area is a reason sufficient in itself to dismiss this appeal. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J M Trask

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 August 2008

by **John Papworth** DipArch(Glos) RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
19 August 2008

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/A/08/2072621 **16 Hill Drive, Hove, East Sussex BN3 6QN**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr S Cohen against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
- The application Ref BH2007/03293, dated 31 August 2007, was refused by notice dated 3 March 2008.
- The development proposed is described as new 3 bedroom single storey Carbon neutral eco home set in rear garden of no. 16 Hill Drive and new garden walls around 16 Hill Drive.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be;
 - The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the Hill Drive area of Hove.
 - The effect of the development on the living conditions of neighbouring and prospective residential occupiers with particular regard to outlook, daylight and amenity space.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The area around the site comprises a variety of styles and sizes of dwelling and is close to shops and transport. I note that Local Plan Policy QD1 encourages innovation subject to the character of the area and I do not discount the possibility of a modern design being able to be accommodated here. In addition I welcome the description of this being a 'carbon neutral eco home'.
4. The site is presently part of a rear garden fenced on the footway boundary and as such is a break in the open frontage that extends round two sides of No16 and along the front of dwellings in Deanway. The proposed setting back of the dwelling would continue this openness. However, included in the description and shown on the drawing is a wall on the boundary around the remaining part of No16's garden to the front. Whilst outside the red-line application site, this would outweigh the advantages of the open front at the appeal site and cause harm to the character and appearance of the corner in my view.

5. Notwithstanding the improvement in the openness of the appeal site frontage, the predominantly blank walls of the proposed dwelling and the appearance of being squeezed into a narrow site detract from the character and appearance of the development and the area in my judgement. The existing buildings in the area have a pleasing relationship with the street through having windows, presenting an inviting face. The appeal scheme turns its back on the street and presents, I consider, an uninviting face which would cause harm to the streetscene. I am not persuaded that the lack of outward facing windows is needed to conserve energy and similarly I am not persuaded that the use of only inward facing courtyard windows would maximise passive gain from the low winter sun.
6. In conclusion on this issue I find the design uncompromising in relation to the character and appearance of the area, causing visual harm and containing little in the way of interest to justify an appearance that is so at odds with its surroundings. Hence it is my view that the proposal fails to accord with the aims of Local Plan Policies QD1, QD2 and QD3 as it does not make a positive contribution to the visual quality of the environment, failing to take account of local characteristics where these are of value, and, whilst making effective use of the site, this is at the expense of the prevailing townscape.

Living Conditions

7. With regard to number 4 Deanway, conditions could control the slab level relative to the neighbouring house. Whilst not so high as to cause real harm to daylight and sunlight in my estimation, I consider the form and proximity to be unacceptable due to the visual impact. Turning to number 16 Hill Drive, this family-sized house would have very little remaining garden to the rear, being described at the site inspection as being in the order of 5m, but it appears that there is a reliance on the use of the front garden by addition of the enclosing wall. A low wall that might be permitted development would not provide privacy, and a higher wall would cause harm as previously stated. In the circumstances I consider the usable space left to this dwelling to be insufficient in size and quality, and the effect of the proposals on both neighbouring occupiers to be contrary to the aims of Local Plan Policy QD27 of protecting the amenity of residents.
8. The proposed new dwelling is in the form of an enclosed box with an open frontage space and built tight to the other three boundaries. The only private space available for what appears as a four or five person house would be the open internal courtyard. The outlook of all rooms would be to this space also. Whilst therefore private with regard to outside views and noise, I consider the space limited in area and quality with the risk of compromising privacy between users of the dwelling. The proposals do not in my judgement reach the quality of design sought by Local Plan Policies such as QD27 and HO5.

Other Matters

9. The Council raises various other concerns in the reasons for refusal; lifetime homes, cycle and vehicle parking, waste management and refuse storage. Were all else acceptable in these proposals I consider these other matters could be addressed by way of negatively worded conditions requiring schemes or further details. I have no reason to consider that the schemes could not

satisfy the Local Plan policy requirements cited. In addition, I am unable to comment on the advice that the appellant claims to have received from Council Officers regarding failings in a previously refused scheme and how they might be rectified, but I have determined this appeal on the information before me.

Conclusions

10. The proposal would make good use of previously developed land close to transport and services and aims to be carbon neutral with low energy uses. The design is modern as encouraged by the Local Plan policy referred to, but in this location and on such a small site I consider the windowless box form to be an uncompromising addition to the streetscene that would cause visual harm. This failing is added to the lack of amenity space and the adverse effect on the two neighbouring occupiers, so as to indicate that the scheme is unacceptable in this position. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S J Papworth

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 August 2008

by **J M Trask BSc (Hons) CEng MICE**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
21 August 2008

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/A/08/2071166

Block J, Brighton Station Site

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by New England Square Ltd against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
- The application Ref BH2008/00033, dated 21 December 2007, was refused by notice dated 18 February 2008.
- The development proposed is the temporary use of land as a car park (105 spaces) for 12 months.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on the modes of transport in the area, whether there would be adequate provision for people with limited mobility, pedestrians and cycle parking and the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The area that is the subject of this appeal is already in use as a car park. I shall therefore determine this appeal on the basis that it is a retrospective application.
4. The site is a part of the Brighton Station development site that has not yet been developed. Although a temporary use, by its nature the development encourages car journeys. While no transport assessment has been submitted, and the appellant has advised that the car park is primarily used by contractors, I consider that the presence of the car park encourages journeys to be made by private car rather than more sustainable forms of transport. Accordingly the development conflicts with Policy TR1 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan.
5. The site plan indicates provision for disabled parking bays but none are indicated on site and the development conflicts with the requirements of Policy TR18 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan. However, this could be overcome by the imposition and implementation of a condition and therefore is not a reason to dismiss this appeal. There is an access point for pedestrians

onto Fleet Street in addition to the 2 main vehicle access points but little indication of how these align with main pedestrian routes outside the site and there is a conflict with Policy TR8 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan. No cycle parking is provided and despite the proximity of cycle parking facilities at the station and elsewhere, this conflicts with Policy TR14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan. However, the appellant has suggested the imposition of condition requiring cycle parking and I am content that this would address my concerns in this respect.

6. The car park is visible from the nearby apartments. It is surfaced with hardcore, has a poorly constructed corrugated metal structure in the corner and at times is covered with parked cars. The scruffy appearance of the site is not commensurate with the recent development in the area and this is recognised in the condition attached to the outline planning permission which requires landscaping before construction works commence. I conclude the car park is of poor quality, does not respect character and appearance of the area and detracts from the outlook of the occupiers of the apartments. The development conflicts with Policy QD27 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan.
7. The application is for the provision of a car park for a period of one year and I note that the car park has been in operation for some time. While the temporary nature of the development reduces its effect on transport, and the Council's objectives in relation to a modal shift, it does not reduce it to such an extent that it has no significant effect on transport. While I have noted the recent appeal decision for proposed development on the site, in particular the section dealing with transport related issues, it seems to me to be of limited relevance as it refers to the effects of a completely different scheme.
8. Despite my conclusions in respect of provision for people with limited mobility and cycle parking, I consider the effect on the modes of transport in the area, lack of provision for pedestrians and harm to the character and appearance of the area warrant dismissal of this appeal. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J M Trask

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 August 2008

by **Alison Lea MA(Cantab) Solicitor**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
21 August 2008

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/A/08/2068227

14 Petworth Road, Brighton BN1 8LQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr J Chinchin against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
- The application Ref BH2007/03164, dated 16 August 2007, was refused by notice dated 29 November 2007.
- The development proposed is the demolition of the existing single storey garage and the construction of an attached 2 storey house.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2 storey semi-detached house with a single storey utility room and garage to the side. It is situated in a residential road characterised by similar properties. The proposal would involve the demolition of the utility room and garage and introduce a 2 storey house which would be attached to the flank wall of No 14 resulting in a small terrace of 3 houses. Although I note that the Council has expressed some concerns about the detailed design of the proposal I accept that the materials and fenestration proposed would not look out of keeping either with No 14 or the surrounding area.
4. Petworth Road is characterised by pairs of semi-detached houses with substantial gaps between the pairs, particularly at first floor level. Although some of the properties are joined by single storey development I do not agree with the appellant's description of some of the properties, including the appeal property, as terraced. The proposal, although designed in some ways to appear as an extension to the parent dwelling, with a set back from the front building line and a roof which would project off the main roof slope under the main ridge height, would nevertheless, by virtue of its width and bulk fail to appear subservient to it. It would unbalance the pair of semi-detached houses and would substantially fill the gap at first floor level between No 14 and the boundary with the neighbouring property. Although I accept that some gap

between the properties would remain, and that the spaces between properties in Petworth Road are not uniform, nevertheless I consider that the rhythm of the street would be interrupted and that that would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly I conclude that the proposal would be contrary to Policies QD1 and QD2 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005 (LP) which provide, amongst other matters, that new buildings must make a positive contribution to the visual quality of the environment and take into account the design of existing buildings and the layout of streets and spaces.

5. I accept that LP Policy QD3 requires new development to make efficient and effective use of a site and that this reflects national planning advice as contained in particular in Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (PPS3). However, this should not be at the expense of the environment and in this case I agree with the Council that the harm which would be caused by this proposal to the character and appearance of the area outweighs the need to make efficient use of land.
6. I note that No 13 Petworth Road has a substantial 2 storey extension. However, although it is a semi-detached property, due to its position at the head of the cul-de-sac it does not form part of a row with other houses and the extension does not therefore interrupt the rhythm of the street.
7. The appellant has referred to a decision relating to 109 Cowley Drive, Ref APP/Q1445/A/06/2027078. I note that in that case the Inspector referred to it being difficult to identify the particular character of the area and concluded that the appeal proposal would not compromise the symmetry or harmony of the terrace as a gap between the proposal and the adjacent property would remain. However, in this case I consider that the proposal would unbalance the pair of houses and would interrupt the rhythm of the street and accordingly, I do not find that case of any assistance. In any event have considered this case upon its own merits.
8. I conclude therefore that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would be contrary to LP Policies QD1 and QD2.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has clarified that no on-site parking is proposed as it is considered that the vehicles generated by both the host house and the proposed new house could be easily absorbed on street. Although at the time of my site visit in the afternoon on-street parking was available I have not been provided with any information regarding general levels of parking in the area. As the site is outside a controlled parking zone, SPGBH4 (the SPG) which has been adopted by the Council following public consultation and therefore attracts significant weight, sets out a maximum parking standard of 1 space per dwelling plus one space per 2 dwellings for visitors.
10. I note the Council's view that access to public transport from the site is not high and that the site is not in a sustainable transport corridor and therefore that the development is likely to attract private vehicle use. I also note that LP Policy TR2 provides that permission will only be granted for proposals that have been assessed to determine their level of accessibility to public transport and

that according to that assessment the appropriate level of parking should be provided. Furthermore, where parking levels below the standard are agreed measures will be specified for monitoring on street parking. In this case no parking would be provided for either the host property or the appeal proposal, and given the location of the site and the absence of any information with regard to levels of parking, this adds to my concerns about this proposal.

11. The Council has also stated that it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would achieve acceptable standards of sustainability, be efficient in the use of energy, water and materials, would be built to Lifetime Homes Standards or would minimise and re-use construction industry waste. However I am satisfied that all of these matters could have been dealt with by the imposition of appropriate conditions and have therefore not considered these matters further.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alison Lea

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 August 2008

by **Alison Lea MA(Cantab) Solicitor**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
21 August 2008

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/A/08/2066574 **159 Ladies Mile Road, Brighton BN1 8TF**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs S Thomas against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
- The application Ref BH2007/03992, dated 24 October 2007, was refused by notice dated 4 February 2008.
- The development proposed is roof extensions.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and on the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow located in a residential area characterised by similar properties. A number of neighbouring properties have been subject to roof extensions of a variety of forms, including the adjoining property, No 161 which has front and rear dormer windows. The proposal would alter the roof from a hipped to a half hipped roof and introduce dormer windows to the front and rear.
4. Although there are front and rear dormers at No 161, it retains a side hipped roof. The alteration proposed to the shape of the roof of No 159 would unbalance the pair of properties and would be contrary to advice in SPGBH Note 1 (the SPG) which has been adopted by the Council following public consultation and therefore attracts significant weight. This provides, amongst other matters, that roof extensions that alter the basic shape of the roof on a semi-detached house will be unacceptable as it leads to an imbalance between the pair and creates a visually heavy roof to one half. Although it also states that where one half of a semi-detached house has been altered and this has created an imbalance, a well designed alteration to the other half may be acceptable, this does not apply to this proposal as the basic form of the roof to No 161 has not been altered.
5. I note that there are a number of examples within the vicinity of the site where alterations have been carried out to the shape of the roof of one of a pair of

properties and have been provided with some information regarding proposals which have been permitted at Nos 155 and 165. However, I note the advice in the SPG that a small number of inappropriate roof alterations in a street will not be accepted as evidence of an established precedent. In my opinion, although within the vicinity of the site the number of roof alterations consisting of the insertion of dormers may not be small, nevertheless in the majority of properties, the basic roof form has not been altered, and the pairs where the roof is unbalanced serve to highlight the visual damage which is caused by the loss of symmetry. The existence of similar extensions is insufficient reason to permit otherwise unacceptable development.

6. With regard to the proposed dormer windows, I agree with the Council that, given that No 161 has an identical front dormer, the proposed front dormer would help to rebalance the pair of properties and accordingly would not appear incongruous or out of keeping with the street scene. The rear dormer would be larger than the dormer on the adjoining property and, contrary to advice in the SPG, would not be set within the roof slope. However, there is a large conservatory to the rear of the property and this together with the steep gradient of the land and mature planting would ensure that views of the dormer would be largely obscured. Accordingly I consider that in itself the large rear dormer would be insufficient reason to dismiss this appeal.
7. Nevertheless I conclude that the proposed alteration to the roof form would unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties to the detriment of their character and appearance and would cause harm to the surrounding area. The proposal would be contrary to Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005 which provides that planning permission for extensions or alterations to existing buildings, including the formation of rooms in the roof, will only be granted if they meet a number of criteria. These include that they are well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended, adjoining properties and to the surrounding area.
8. I note the appellants' comment that the bungalow is quite small and that the alterations have been proposed to get the most out of the property. However, any benefits to the appellants in extending the property as proposed do not outweigh the harm which would be caused.

Alison Lea

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 August 2008

by **Alison Lea MA(Cantab) Solicitor**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State
for Communities and Local Government**

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

**Decision date:
21 August 2008**

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/A/08/2069187

1 Marine Close, Saltdean, Brighton BN2 8SA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr N Rose against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
- The application Ref BH2007/04354, dated 6 November 2007, was refused by notice dated 30 January 2008.
- The development proposed is the conversion of the bungalow to a 2 storey house including first floor extension, new roof with balconies and lower ground garage extension.

Decision

1. I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission for the conversion of the bungalow to a 2 storey house including first floor roof extension, new roof with balconies and lower ground garage extension at 1 Marine Close, Saltdean, Brighton BN2 8SA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BH2007/04354, dated 6 November 2007, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) No development shall take place until samples of the materials (including colour of render, paintwork or colourwash) to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 3) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no extension, enlargement or other alteration of the development hereby permitted shall be carried out.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no window, dormer window or rooflight, other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed.
 - 5) No development shall take place until a written waste minimisation statement, confirming how demolition and construction waste will be

recovered and reused on site or at other sites has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached bungalow situated on the south side of a residential close. It forms the end of a row of similar properties, albeit that many of them have been extended in a variety of ways. The surrounding area consists of residential properties of a variety of sizes and designs and immediately to the south is a steep slope which forms part of a cutting for the A259 road. Planning permission was granted by the Council in May 2008 for the conversion of the bungalow to a 2 storey house in accordance with a revised application and at the time of my site visit substantial work had commenced in relation to the conversion.
4. The appeal proposal would result in a complete redesign of the bungalow, including an additional floor of accommodation and enlarged garage. I agree that the garage, although it would extend a considerable distance beyond the existing building line would not appear prominent and also that given the location of the appeal site, at the end of Marine Close, where it meets Saltdean Close which is characterised by properties of a variety of sizes and designs, and where there is a noticeable change of levels, a detached 2 storey house would not appear out of keeping with the area. The Council's main concern relates to the alterations to the roof and I shall therefore concentrate on this matter.
5. The proposal would have a ridge height similar to that of the bungalow and the replacement of the side gable ends with a pitched roof would result in a reduction of the bulk of the main roof and in its prominence when viewed from the front and rear. This would accord with advice in Policy QD2 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005 (LP) which states that local characteristics such as height, scale and bulk of existing buildings should be taken into account.
6. The proposal also includes significant extensions to the front and rear elevations which would give the roof a complex appearance. The Council accepts that the design of the roof extensions is not inappropriate given the location of the property and in my opinion they would add visual interest to the proposal. The roof slopes of the front and rear extensions would be below the ridge height of the main roof and would not appear dominant or overbearing. I consider that the roof would complement the property as altered.
7. Although the front extension would extend over 6m beyond the main roof line, it would be only about 2.5m beyond the front elevation of the existing building and given the varied building line in Marine Close including forward projecting garages, and the position of the appeal site at the end of the close, I consider that the proposal would not appear incongruous in the street scene. The rear extension would have a covered balcony to take advantage of the sea views. It would be visible from the A259 but would not be an unusual feature given the

location of the property and in my opinion would not appear out of keeping with the area.

8. I conclude therefore that although the proposal would have a significant effect on the character and appearance of the original bungalow, the proposal would make a positive contribution to the visual quality of the environment whilst taking into account local characteristics. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would not cause significant harm to the character or appearance of the appeal property or the surrounding area and that it would not be contrary to LP Policies QD1 or QD2.
9. In addition to the standard commencement of development condition the Council has suggested 4 conditions. I agree that in the interests of the character and appearance of the property and surrounding area a condition requiring the submission and approval of samples of external materials is necessary. For the same reason and also to protect the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties I agree that in this case it is reasonable and necessary to impose conditions removing permitted development rights relating to future extensions and the insertion of additional windows. A condition requiring a waste minimisation statement is required to comply with policies in the East Sussex and Brighton & Hove Waste Local Plan and in the local and structure plan.

Alison Lea

INSPECTOR



The Planning Inspectorate

Room: 3/04
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

Direct Line: 0117-372-6117
Switchboard: 0117-372-8000
Fax No: 0117-372-8443
GTN: 1371-6117

<http://www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk>

Appeals Officer
Brighton and Hove City Council
Development Control
Hove Town Hall
Norton Road
Hove
E Sussex
BN3 3BQ

Your Ref: BH2007/03120
Our Ref: APP/Q1445/A/08/2071905/WF
Date: 22 August 2008

Dear Sir/Madam

Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Appeal by Mrs M Richardson
Site at 29 Nevill Road, Rottingdean, Brighton, BN2 7HH

I enclose a copy of our Inspector's decision on the above appeal.

Leaflets explaining the right of appeal to the High Court against the decision, our complaints procedures and how the documents can be inspected are on our website – www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk/pins/agency_info/complaints/complaints_dealing.htm - and are also enclosed if you have chosen to communicate by post. If you would prefer hard copies of these leaflets, please contact our Customer Services team on 0117 3726372.

If you have any queries relating to the decision please send them to:

Quality Assurance Unit
The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square, Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

Phone No. 0117 372 8252

Fax No. 0117 372 8139

E-mail: complaints@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Yours sincerely

Zelah Vincent



COVERDL1

You can now use the Internet to submit documents, to see information and to check the progress of this case through the Planning Portal. The address of our search page is -

<http://www.pcs.planningportal.gov.uk/pcsportal/casearch.asp>

You can access this case by putting the above reference number into the 'Case Ref' field of the 'Search' page and clicking on the search button



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 August 2008

by **Alison Lea MA(Cantab) Solicitor**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
22 August 2008

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/A/08/2071905 **29 Nevill Road, Rottingdean BN2 7HH**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mrs M Richardson against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
- The application Ref BH2007/03120, dated 20 July 2007, was refused by notice dated 10 October 2007.
- The development proposed is a loft conversion with single rear dormer.

Decision

1. I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission for a loft conversion with single rear dormer at 29 Nevill Road, Rottingdean BN2 7HH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BH2007/03120, dated 20 July 2007, and the plans submitted with it.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached house located on the southern side of Nevill Road. A flat roof dormer window has been constructed on the rear elevation. Essentially the appeal seeks consent for the dormer which has already been constructed, although I note that the Council has commented that the proposal as constructed does not appear to be identical to that shown on the plans. Furthermore, I note that the appellant considers that planning permission is not required for the appeal proposal as she believes that it has been constructed in accordance with permitted development rights. However, this is not a matter for me to comment on as part of this appeal and I have determined it in accordance with the planning application and plans submitted.
4. The Council has referred to a number of policies, of which I consider Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005 (LP) to be of particular relevance. This provides that planning permission for extensions or alterations to existing buildings, including the formation of rooms in the roof, will only be granted if the proposed development meets a number of criteria, including that it is well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended, adjoining properties and to the surrounding area. Reference has also been made to SPGBH Note 1(the SPG) which has been adopted by the Council

following public consultation and therefore attracts significant weight. This contains more detailed advice on dormer windows.

5. The appeal proposal is for a dormer consisting of a pair of slim line French doors with balustrades and side windows. Although overall it is wider than the window below and has cladding either side of the French doors, both of which are contrary to the guidelines in the SPG, it is well contained within the existing roof profile, and in my view it does not dominate the property or appear out of keeping with it. The rear elevation of No 29 faces the head of a cul-de-sac which forms part of Park Crescent and the dormer window is clearly visible from the cul-de-sac. However, due to its size and position with the roof, the dormer does not appear unduly prominent and in my view does not cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
6. Reference has been made to a number of other dormer windows within the vicinity of the appeal site. However, I do not have any details of those developments, whether they required planning permission or the basis upon which they may have been permitted. In any event I have determined this appeal on its own merits.
7. I conclude therefore that the appeal proposal does not cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property or the surrounding area and is not contrary to LP Policy QD14, or to LP Policies QD1 and QD2 both of which relate to design matters. I therefore permit the appeal. The Council has not proposed any conditions and I agree that none are necessary.

Alison Lea

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 July 2008

by **S J Turner** RIBA MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
1 August 2008

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/A/08/2064947

26 Chalkland Rise, Woodingdean, Brighton, East Sussex, BN2 6RH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Peter Millis against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
- The application Ref BH2007/04235, dated 12 November 2007, was refused by notice dated 9 January 2008.
- The development proposed is ground floor extension to rear and room in the roof.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is situated on high ground in residential area. There are some larger houses and a school nearby but the area is characterised predominantly by modest bungalows with shallow hipped roofs. No 26 already has large dormer windows positioned at high level in the side and rear roof slopes. These are visible from the street and from lower ground to the west.
4. The proposal would extend the main roof, making it project out to the rear with a gable facing west over the back garden. The existing shallow pitch would be maintained, the proposal would not increase the roof height and the large rear dormer would be removed. However the gable end would be prominent in long views from the west and the extended roof would be visible in oblique views from the street and from adjacent properties.
5. I consider that the extended roof in particular would be unsympathetic to the scale and appearance of the existing modest bungalow and would appear awkward and out of proportion. Furthermore the proposal would create a significantly enlarged dwelling which, even taking account of existing dormers and extensions in the locality, would be out of keeping with the established scale and appearance other similar bungalows nearby.
6. I note the appellant's need for additional accommodation, the existence of gables in Woodingdean and the range of styles in the area. However none of these matters outweighs my conclusion that this particular proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would conflict with Brighton and Hove Local Plan Policy QD14.

7. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Sue Turner

INSPECTOR

NEW APPEALS RECEIVED

WARD

APPLICATION NUMBER

ADDRESS

DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION

APPEAL STATUS

APPEAL RECEIVED DATE

APPLICATION DECISION LEVEL

SOUTH PORTSLADE

BH2008/00059

8 Benfield Crescent Portslade

Two storey rear extension, and loft conversion including enlargement of roof (raising of ridge height), rear dormer, and front and rear rooflights.

APPEAL LODGED

05/08/2008

Delegated

WARD

APPLICATION NUMBER

ADDRESS

DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION

APPEAL STATUS

APPEAL RECEIVED DATE

APPLICATION DECISION LEVEL

BRUNSWICK AND ADELAIDE

BH2008/00071

Flat 2 33 Adelaide Crescent Hove

Proposed rear extension at first floor and internal alterations.

APPEAL LODGED

06/08/2008

Delegated

WARD

APPLICATION NUMBER

ADDRESS

DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION

APPEAL STATUS

APPEAL RECEIVED DATE

APPLICATION DECISION LEVEL

HANGLETON & KNOLL

BH2008/01197

251 Hangleton Road Hove

Loft conversion including rear dormer with glazed doors and juliet balcony, and side half gable extension. Front, side, and rear rooflights.

APPEAL LODGED

07/08/2008

Delegated

WARD

APPLICATION NUMBER

ADDRESS

DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION

APPEAL STATUS

APPEAL RECEIVED DATE

APPLICATION DECISION LEVEL

ST. PETER'S & NORTH LAINE

BH2007/04623

95 Trafalgar Street Brighton

Installation of automated teller machine - Retrospective

APPEAL LODGED

07/08/2008

Delegated

<u>WARD</u>	HOLLINGBURY & STANMER
<u>APPLICATION NUMBER</u>	BH2007/02920
<u>ADDRESS</u>	86 Davey Drive Brighton
<u>DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION</u>	Engineering operation to create decking in rear garden (Retrospective).
<u>APPEAL STATUS</u>	APPEAL LODGED
<u>APPEAL RECEIVED DATE</u>	11/08/2008
<u>APPLICATION DECISION LEVEL</u>	Delegated

<u>WARD</u>	MOULSECOOMB & BEVENDEAN
<u>APPLICATION NUMBER</u>	BH2007/03934
<u>ADDRESS</u>	6 Jevington Drive Brighton
<u>DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION</u>	Proposed two storey side extension to house.
<u>APPEAL STATUS</u>	APPEAL LODGED
<u>APPEAL RECEIVED DATE</u>	11/08/2008
<u>APPLICATION DECISION LEVEL</u>	Delegated

<u>WARD</u>	QUEEN'S PARK
<u>APPLICATION NUMBER</u>	BH2008/00436
<u>ADDRESS</u>	Sawadee Thai Restaurant 87 St James Street Brighton
<u>DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION</u>	Installation of kitchen extract duct.
<u>APPEAL STATUS</u>	APPEAL LODGED
<u>APPEAL RECEIVED DATE</u>	11/08/2008
<u>APPLICATION DECISION LEVEL</u>	Delegated

<u>WARD</u>	BRUNSWICK AND ADELAIDE
<u>APPLICATION NUMBER</u>	BH2008/00068
<u>ADDRESS</u>	Flat 2 33 Adelaide Crescent Hove
<u>DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION</u>	Rear extension to flat at first floor.
<u>APPEAL STATUS</u>	APPEAL LODGED
<u>APPEAL RECEIVED DATE</u>	06/08/2008
<u>APPLICATION DECISION LEVEL</u>	Delegated

<u>WARD</u>	WESTBOURNE
<u>APPLICATION NUMBER</u>	BH2008/01118
<u>ADDRESS</u>	53A New Church Road Hove
<u>DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION</u>	Three new detached houses and ancillary landscaping works.
<u>APPEAL STATUS</u>	APPEAL LODGED
<u>APPEAL RECEIVED DATE</u>	05/08/2008
<u>APPLICATION DECISION LEVEL</u>	

WARD**APPLICATION NUMBER****ADDRESS****DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION****APPEAL STATUS****APPEAL RECEIVED DATE****APPLICATION DECISION LEVEL****CENTRAL HOVE**

BH2008/00582

Flat 5 4 St Aubyns Gardens Hove

Replacement of front doors and window with UPVC.

APPEAL LODGED

18/08/2008

Delegated

WARD**APPLICATION NUMBER****ADDRESS****DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION****APPEAL STATUS****APPEAL RECEIVED DATE****APPLICATION DECISION LEVEL****WITHDEAN**

BH2008/00397

3 Copse Hill Westdene Brighton

Proposed hip to gable roof extension, rear dormer and front rooflight (resubmission and revision of refused application BH2007/00708).

APPEAL LODGED

18/08/2008

Delegated

INFORMATION ON INFORMAL HEARINGS / PUBLIC INQUIRIES 10 September 2008

This is a note of the current position regarding Planning Inquiries and Hearings

57 Shirley Drive, Hove

Planning application no: BH2007/02609
Details of application: Construction of two semi-detached houses.
Decision: Delegated
Type of appeal: Informal Hearing
Date: 8 October 2008, 10am
Location: Committee Room 2, Hove Town Hall

Albany Towers, St Catherines Terrace, Kingsway Hove

Planning application no: BH2007/03305
Details of application: Roof extension to provide 2 penthouse flats with 2 car parking spaces and new secure cycle store.
Decision: Delegated
Type of appeal: Informal Hearing
Date: 21 October 2008
Location: Hove Town Hall

46-48 Kings Road, Brighton

Planning application no: BH2007/03924
Details of application: Display of externally illuminated advertisement banner.
Decision: Delegated
Type of appeal: Informal Hearing
Date:
Location:

Bali Brasserie, Kingsway Court, First Avenue, Hove

Planning application no: BH2007/04314
Details of application: UPVC canopy to rear of building to provide smoking shelter (retrospective)
Decision: Delegated
Type of appeal: Informal Hearing
Date:
Location:

Bali Brasserie, Kingsway Court, Queens Gardens Hove

Planning application no: Enforcement case 2007/0547
Details of application: Construction of smoking shelter.
Decision: N/A
Type of appeal: Informal Hearing
Date:
Location:

128 Church Road Hove

Planning application no: BH2007/02378
Details of application: Change of use of first floor with second floor extension, with additional accommodation in the roof space to form five flats.
Decision: Delegated
Type of appeal: Informal Hearing
Date:
Location:

124 Church Road Hove

Planning application no: BH2007/02379
Details of application: Alterations and extensions to form part 2, part 3 storey building with roof accommodation to form four flats above existing retail.
Decision: Delegated
Type of appeal: Informal Hearing
Date:
Location:

Norfolk Court, Norfolk Square

Planning application no: BH2007/02515
Details of application: Gambrel roof extension to form 1 bedroom flat and external alterations to existing building.
Decision: Delegated
Type of appeal: Informal Hearing
Date:
Location:

Land to the rear of 48 & 50 Old Shoreham Road

Planning application no: BH2007/04047
Details of application: Construction of two three storey, four bedroom houses.
Decision: Delegated
Type of appeal: Informal Hearing
Date:
Location:

9 Station Road, Portslade

Planning application no: BH2007/04148
Details of application: Proposed roof extensions and alterations, including provision of mansard roof to provide additional floors creating two additional flats and bike/bin storage at entrance.
Decision: Delegated
Type of appeal: Informal Hearing
Date:
Location:

32 Redhill Drive, Brighton

Planning application no: BH2007/02980
Details of application: Demolition of existing house and construction of a pair of semi-detached houses - resubmission of refused application BH2007/00041.

Decision: Delegated
Type of appeal: Informal Hearing
Date:
Location:

87 Cowley Drive, Woodingdean, Brighton

Planning application no: BH2008/00443
Description: Outline application for a detached dwelling.
Decision: Delegated
Type of appeal: Informal Hearing
Date:
Location:

5 The Sett Portslade

Planning application no: BH2008/00585
Description: Proposed 2 storey side extension.
Decision: Delegated
Type of appeal: Informal Hearing
Date:
Location:

7 Welesmere Road Rottingdean Brighton

Planning application no: BH2008/00892
Description: Change of use of an existing 'granny annex' to a detached dwelling.
Decision: Delegated
Type of appeal: Informal Hearing
Date:
Location:

Site Address: 2 Northgate Close Rottingdean

Planning application no: BH2008/00177
Description: First floor and side extensions. Retrospective.
Decision: Delegated
Type of appeal: Informal Hearing
Date:
Location:

Site Address: 106 Longhill Road

Planning application no: BH2007/03875
Description: Demolition of existing house and garage. Construction of a five-bedroom detached house with integral annexe and a detached double garage.
Decision: Delegated
Type of appeal: Informal Hearing
Date:
Location:

69-70 Queens Head, Queens Road, Brighton

Planning application no: BH2007/03632
Description: Partial change of use of 1st and 2nd floors from solely A4 (incorporating staff accommodation) to mixed use A3, A4 and sui generis. Also proposed new 3rd floor mansard roof with A4 use.
Decision: Delegated
Type of appeal: Informal Hearing

Date:
Location:

Land east of 55 Highcroft Villas

Planning application no: BH2007/03843
Description: Erection of an apartment building containing 24 flats with parking and access.
Decision: Committee
Type of appeal: Public Inquiry
Date:
Location:

128 Longhill Road Ovingdean Brighton

Planning application no: BH2007/01679
Details of application: Erection of four detached houses.
Decision: Against non-determination
Type of appeal: Public Inquiry
Date:
Location:

128 Longhill Road Ovingdean Brighton

Planning application no: BH2008/01353
Details of application: Construction of four houses. Existing dwelling to be demolished.
Decision: Delegated
Type of appeal: Public Inquiry
Date:
Location:

