

20<sup>th</sup> July 2011 Planning Committee – Additional Representations

Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
44	Withdean Stadium, Tongdean Lane	BH2011/00973	<p>Further <u>objection</u> received to the amendment from the occupier of <b>15 Shepherds Croft</b> for the same reasons as those for the original submission.</p> <p>Officer response:</p> <p>The original objections are included in the officer report.</p> <p>Further comments received on the amendment from the <b>Crime Prevention Design Officer</b> who has <u>no objection</u> to the removal of the proposed structures. The removal of the temporary stand and toilet facilities has resulted in there being one double gated access point for the stadium. From a crime prevention perspective this has had the effect of strengthening the security of the perimeter as it will be far easier to control a singular access and egress point. Asks that any existing security measures and systems are continued to be used and are adapted to suit the new environment.</p>
63	189 Kingsway (former Sackville Hotel site)	BH2011/01146	<p>An <u>objection</u> has been received from John Coleman, the applicant for the redevelopment of <b>191 Kingsway</b> which immediately adjoins the former Sackville Hotel site to the west (application BH2011/01659). This letter was emailed by Mr Coleman to members of the Planning Committee on 14 July 2011. The grounds of objection are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A contemporary scheme for the redevelopment of <b>191 Kingsway</b> has been submitted and is now a material consideration in the determination of the application for the redevelopment of the former Sackville Hotel site.</li> <li>• The proposed western elevation of the terrace of 5 dwellings fronting Kingsway has been designed with no consideration for either the existing property at <b>191 Kingsway</b> and the amenity which it enjoys, or for its redevelopment.</li> <li>• For some time discussions have been underway to redevelop both <b>189 &amp; 191 Kingsway</b>. The owners of 189 had originally taken an option to purchase 191 to enable a comprehensive redevelopment of both sites, which has been withdrawn.</li> <li>• At the consultation stage the proposal had no windows within the western elevation to the terrace. In principle no objections are raised to the redevelopment of 189, but the inclusion of 20 windows in the elevation appears to be a deliberate ploy to stifle any attempts to redevelop 191.</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that the windows in the western elevation would not comply with Building Regulations, specifically with regard to the spread of fire.</li> </ul> <p>Officer response: The impact of the scheme on both the existing property at 191 Kingsway, and on the proposed scheme for the redevelopment of the site, has been fully addressed in the committee report.</p> <p>Whether the scheme would be acceptable in terms of Building Regulations is not a material planning consideration.</p>
80	Upper Dene Court 4Westdene Drive	BH2011/00992	<p>An additional letter of <u>objection</u> has been received from the residents of <b>3 Westdene Drive</b>. The grounds of <u>objection</u> are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The residents live exactly opposite the application site and have suffered months of inconvenience as a result of the application BH2007/01441 for two flats being constructed to the rear of <b>2 Westdene Drive</b>.</li> <li>The application is contrary to policies QD1, QD2, QD14 and TR1 of the Brighton &amp; Hove Local Plan.</li> <li>Nos. <b>2/4 Upper Dene Court</b> is now 14 flats and has never benefited from on site parking. Photographs are included which show the existing parking arrangement and congestion as vehicles currently park on all sides, including on the pavement and across driveways.</li> <li>Since the construction of the extension at <b>2 Upper Dene Court</b> the situation has deteriorated further. Should this application be approved, the increase of traffic anticipated will only exacerbate the situation which is already intolerable.</li> </ul> <p>Officer response: The impact of the scheme on parking and traffic generation has been fully addressed in the committee report. This includes reference to the Inspector's comments on the previous scheme approved at appeal and the Sustainable Transport Manager's comments on the current scheme.</p> <p>An additional letter of <u>objection</u> has been received from Councillor Mike Jones. The letter is attached to this document.</p>
107	Windlesham School, Dyke Road	BH2011/01463	<p>An additional letter of representation, undersigned by the occupiers of <b>5, 6, 8 and 16 Crescent Place</b> has been received re-enforcing their previously submitted objections.</p> <p>No additional office comment</p>
115	15 Crescent Place	BH2011/00750	

125	3 Ovingdean Close	BH2011/01132	<p>Following the re-consultation of neighbouring residents, additional letters from the residents of nos. <b>5 and 6 Ovingdean Close</b> have been received raising the following <u>objections</u> to the proposed development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the property as viewed from the wider streetscene and would be out of keeping with the area,</li> <li>• It has been Council's policy through the years to discourage high extensions within <b>Ovingdean Close</b> as this would lead to an overbearing shadowing of adjoining properties and possible loss of privacy.</li> <li>• Most adjoining dwellings are in keeping with the sylvan setting originally envisaged and emphasised by a Conservation Area.</li> <li>• The extension of the main ridge will result in the main house being weighted towards the north end,</li> <li>• A two storey extension will be built right up to the boundary with no. 5.</li> <li>• The amendments are not substantially different from earlier plans and therefore the previous Planning Inspectors comments are relevant especially regarding the gap between nos. <b>3 and 5. Ovingdean Close</b> is a spacious street in a semi-rural location where the houses are not or give the impression of being glued one against the next.</li> <li>• The rear extensions ridge will be as long as the main ridge of the house, as extended. The overall result is a bulky building that bears no relationship to the size and proportions of the original house or to that of any of the neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• The proposal will neither preserve nor enhance the character of <b>Ovingdean Close</b> as required by SPGBH1. and</li> <li>• Overshadowing of the property on the north side, no. 5.</li> </ul> <p>No additional officer comment.</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).

