



PLANNING COMMITTEE LIST

Brighton & Hove COUNCILLOR REPRESENTATION **City Council**

Cllr. Jackie O'Quinn

BH2024/01297 – 120 Holland Road

30th June 2024:

I am writing to object to the above planning application on behalf of residents and in particular on behalf of the residents at no 122 Holland Road.

I have made a site visit to 122 Holland Road to assess the situation for myself as it was so difficult to see where the issue lay from the plans that are presented in this application which don't reflect the situation on the ground. The following are the issues that have led to the large number of objections to this application:

The height of the single storey ground rear infill extension at no 120 is most definitely higher than the extension at no 122 and the difference in height does create an appreciable loss of light to no 122. The drawings presented do not reflect the difference in height very accurately and thus one could be led to believe there is little difference.

The loss of light to no 122 is to their main living area – kitchen, dining room and leading into the living room – all open plan. The roof of the extension at no 120 is their main source of daylight for the living area and without it the area is cast into various degrees of shadow for at least 6 months of the year. This loss of light is a loss of private amenity to the residents of no 122, especially as the area is utilised by Mrs Heathfield who uses the area immediately under the clear roof of the extension to carry out her work. We are all aware of how important natural light is to our wellbeing and that is underlined by the fact that the residents of no 120 have installed a light/sun tunnel to their roof as they know how important light is.

It has been stated that there were no objections to the initial planning application and that somehow this makes everything ok. However, the residents of no 122 believed that the infill extension at no 120 was the same height as their own extension as shown in the plans presented – in BH2023/02625 - and that there would therefore be no issues- so there was no point in objecting. However, the planning officer was 'apprehensive about light loss as a result of (the) development' and it was passed on the proviso that it was built 'in accordance with the approved drawings', all of which show the extension as no higher than 3m – so, no higher than the one at no 122.

However, as the extension was built it became clear that there was going to be a significant height difference and the residents of 122 asked for changes to be made – but they weren't and that is what has led to this debacle and the retrospective application.

The situation has done considerable damage to the relationship of the residents at no 122 and 120 who were previously on friendly terms, and this is directly as a result of misleading plans. On another note, I would like to say how sad it is that this has happened to Mrs Heathfield who campaigned so hard on behalf of all her neighbours, including at Bellmead (Housing for older residents), against the building of 80 flats on the corner of Cromwell Road and Palmeira Avenue. This went to appeal and the appeal was won by residents with Mrs Heathfield being



PLANNING COMMITTEE LIST

Brighton & Hove COUNCILLOR REPRESENTATION **City Council**

one of the residents who spoke at the appeal hearing despite her nervousness about public speaking. I'm aware this is not a planning consideration, but it does rather underline the saying 'no good deed goes without punishment'.

I would request that this retrospective application not be approved, and I wish to speak at the Planning Committee when this application is heard.