

04 April 2012 Planning Committee – Late List

Page	Site Address	Application No.	Update
Part One 19	Former Nurses Accommodation, Brighton General Hospital, Pankhurst Avenue	Request for variation of s106 Variation BH2010/01054	<p><b>Amendments as a consequence of the NPPF</b> None</p> <p><b>Housing Commissioning Team:</b> Southern have confirmed that notwithstanding the variation they are seeking to the section 106 agreement it is their intention is to deliver all the housing as affordable housing tenure, as detailed in their Framework Development agreement with the Homes and Communities Agency. We understand that the reduction in the level of the quota and flexibility in tenure in the legal agreement will have a positive impact on how their lenders value the development for security. This will assist Southern in maximising their borrowing capacity and ability to further invest in the City. On the basis of this information from the applicant and assurances that the affordable housing will be delivered through the Homes and Communities Affordable Housing Programme, Housing Commissioning support this requested variation in order that this key strategic site can be delivered.</p> <p><b>Officer response:</b> Additional consultation response received and noted</p>
Item A Page 11	Park House, Old Shoreham Road, Hove	BH2012/00114	<p><b>Amendments as a consequence of the NPPF</b> Page 26, Section 7. Delete reference to the PPS1, PPS3, PPS4, PPS9, PPS10, PPS22, PPS23, PPS25, PPG13, PPG17 and PPG24. Replace with reference to the National Planning Policy Framework. P28, Para 6 – The definition of Affordable Housing remains unchanged in the NPPF. P35, Para 6 – First line remove reference to PPG24.</p> <p><b>Public Art:</b> <u>No objection.</u> Comments have been received in relation to public art on site. It is recommended that an ‘artistic component’ schedule is included in the Section 106 Agreement. It is suggested that the public art element for this application is to the value of £67,000.00 based on the internal gross area of the development proposed (8,500 square metres). The final contribution is a matter for the Case Officer to test against requirements for</p>

Sections 106 contributions for the early development in relation to green defences contributions which may be necessary. The proposed measures in the measures report, the contributions set out in the report have been provided.

A letter of [agreement](#) has been received from **Mike Weatherly MP** stating the following:

- the proposed amendments of the main block on its road frontage are acceptable
- the gardens would benefit from more foliage to reduce the visual impact of the development
- there is sufficient communal amenity space on the grounds of the block and the proposed amendments would not be detrimental to residents to at least be acceptable
- the proposed boundary wall does not do to the development justice, it is suggested that the wall be removed

**Officer response:** All issues raised have been addressed in the report.

Letters of representation have been received from **Steve Howe** and the occupier of 7 Grosvenor Gardens, stating the following:

- the design of the development represents an incongruous addition, out of keeping with the surrounding area and ignores the historic significance of Park Lane
- heights will not be adequately reduced by the scheme
- mechanical noise will not protect the residents with Tower Place, Gardens; Grosvenor Gardens and Grosvenor Gardens
- the traffic study was performed in August and is therefore relevant due to the winter months
- noise mitigation measures to be implemented
- the development poses a significant security risk to existing residents in Howe Gardens

**Officer response:** All issues have been addressed in the report. In terms of the traffic study, a report update will be provided during the committee presentation.

Item 2 Page 91	Item 2 7 Elm Close, New	B14011103295	<p><b>Amendments as a consequence of the MPPF</b></p> <p>Page 65, Section 7, replace reference to PPS 1 and PPS3 with reference to the MPPF.</p> <p>The report reference PPS2 with respect to the Greenbelt status of the land. The MPPF does not change this definition and there on the CSH rating is unchanged.</p>
Item F 96	Item F 23 Lowther Road	B14012103700	<p><b>Amendment to the report:</b> Page 36, under the heading SITE, this should read and be used after from end of and on to page 101, last paragraph the number should read the 23 instead of 24.</p> <p>Further detail of <del>232323</del> from occupier of no. 23 Lowther Road on grounds that since it is the dring area, in addition one of the occupiers of the neighbouring premises is a child, the proposed development will have a significant adverse impact on the day to day living of the person.</p> <p><b>Officer response:</b> The special needs of the neighbouring occupier are not considered to a material consideration which weight should be given in the determination of the application.</p>
Items G and 105 106 121	Items 11 Dyle Road	B14011103706 B14011103708	<p><b>Amendments as a consequence of the MPPF</b></p> <p>Column reference to PPS1, PPS and PPS3 on section 7 of pages 115 and 125</p>

