



**Brighton & Hove
City Council**

PLANNING COMMITTEE ADDENDUM

2.00PM, WEDNESDAY, 9 MAY 2018

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

ADDENDUM

Page

LATE/ ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

5 - 8

9th May 2018 Planning Committee – Additional Representations

Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
	Hove Business Centre Fonthill Road Hove	BH2017/03863	<p>During the original consultation, Cllr Jackie O’Quinn objected to the proposed development, a copy of this letter is appended.</p> <p>Following re-consultation of the revised plans received on 29th March 2018, eight (9) further representations of objection have been received. New points of objection raised are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Too many applications for residents to comment on; - Drawings are unclear and unrepresentative; - Some existing office units are vacant and so the proposal is unnecessary; - There are currently building works on top of the Dubarry Factory, and the scaffolding is already blocking out light; - Despite the setback, the new storey would spoil the appearance of the building; - Concerns that the offices will later be converted into a residential scheme; - Solid metal panels on the rear will block out even more light; - Light report submitted with BH2014/03742 was flawed; - Resident has re-submitted independent desktop analysis by MES building solutions that was submitted during consultation of BH2014/03742 <p>Officer response: The issues relating to design, proposed office use, and impact on amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of light and privacy are considered in the committee report. The submitted desktop analysis by MES building solutions is in response to Revision 2 of the applicant’s daylight/Sunlight assessment submitted under application BH2014/03742. Revision 3 of the report was submitted prior to application BH2014/03742 being determined at planning committee. Therefore the submitted desktop analysis by MES building solutions was fully considered during application BH2014/03742. As detailed in the committee report, the impact on sunlight and daylight is considered to be acceptable as was the case under application BH2014/03742.</p>

5

	31 Harrington Road	BH2018/00865	<p>Amendment to Condition 1 to reflect minor correction to the west side elevation, to read:</p> <p>1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings listed below.</p> <p>Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="920 339 2128 619"> <thead> <tr> <th>Plan Type</th> <th>Reference</th> <th>Version</th> <th>Date Received</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Location and block plan</td> <td>PP/HL/001</td> <td>/</td> <td>16 March 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Floor Plans Proposed</td> <td>PP/HL/110</td> <td>/</td> <td>16 March 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Roof Plan Proposed</td> <td>PP/HL/111</td> <td>/</td> <td>16 March 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Elevations Proposed</td> <td>PP/HL/120</td> <td>A</td> <td>01 May 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sections Proposed</td> <td>PP/HL/130</td> <td>/</td> <td>16 March 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Design and Access Statement</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>16 March 2018</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Three (3) additional representations received <u>supporting</u> the application, on the grounds that it would enhance the energy efficiency of the house, and that the design is sympathetic.</p> <p>Officer response: These matters are addressed in the committee report.</p>	Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received	Location and block plan	PP/HL/001	/	16 March 2018	Floor Plans Proposed	PP/HL/110	/	16 March 2018	Roof Plan Proposed	PP/HL/111	/	16 March 2018	Elevations Proposed	PP/HL/120	A	01 May 2018	Sections Proposed	PP/HL/130	/	16 March 2018	Design and Access Statement			16 March 2018
Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received																												
Location and block plan	PP/HL/001	/	16 March 2018																												
Floor Plans Proposed	PP/HL/110	/	16 March 2018																												
Roof Plan Proposed	PP/HL/111	/	16 March 2018																												
Elevations Proposed	PP/HL/120	A	01 May 2018																												
Sections Proposed	PP/HL/130	/	16 March 2018																												
Design and Access Statement			16 March 2018																												

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).

Hove Town Hall,
Norton Road,
Hove,
East Sussex

4th February 2018

Dear officer,

Objection to planning application BH2017/03863

I am writing to object to the planning application for the creation of a 4th floor on the Du Barry building/Hove Business Centre on which will be situated 4 new offices. It has been difficult to establish exactly what is happening with this building as so many applications have been put in. I find it extraordinary that on the one hand office space is deemed as superfluous because it can't be rented out, so 15 flats are going to be built under permitted development, but on the other hand there is an application to build new offices on the roof of this iconic building. What a contradiction in terms.

I have now managed to ascertain that the 9 residential flats that were granted when the application went to appeal are now not going to be built – the landlords have put in for four offices instead. It has been very difficult to work out from the plans what these offices will actually be like. It seems that they will have large windows that will overlook the rear of residents houses in Newtown Road and thus there are major concerns about a loss of privacy and of a loss of light. Residents have also expressed concerns about the light pollution from these offices late into the night as it seems that at present people remain working in the building until very late at night. There also appears to be a balcony running along the back of all the offices, and once again this is an infringement of privacy through overlooking and there will also be noise implications.

It states in the Highways Report that these offices do not intend to have a requirement for any parking but I find that very hard to accept. This area has a serious parking problem and residents have expressed their feelings on this quite clearly. It may well be that no permits or parking spaces will be given to the offices, but I could guarantee that the people working in them will not all come in by train or bus. They will try to park locally and this will create further problems in this dense residential area, as 10 or 11 cars, added to the number that will inevitably come in due to the 15 flats to be built in what was once office space, will cause chaos.

I can't say strongly enough how much I support the residents in their concerns about this application. I agree that coming in just before the Xmas period was quite a ruse by the applicant and I find their approach of putting in a series of applications within the same time period, withdrawing past ones and being so vague in their plans, is all rather 'smoke and mirrors' and designed to cause the utmost confusion amongst residents.

I am sure that this application will come to the planning committee as there are so many objections to it and I will now put in my request to speak against this application when it does go to committee.

I recommend this this application be refused.

Regards

Jackie O'Quinn
Chair of Licensing for Brighton and Hove
Goldsmid Ward Councillor