

Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
18	34 Hove Park Road	BH2011/01431	<p>An additional letter of <u>support</u> has been received from <b>18 Rigden Road</b>. The applicant has submitted a representation in support of the proposals highlighting considerations relating to design and sustainability.  <b>Response:</b> These issues are addressed in the report.</p>
44	54-55 Meeting House Lane	BH2011/02561	<p><b>Relevant History:</b> A Planning Enforcement Notice was issued on 11 May 2011 requiring the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove the first floor rear extension</li> <li>• Remove decking from the roof at first floor level</li> <li>• Remove wooden balustrade from roof at first floor level</li> <li>• Cease the use of the first floor as a roof terrace</li> </ul> <p>The period for compliance of the notice was 13 July 2011. Officers are awaiting the outcome of this current application before proceeding with further action.</p> <p>Additional representations have been received from <b>Gold Lion Group (The Cricketers PH)</b> and <b>15 Prince Albert Street</b> in <u>support</u> of the proposal for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applicant is a proven and successful operator that will ensure the business is run to a more professional level than previous tenants, and a new quality venue will benefit the locality as a whole;</li> <li>• Timber shop front would be more suitable than the existing appearance with roller shutters;</li> <li>• Welcome the changes as they reflect daytime opening;</li> <li>• Roof terrace is not visible from the street and would be a preference to having smokers blocking the Lanes in an already narrow and congested area;</li> <li>• Litter on Meeting House Lane would be significantly reduced.</li> </ul> <p><b>Response:</b> The proposed shop front alterations have been noted in the report. The other comments made above are noted, however they do not relate to the reasons for refusal which are based on inappropriate design and the impact on amenity of the occupiers of nearby residential properties.</p> <p><b>Licensing Unit of Sussex Police</b> have commented on the application:-</p>

58	4 Roedean Heights	BH2010/02909	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sussex Police are not opposed to the planning application to use the smoking area roof terrace beyond the current cut off time of 23:00 hours;</li> <li>• There are advantages to using this area rather than the current smoking area by the entrance, as long as the area promotes the 4 licensing objectives and does not cause issues of noise late at night.</li> </ul> <p><b>Response:</b> This is a response to a request to comment on the application from the applicant directly. The issue of noise is discussed in the committee report.</p> <p><b>Environmental Health</b> have made an additional comment on the application:- There is a history of noise complaint relating to 54-55 Meeting House Lane, Brighton however these have affected residents in Ship Street and Meeting House Lane and are not as a result of the use of the smoking terrace at the rear of the premises.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> This is a response to a request for additional clarification from the applicant directly. The issue of noise is discussed in the committee report.</p> <p><b>The Applicant</b> has submitted further comments in <u>support</u> of the application:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Negotiated at length with Conservation &amp; Design and Environmental Health;</li> <li>• Committee report does not reflect that the applicant has agreed to the changes that could be practically and financially supported;</li> <li>• Comments of the supporters should be given due weight;</li> <li>• There is only one residential unit in the surrounding area which is not self-contained;</li> <li>• Applicant encloses an outline of a management and security plan;</li> <li>• The use of the terrace would be better controlled than in the last 3 years, a time in which there not been any noise complaints;</li> <li>• The current terrace is not attractive but the changes proposed will be a considerable improvement;</li> <li>• There are rendered finishes to the adjoining listed building;</li> <li>• The benefits that would arise from the proposal would considerably outweigh the so-called harm that has been identified in the committee report.</li> </ul> <p><b>Response:</b> The comments made above are noted. The design issues and nearby residential uses have been noted in the report.</p>	Letters have been received from ‘ <b>DMH Stallard</b> ’ (on behalf of the freeholders of
----	-------------------	--------------	---	--

**Ocean Heights), ‘WS Planning’ (on behalf of the owners of nos. 2 and 3 Roedeane Heights) and the occupiers of no. 12 The Cliff and no. 48 Roedeane Crescent** reiterating a number of the objections detailed in Section 5 of the Committee Report and raising the following further points:

- If the application is approved it will set an unwelcome precedent and will cause ‘the end of Roedeane as a family based single dwelling environment’.
- The proposed developments will bring more than 30 cars; where will they park?
- Further visuals should have been submitted showing views looking west along Roedeane Heights and from Roedeane Crescent to fully demonstrate the impact on Roedeane Heights.
- The scale, height and bulk of the proposed building would be out of keeping and would have a detrimental impact on the identity and character of the area.
- It is possible that further similar developments along Roedeane Heights could be proposed which would have an unacceptable cumulative visual impact, including impact upon the setting of the National Park.
- Notwithstanding the additional information submitted in relation to the proposed biomass heating system, a number of concerns remain including smoke / dust nuisance, fire safety risk, disturbance caused by pellet deliveries, and disturbance caused by required maintenance.
- The submitted sunlight and daylight report relating to impact on Ocean Heights is not sufficient / conclusive. The proposal would cause a loss of daylight/sunlight.
- The submitted sunlight and daylight reports do not address the potential for each of the two developments to be built separately.
- Further concerns are raised regarding overlooking and noise disturbance.
- Full details of boundary planting have not been provided; this would be required to protect the privacy of residents of Ocean Heights, but could cause additional loss of daylight/sunlight.
- The submitted visuals may be misleading.
- The submitted visuals only show the two developments constructed together, the potential for each to be built separately has not been addressed.
- The Ocean Heights building has a detrimental impact on views from the National Park. The proposed developments would not right that wrong, they would increase the prominence of the development.

**Response:** These issues have been addressed in the report.

85	5 Roedean Heights	BH2010/02910	<p>Letters have been received from ‘<b>DMH Stallard</b>’ (on behalf of the freeholders of <b>Ocean Heights</b>), ‘<b>WS Planning</b>’ (on behalf of the owners of nos. 2 and 3 <b>Roedean Heights</b>) and the occupiers of <b>no. 12 The Cliff</b> and <b>no. 48 Roedean Crescent</b> reiterating a number of the <u>objections</u> detailed in Section 5 of the Committee Report and raising the following further points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the application is approved it will set an unwelcome precedent and will cause ‘the end of Roedean as a family based single dwelling environment’.</li> <li>• The proposed developments will bring more than 30 cars; where will they park?</li> <li>• Further visuals should have been submitted showing views looking west along Roedean Heights and from Roedean Crescent to fully demonstrate the impact on Roedean Heights.</li> <li>• The scale, height and bulk of the proposed building would be out of keeping and would have a detrimental impact on the identity and character of the area.</li> <li>• It is possible that further similar developments along Roedean Heights could be proposed which would have an unacceptable cumulative visual impact, including impact upon the setting of the National Park.</li> <li>• Notwithstanding the additional information submitted in relation to the proposed biomass heating system, a number of concerns remain including smoke / dust nuisance, fire safety risk, disturbance caused by pellet deliveries, and disturbance caused by required maintenance.</li> <li>• The submitted sunlight and daylight report relating to impact on Ocean Heights is not sufficient / conclusive. The proposal would cause a loss of daylight/sunlight.</li> <li>• The submitted sunlight and daylight reports do not address the potential for each of the two developments to be built separately.</li> <li>• Further concerns are raised regarding overlooking and noise disturbance.</li> <li>• Full details of boundary planting have not been provided; this would be required to protect the privacy of residents of Ocean Heights, but could cause additional loss of daylight/sunlight.</li> <li>• The submitted visuals may be misleading.</li> <li>• The submitted visuals only show the two developments constructed together, the potential for each to be built separately has not been addressed.</li> <li>• The Ocean Heights building has a detrimental impact on views from the National Park. The proposed developments would not right that wrong, they would increase the prominence of the development.</li> </ul>
----	-------------------	--------------	--

148	Badgers Walk, Ovingdean Road	BH2011/02480	<p><b>Response:</b> These issues have been addressed in the report.</p> <p>Amended Block Plan received.</p> <p><b>Amend Condition 2</b> to read;</p> <p>The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with part of the approved drawings no.2272/01RevA received on 18th August 2011 and the Block Plan received on the 10<sup>th</sup> November 2011.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.</p>
172	The Level, Ditchling Road	BH2011/02555	<p>Following discussion with applicant <b>amend Conditions 4 and 11</b> to read;</p> <p><b>Condition 4</b> - Deliveries to the café hereby approved shall only be made between the hours of 07.30 and 13.30 Monday to Saturday and at no times Sunday or Bank Holidays.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> To safeguard the amenities of the locality and to comply with policies SU10 and QD27 of the Brighton &amp; Hove Local Plan.</p> <p><b>Condition 11</b> – Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority the sustainability measures set out in the application, including the ground source heat pump, solar thermal panels and green roof, shall be installed prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> To ensure that measures to make the development sustainable and efficient in the use of energy, water and materials are included in the development and to comply with policy SU2 of the Brighton &amp; Hove Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Document SPD08 Sustainable Building Design.</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).

