

18th September 2013 Planning Committee – Additional Representations

Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
23	Hove Park Depot The Droveway, Hove	BH2013/02096	The full planning application has been withdrawn by the applicants
53	Aldi Stores Ltd 7 Carlton Terrace Portslade	BH2013/02050	<p>Occupiers of 11 Ronuk House <u>object</u> on the grounds that the present operation in the store causes constant disruption, especially in the evening and when trying to sleep. There appears to be poor insulation between the store and residential properties above.</p> <p>The noise assessment is irrelevant as it does not cover disturbance caused to flats. If the residents could not hear the operation it is doubted they would have objections, but the store does cause considerable disturbance and noise nuisance. At times it is not possible to go to bed till after 10:30pm which is of detriment to those who have to get up early, at 4:30 for example as the occupant of 11 Ronuk House.</p> <p>If they employed more staff to stack shelves and operated during the day then an extension in hours would not be necessary to service the store later.</p> <p>Officer response: The comments are noted. The Applicant's noise assessment does cover impact to the occupiers of the flats and the impact upon residents has been considered.</p>
89	Land to South of 32 Cambridge Grove, Hove	BH2013/02349	<p>Cllr Rob Jarrett <u>supports</u> the application, A copy of his email is attached to the end of the late list.</p> <p>Amended site plan attached to end of late list</p>
103 & 117	119 Church Road Hove	BH2013/02074 & BH2013/02075	Legible copy of Cllr Cox's letter attached to end of late list

155 & 167	3 Royal Crescent Brighton	BH2013/02139 & BH2013/02140	<p>Occupier of 4 Royal Crescent Mews <u>objects</u> to the proposal on the following grounds:</p> <p>Impact on Amenity Item K BH2013/02139 - Section 8.17</p> <p>We strongly disagree that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on our privacy and amenity. Our objection to the roof lantern is not that the occupiers of the garden room would be overlooking us but that the reverse would be the case - against our will, we will be forced to look down on them from our first floor windows. This will be particularly unwelcome at night when the room will be illuminated from below.</p> <p>We wonder whether the applicants themselves have fully considered the implications of this.</p> <p>In our view, there are two ways this could be solved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As previously suggested, the roof could be solid, which would be in keeping with other structures in the immediate area or 2. The boundary wall to 3 Royal Crescent could be raised to the same level as the adjacent wall of 4 Royal Crescent. This would neatly tie together these two areas of flint wall and help to mask the roof lantern from the upper windows of houses in Royal Crescent Mews, to the benefit of all parties. <p>Impact on Royal Crescent Mews during building work</p> <p>In conclusion we would like to request that, should the application be approved, the council consider using its powers to enforce controlled hours of operation and other restrictions that might make the duration of the works more bearable to the residents of Royal Crescent Mews. The mews is very small, with limited parking space, and the ground floor windows of the houses look directly onto the roadway. We would ask that consideration be made about how and where construction vehicles and staff would gain access to the site for unloading without causing a highway hazard or inconveniencing neighbours and that vehicles should not be parked in the mews. We would also ask that building materials are stored on site, i.e: within the boundaries of 3 Royal Crescent.</p>
--------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------	---

			<p>Officer response: It is still considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the adjacent occupiers within Royal Crescent Mews. Having views into the garden room through the roof lantern is not a reason that would warrant a refusal of planning permission. As such, it is not necessary to seek amendments to the design of the proposal, which in itself is considered acceptable. While the proposal could have an impact on the Mews during construction work, restrictions on working hours or access arrangements would fall outside of planning control.</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).



PLANS LIST – 18 SEPTEMBER 2013

COUNCILLOR REPRESENTATION

From: Rob Jarrett
Sent: 13 September 2013 00:19
To: Jeanette Walsh
Subject: BH2013/02349 unclassified

Dear Jeanette,


I would like to register my support for planning application BH2013/02349 – Land to South of 32 Cambridge Grove, Hove.

Yours Sincerely.

Rob Jarrett

Cllr Rob Jarrett
Chair, Adult Care and Health
Chair, Health and Wellbeing Board

BH2013/02349 Land to South of 32 Cambridge Grove, Hove.



**Brighton & Hove
City Council**



Scale: 1:1,250

From: Graham Cox
Sent: 29 July 2013 07:51
To: Helen Hobbs
Subject: RE: 119 Church Road Hove, Application reference BH2013/02074 and 02075

Helen

I am emailing in connection with this application as a local resident (of 53 Hova Villas) rather than as a Councillor.

I have no objection to the proposed physical extension to the building.

I do though note there is another attempt to extend the opening hours of the bar. This would have a detrimental impact on nearby residents, including noise and disturbance. The opening hours should remain as per what was approved in 2010 (BH2010/01342). Any extension to the hours would be unreasonable.

I ask that the current opening hours of the 119 Church Road are not extended and in addition that the Council ensures the currently approved hours are complied with.

Many thanks

Graham

Graham Cox
Councillor for Westbourne Ward