

PLANNING COMMITTEE ADDENDUM

2.00PM, THURSDAY, 17 SEPTEMBER 2020

VIRTUAL VIA SKYPE

Agendas and minutes are published on the council's website www.brighton-hove.gov.uk. Agendas are available to view five working days prior to the meeting date.

Electronic agendas can also be accessed through our meetings app available through [ModernGov: iOS/Windows/Android](#)

This agenda and all accompanying reports are printed on recycled paper

ADDENDUM

ITEM		Page
52	LATE/ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS	1 - 4

17th September 2020 Planning Committee – Additional Representations

Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
Item C, p 17	57 Goldstone Crescent	BH2020/01619	<p>Cllr Bagaeen asked that two documents be included in the Planning Committee papers, in relation to Items C and D, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hove Park Design Code (Draft Report, August 2020); and - Hove Park Housing Needs Assessment (July 2020). <p>Officer Response: In planning terms, these documents carry little weight as they are not part of the development plan. They may form part of the evidence base to feed in to the emerging Hove Park Neighbourhood Plan, but as no Plan has been prepared and no consultation undertaken, very little weight can be given to them.</p> <p>Revised comments from Highways:</p> <p>Cycle Access, Parking and Use: the applicant has subsequently provided amended drawings showing a cycle ramp to ease the problem and this is deemed acceptable in principle.</p> <p>Servicing & Deliveries: the applicant has subsequently provided plans that show the bin store rotated to reduce the inconvenience therefore the location of the bin store is now deemed acceptable.</p> <p>Vehicular Access: the applicant has subsequently provided additional VSPA drawings now showing vehicles reversing into these spaces therefore this aspect is now deemed acceptable.</p>
Item D, p43	55 Goldstone Crescent	BH2020/01620	
Item E, p 117	40 Dyke Road	BH2020/01973	<p><u>Response from Conservation Advisory Group omitted from report:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The Group recommends APPROVAL (7 votes for; 2 abstain)</i> • <i>The Group is pleased to note the significant redesign of the street elevation and the proposed rebuilding of the front boundary wall.</i>

			<p>Officer Response: Officers note the view of CAG but do not consider they alter the conclusions set out in the Officer Report to Committee.</p>
Item F, p134	4 Tandridge Road	BH2020/01899	<p>Additional condition to secure a contaminated land discovery strategy –</p> <p>Condition 18: If during construction, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority), shall be carried out until a method statement identifying and assessing the risk and proposing remediation measures, together with a programme for such works, shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. The remediation measures shall be carried out as approved and in accordance with the approved programme.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the health of future residents or occupiers of the site and to comply with policy SU11 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.</p>
Item K, p207	90 Southall Avenue	BH2020/00995	<p>Additional comment from agent (was unable to attend previous meeting from which this was deferred)</p> <p><i>Firstly I apologise for my absence at the previous committee. I was on leave without access to emails.</i></p> <p><i>We echo the Officer's recommendation that planning permission be granted for the change of use of 90 Southall Avenue from C3 dwelling to C4 small HMO incorporating a single storey rear extension. As shown in the Committee Report the Officer has considered the acceptability of the development in detail. In the interests of conciseness we will not dwell upon those considerations here.</i></p> <p><i>With regard to the matter of 98 Southall Avenue this is clarified in the Officer's updated Committtee Report. For the avoidance however, 98 Southall Avenue, being</i></p>

		<p><i>headleased to the University, is not a HMO but a C3(c) dwelling which has correctly been discounted from the Policy CP21 calculations.</i></p> <p><i>Were the headlease contract with the University to cease, planning permission would be required to convert 98 Southall Avenue to C4 HMO use. There is no evidence to suggest 98 Southall Avenue was in C4 HMO use prior to the Article 4 Direction. However, even if it were, C4 HMO would no longer be that property's lawful use. The Article 4 Direction does not remove the permitted development right of C4 HMOs to change to C3 dwellings. The Direction only removes the right of C3 dwellings to change to C4 HMOs. So as 98 Southall Avenue has been in a C3 use since the Article 4 Direction has been introduced C3 dwellinghouse is that property's lawful use.</i></p> <p><i>Therefore, the proportion of neighbouring dwellings in HMO use within a 50metre radius of 90 Southall Avenue is 8.8%, as confirmed by the Officer. As such the principle of development is acceptable and compliant with Policy CP21.</i></p>
--	--	---

