10th October 2018 Planning Committee – Additional Representations

Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment				
	Enterprise Point & 16-18 Melbourne Street	BH2018/02751	Informative 2. This decision is	based on the revised drawing	s received o	on 29 th Marc	h as below:
					First submissi on	Re- submissi on	Final Submissi on
			Drawing no.	Title	revision	revision	revision
			2717_GAD_100	Site location plan (site		No	
			000	edge red)	С	change	C
			2717_GAD_100				
			001	Block Plan	Α	С	С
			2717_GAD_100				
			002	Site plan as existing	Α	С	С
			2717_GAD_100 010	Existing Lower Ground Floor Plan	A	С	С
			2717_GAD_100 011	Existing Ground Floor Plan		С	С
			2717_GAD_100	Existing Ground Floor Flair	/ \		
			012	Existing 1st-4th Floor Plan	Α	С	C
			2717_GAD_100	Existing North & South			
			013	Elevations	Α	С	С
			2717_GAD_100	Existing East & West			
			014	Elevations	Α	С	С
			2717_GAD_120	Ground floor plan as			
			000	proposed	0	S	U
			2717_GAD_120	First floor plan as			
			001	proposed	0	S	U
			2717_GAD_120	Second floor plan as	0	S	U

_

	()	
۰	v	

002	proposed			
2717_GAD_120	Third floor plan as			
003	proposed	0	S	U
2717_GAD_120	Fourth floor plan as			
004	proposed	0	S	U
2717_GAD_120	Fifth floor plan as			
005	proposed	0	S	U
2717_GAD_120	Sixth floor plan as			
006	proposed	0	S	U
2717_GAD_120	Seventh floor plan as			
007	proposed	0	S	U
2717_GAD_120	Eighth floor plan as		Withdraw	Withdraw
800	proposed	0	n	n
2717_GAD_120				
009	Roof plan as proposed	0	S	Т
2717_GAD_141				
010	West Elevation	D	E	F
2717_GAD_141				_
011	South Elevation	D	Е	G
2717_GAD_141				
012	East Elevation	D	Е	F
2717_GAD_141				
013	North Elevation	D	E	E
2717_GAD_141	Contextual West and			
020	South Elevation	Α	В	С
2717_GAD_141	Contextual East and North		_	_
021	Elevation	Α	В	В
2717_GAD_141				_
030	Bay Elevation AA	Α	В	В
2717_GAD_141				_
031	Bay Elevation BB	А	В	В

w		

2717_GAD_141				
032	Bay Elevation CC	Α	В	В
2717_GAD_151	Section AA and Section			
000	ВВ	В	С	F
2717_GAD_151	Section CC and Section			
001	DD	В	С	E
2717_GAD_151				
002	Section EE and Section FF	В	С	E
2717_GAD_151		Not		
003	Section GG	submitted	Α	Α

Committee Report:

Typo paragraph 4.2: First sentence should end: ".....and the west block by a storey from **8 to 7** storeys."

Typo paragraph 9.35: Third sentence should read "The proposed **7** storey west block...."

All other references in the report to the height of the west block as being 7 storeys in height are correct.

Affordable Housing:

A letter dated 18th March was received from the applicants with a formal offer of a financial contribution of £1,272,000 towards affordable housing, made via a payment in lieu, for off-site provision in connection with the scheme. This would be in addition to the 24 flats proposed to be built on site. The applicants would like to the offer to be considered by officers and members of the Planning Committee.

Officer response:

These additional comments are submitted in response to the further information submitted by the applicant, dated 18 March 2019. In summary, the applicant proposes an additional financial contribution of £1,272,000 to be made through a

Section 106 agreement based on the financial equivalent for 8 off-site affordable housing units consisting of 4 x one and 4 x two bed units (at a cost of £135,750 for one bed and £182,250 for two bed). This contribution would be in addition to the proposed 24 on-site affordable housing units, thereby providing an effective total affordable housing contribution of 32 units.

The proposed level of contribution appears to have been determined to enable the overall on-site and off-site affordable housing 'offer' to be equivalent to 32 units. This would equate to a 40% overall proportion as set out in Policy CP20 had the site been developed to include the indicative total of 80 residential units (use class C3) that are envisaged in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA).

There remains a fundamental planning policy objection as the site is not proposed for development in this way and there remains an overall significant deficiency of C3 housing on this key allocated site. The proposal is therefore in conflict with the allocation in City Plan Policy CP3.

Since the submission of earlier policy comments, the Council's most recent housing land supply position as published in the SHLAA Update 2018 (February 2019) has been confirmed through the results of the Government's Housing Delivery Test. There is a five year housing supply shortfall of 576 net dwellings (4.5 years supply). In this situation, when considering the planning balance in the determination of planning applications, increased weight should be given to housing delivery in line with the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the NPPF (paragraph 11).

Furthermore, City Plan Part One Policy CP20 (Affordable Housing) requires a 40% **on-site** affordable housing provision on sites of 15 or more (net) dwellings. Providing an element of affordable housing off-site on a site of this size would therefore not be fully compliant with Policy CP20.

Recommend refusal for the reasons set out above and in earlier policy comments.

C	7	1
•		۰

	T	T
		Sunlight/Daylight A full set of revised plans and elevations together with a full assessment of all habitable rooms was received on 30 th March together with an accompanying letter dated 29 th March. The letter seeks to address refusal ground 3 related to the quality of daylighting to future occupants of the student and residential development thus contrary to policy QD27 of the adopted Brighton and Hove Local Plan. The amendments are stated to be minor and relate to alterations to window sizes in the student accommodation and further analysis of student studios with 2 windows and redefining the kitchen spaces in the affordable housing units. The amendments will be assessed by officers and a verbal update will be provided at the Committee meeting.
Former Peter Pan Playground Site Madeira Drive Brighton	BH2019/00293	Representations 7 Further letters of support received. Conservation Advisory Group Outcomes Following a lengthy discussion by 9 to 1 the Group recommended REFUSAL to this application for the following reasons; The application does not meet the requirements of the CA Character Statement for the East Cliff CA, the double storeys detract from the CS. Although a key design improvement are the glass balustrades and the swimming pool being moved up the beach towards the main proposal area The design of the scheme has no connection with marine architecture that would be expected along Madeira Drive. It does not compliment the historic

		 Views from Madeira Terraces when back in use will be interrupted by the two storey structures A welcome change to the colour scheme from the previous application, but why BLACK rubber. Very unsympathetic with the surroundings which indicate
		the grand open design of the 1880's. Email received from agent 28.03.2019 commenting on report. Officer Comment: The objection from CAG is noted but this does not change the recommendation.
BH2018/03600	Buckley Close, Hove	As the submitted plans include finished ground floor slabs and heights, Condition 12 is superfluous, particularly with Condition 1 requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Condition 21 – amend to include specific reference to the provision of swift boxes.

NB. Representations received after midday the Friday before the date of the Committee meeting will not be reported (Sub-Committee resolution of 23 February 2005).