

8th January 2020 Planning Committee – Additional Representations

Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
31	Glenside, Wincombe Road, Brighton	BH2019/03132	<p>Additional neighbour response <u>objecting</u> to the proposal on the following ground:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The loss of larger family homes in this location, close to many schools. <p><u>Officer response</u>: These issues are addressed in the report.</p>
47	40 Dyke Road Avenue, Brighton	BH2019/02306	<p>CAG recommends <u>refusal</u> on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The demolition of the existing house Arts and Crafts Revival house which is designed in the simplified style typical of houses by the renowned architect Charles Voysey would be a great loss to the conservation area. It is therefore wrong to suggest that the relatively plain design detracts from the house's interest. It is perfectly feasible to restore the existing house and extend it if more accommodation was required. The proposed replacement house is a particularly unattractive pastiche containing elements of mock Georgian style with little apparent common architectural vocabulary with its immediate or more distant neighbours. It would not only fail to preserve the character of conservation area it would significantly harm it. <p>Additional neighbour response <u>objecting</u> to the proposal on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demolition of the building. Proposed dwelling represents an overdevelopment. Out of keeping. <p><u>Officer response</u>: These issues are addressed in the report.</p>
59	218 Dyke Road, Brighton	BH2019/02290	<p>CAG: <u>No objection</u> but have the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about the rear terrace and its overlooking nature when viewed

			<p>from Highcroft Villas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Also concern about the terraces and the confusing wording in the application, “front and rear terraces”.
81	218 Dyke Road, Brighton	BH2019/02273	<p>CAG: <u>No objection</u> but have the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hoped Officers will look closely at the design of the internal alterations, in particular concerning the public bar area, which is original to 1895 and is of high quality and should be preserved, being part of the listing. • Regret the loss of the pitched roof at the rear which is to be levelled. • The very unusual and unique rear roof feature of the copper dormer/ air vent should be retained, which seems not to be retained on the proposed drawings.