

Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
11	Open Market	BH2010/03744	<p>The approved drawing list (to be inserted in Condition 2):  06590/PA/001A, 06590/PA/002A, 06590/PA/003B, 06590/PA/004A,  06590/PA/005A, 06590/PA/014E, 06590/PA/025B, 06590/PA/030D,  06590/PA/031D, 06590/PA/35, 06590/PA/36, 06590/PA/37, 06590/PA/38,  06590/PA/039, 06590/PA/40A, 06590/PA/45A, 06590/PA/046, 06590/PA/047,  06590/PA/048A, 06590/PA/49, 06590/PA/50A, 06590/PA/55B, 06590/PA/56C,  06590/PA/57B, 06590/PA/058B, 06590/PA/059B, 06590/PA/060A,  06590/PA/65B, 06590/PA/66A, 06590/PA/067A, 06590/PA/068, 06590/PA/069A,  06590/PA/070, 06590/PA/071, 06590/PA/075, 06590/PA/076, 06590/PA/077,  06590/PA/078, 06590/PA/079, 06590/PA/081, 06590/PA/082, 06590/PA/083,  06590/PA/100, E693/PH/01, E693/PH/02, E693/PH/03, E693/PH/04, E693/PH/05,  E693/PH/06, E693/PH/07, E693/PH/08 received on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2010 and  06590/PA/006A, 6590/PA/007B, 06590/PA/008G, 06590/PA/009G, 06590/PA/010F,  06590/PA/011F, 06590/PA/012F, 06590/PA/020F, 06590/PA/021F, 06590/PA/022D,  06590/PA/23C, 06590/PA/024D, 06590/PA/026D, 06590/PA/032G received on 9<sup>th</sup>  February 2011.</p> <p>The description shall be updated to remove the words ‘entrance canopies and’ to reflect the fact that the canopies no longer form part of the application.  Condition no.11 is a duplication of condition 42. Therefore no.11 should be deleted as no.42 is under the correct section of ‘pre-occupation conditions’.  After any reference to the ‘temporary market’ in the pre-commencement conditions the words ‘on the Francis Street car park’ shall be added for the avoidance of any doubt as there will also be a temporary market within the main market site before development is completed.</p> <p>A letter of <u>objection</u> from <b>17-19 Oxford Street</b> has been received on grounds that proposal would prejudice the implementation of the extant permission BH2010/02197 (part residential, part commercial), due to loss of privacy, light, outlook, and rear servicing and due to potential noise complaints.  Response: The impact on this and a previous extant permission was duly considered as part of the application. The issues raised, and the proximity of the Southern Block to properties in Oxford Street, are covered in the report.</p>

117 & 158	Royal Alexandra Hospital, 57 Dyke Road, Brighton	BH2010/03379 & BH2010/03380	<p>The following additional comments have been received:- External: Neighbours: A petition of <b>435 signatures</b> has been received calling 'upon Brighton and Hove City Council and George Wimpey Ltd to make provision for a new medical centre in the redevelopment of the former Children's Hospital of Dyke Road.' An additional 6 duplicate letters of support for a surgery on the site have been received from <b>45 Tongdean Road</b> and <b>5 letters of no address</b>. <b>26 Ferndale Road &amp; 30 St Nicholas Road</b> <u>support</u> retention of the original hospital building. <b>9 Wykeham Terrace</b> <u>object</u> to the proposal due to the impact of blocks A &amp; E on adjoining properties on Clifton Hill. <b>Montpelier Surgery:</b> The inclusion of a GP surgery should be a condition of any planning permission as the existing premises is not suitable (for the reasons outlined in section 3 of the report). The surgery's size requirements have been substantially compromised and a pharmacy could be done away with altogether to minimise the impact on the overall scheme. The Primary Care Trust is fully supportive and willing to finance the relocation of the surgery. In addition the local population / patients support the inclusion of a GP surgery on the site. <b>The Victorian Society:</b> <u>support</u> the retention and conversion of the main hospital building. The scheme enhances the character of the conservation area by restoring this important building. The green space to the southern end of the site is to be left undeveloped. This is important in retaining the open character to the conservation area and views of the hospital building. The scheme is in line with the Council's Planning Brief which reflects the views of the general public and consultees who responded to the consultation exercise on the future of the site. Regret the loss of the villa of Dyke Road but accept that its demolition may be necessary for the scheme to be financially viable. <b>West Hill Community Association:</b> <u>support</u> the plans to restore the main building and to remove the unattractive features that have been added since the early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. The 'conversion option' takes heed of the Council's Planning Brief and preserves as much of a building that, as a former children's hospital, evokes many poignant memories for local families and for families further afield. A restored main building will be some compensation for the loss of the Victorian villa on Dyke Road, which is greatly regretted and will help minimise the impact of the uninspiring new build which is proposed in conjunction with this conversion on the</p>
--------------	--	--------------------------------	---

rest of the site.

Internal:

**Economic Development:** As part of the S106 agreement the economic development team would require an agreed Employment Strategy relating to the Local Employment Scheme (LES) where the developer makes a commitment to using an agreed percentage of local labour in the construction process. Other major developments where this has been agreed include AMEX and The Keep where an agreed figure of local labour is/will be being used on the development. For this development a target of 20% local labour for the construction phase is considered achievable. The employment strategy must be approved by the city council one month before the construction work commences.

**Environmental Health:** No objections, subject to conditions relating to external lighting, soundproofing of the residential units, further studies on the potential contamination risks, the treatment of all plant and machinery against noise / vibration.

**Housing Strategy:** There is a commitment to maximise the provision of affordable housing in the City. The Planning Brief for the site set a general target of 20% of the total new-build units.

We are pleased to see that the affordable housing on site is not visually distinguishable from the market housing on the site in terms of build quality, materials, details, levels of amenity space and privacy

The affordable housing units are built to the Home and Communities Agencies minimum internal space standards, with some exceeding the standard, and are pleased to see private outdoor amenity space provided in the form of balconies and terraces, plus gardens for the ground floor flats.

This scheme provides 6 one-bedroom flats (40%) and 9 two-bedroom flats (60%), and no larger family homes. For the City as a whole our normal preferred affordable housing mix in terms of unit size and type to be achieved is 30% one bedroom units, 45% two bedroom units and 25% three bedroom.

The developer is offering intermediate housing (shared ownership). We could offer some support for a higher proportion of shared ownership properties to increase levels of owner occupation in the area.

**Response**

The additional requirements for the s106 agreement are recommended:-

- Local training and employment strategy to include a commitment to employing a percentage of construction workforce from the local area;

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A contribution of £59,500 towards the 'Futures' programme; and</li> <li>• A contribution of £59,000 towards public art or alternatively the provision of public art in the boundary detailing of the southern open space, within the open space, or a suitable location within the vicinity of the application site.</li> </ul> <p>The following additional conditions are recommended:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BH07.07 Soundproofing plant / machinery</li> <li>• BH07.11 External lighting</li> <li>• BH08.01 Contaminated Land</li> <li>• The communal stair windows at first and second floor level to the north-western elevation of block F, as indicated on hereby approved drawing nos. PL 17-004 B, PL 17-005 C &amp; PL 17-011 B, shall not be glazed otherwise than with obscured glass and shall thereafter be permanently retained as such.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reason:</b> To safeguard the privacy of the occupiers of the adjoining property and to comply with policy QD27 of the Brighton &amp; Hove Local Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The bathroom window to the south-western elevation of flat A-7, as indicated on hereby approved drawing nos. PL 17-004 B &amp; PL 17-012 C, shall not be glazed otherwise than with obscured glass and shall thereafter be permanently retained as such.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reason:</b> To safeguard the privacy of the occupiers of the adjoining property and to comply with policy QD27 of the Brighton &amp; Hove Local Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No development shall commence until details of balustrading to the external terrace of units B-18, as indicated on hereby approved drawings nos. PL 17-006 B, PL 17-010 B &amp; PL 17-012 C, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall make provision for obscured screening to prevent overlooking of adjoining properties on Clifton Hill. The balustrading shall be installed in accordance with the agreed details and shall be retained as such thereafter.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reason:</b> To safeguard the privacy of the occupiers of the adjoining property and to comply with policy QD27 of the Brighton &amp; Hove Local Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No development shall commence until details of the treatment along shared boundaries with properties on Clifton Hill have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be occupied until the boundary treatment has been completed in accordance with the approved details. The boundary treatment shall be retained as such thereafter.</li> </ul>		
---	--	--

200	13-15 Old Steine	BH2010/03968	<p><b>Reason:</b> To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development, to safeguard the privacy of the occupiers of the adjoining property, and to comply with policies QD1, QD27 &amp; HE6 of the Brighton &amp; Hove Local Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BH05.03B Ecohomes Refurbishment – Pre-Commencement (Residential involving existing buildings) ‘<i>Very Good</i>’ or ‘<i>Excellent</i>’</li> <li>• BH05.04B Ecohomes Refurbishment – Pre-Occupation (Residential involving existing buildings) ‘<i>Very Good</i>’ or ‘<i>Excellent</i>’</li> </ul> <p>The following additional informatives are recommended:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is known to be or suspected to be contaminated. Please be aware that the responsibility for the safe development and secure occupancy of the site rests with the developer. The local planning authority has determined the application on the basis of the information made available to it.</li> <li>• It is strongly recommended that in submitting details in accordance with the above/below conditions that the applicant has reference to CLR 11, Model Procedures for the management of land contamination. This is available online as a pdf document on both the DEFRA website (<a href="http://www.defra.gov.uk">www.defra.gov.uk</a>) and the Environment Agency (<a href="http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk">www.environment-agency.gov.uk</a>) website. The phased risk assessment should be carried out also in accordance with the procedural guidance and UK policy formed under the Environmental Protection Act 1990.</li> <li>• IN05.04B Informative: Ecohomes Refurbishment</li> <li>• In respect of condition 17 the applicant is advised that the CEMP should include details of a strategy to keep local residents informed on the progress and timing of demolition and construction works and an arrangement / mechanism for potential concerns to be discussed and addressed.</li> </ul> <p>Additional representations received from <b>Flat 4, 9 Eaton Place, 16 Guildford Street</b> and <b>Flat 7, Kingsgate 10 North Street</b>, <u>objecting</u> to the application for the following reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to another supermarket chain in Brighton, will be the tenth Sainsbury’s store in Brighton and Hove.</li> <li>• Out of character with an area marked by small businesses and independent food outlets.</li> </ul> <p><b>Cllr Ben Duncan</b> – <u>Objects</u> to the application – shop front is not in keeping with the area and therefore runs counter to the principal of protecting the urban fabric of the conservation area. For permission to be granted would allow the applicant to operate a store which would detract from the viability of the area, in contravention of the</p>
-----	------------------	--------------	---

71 & 104	Royal Alexandra Hospital, 57 Dyke Road, Brighton	BH2010/03324 & BH2010/03325	<p>principals of Chapter 6 of the Local Plan Response- No new issues are raised the objections are addressed in the committee report.</p> <p>The following additional comments have been received:-  External:  Neighbours: <b>21A Victoria Road (x2) objects</b> to the application due to the loss of the original hospital building.  <b>The Victorian Society: Objects.</b> The Royal Alexandra Hospital by Thomas Lainson is an attractive and well-loved landmark in Brighton and an important feature of Montpelier and Clifton Hill Conservation Area. It is ideally suited to residential conversion and re-use. The site is large and contains a number of buildings which could also be adapted or redeveloped.  The appeal against the Council's refusal for the redevelopment of this site was dismissed at Public Inquiry in 2009 as the case for the benefits of the scheme did not outweigh the contribution that the building made to the conservation area. It is in sufficiently good condition that its demolition would also be very wasteful. The applicants have applied to convert the main hospital building as well as submitting this application for its demolition. This rather undermines their arguments for granting this application consent since a building which enhances the character of a Conservation Area should not, according to local policy, be demolished if a viable alternative use can be found.  Following the Public Inquiry your Council consulted on a Planning Brief for the site in order to inform the design process. The Brief emphasised the importance of the hospital building as an asset to the area and that the presumption for a scheme was for its retention. This application does not follow this design guidance.  The design of the proposed development does nothing to enhance the Conservation Area. The blocks of flats are bland and do not compare with the distinctive character of the hospital.  Internal:  <b>Environmental Health: No objections</b>, subject to conditions relating to external lighting, soundproofing of the residential units, further studies on the potential contamination risks, the treatment of all plant and machinery against noise / vibration.</p>
----------	--	-----------------------------	--

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).