

# **PLANNING COMMITTEE ADDENDUM Late / Additional Representations List**

**2.00PM, WEDNESDAY, 7 JULY 2021**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

Agendas and minutes are published on the council's website [www.brighton-hove.gov.uk](http://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
6	TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS	1 - 18

**7 July 2021 Planning Committee – Additional Representations**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Site Address</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Comment</b>																																																																				
<b>A</b>	1	Vallance Hall 49 Hove Street Hove BN3 2DE	BH2019/01180	<p><b>The list of approved drawing numbers to be inserted into Condition 2 are:</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>Plan Type</b></th> <th><b>Reference</b></th> <th><b>Version</b></th> <th><b>Date Received</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Location Plan</td> <td>YO275-015</td> <td></td> <td>14 January 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed Drawing</td> <td>YO275 - 120</td> <td>C</td> <td>14 January 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed Drawing</td> <td>YO275 - 121</td> <td>H</td> <td>15 June 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed Drawing</td> <td>YO275 - 122</td> <td>L</td> <td>14 June 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed Drawing</td> <td>YO275 - 123</td> <td>H</td> <td>14 January 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed Drawing</td> <td>YO275 - 124</td> <td>H</td> <td>14 January 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed Drawing</td> <td>YO275 - 125</td> <td>G</td> <td>14 January 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed Drawing</td> <td>YO275 - 126</td> <td>H</td> <td>14 January 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed Drawing</td> <td>YO275 - 200</td> <td>I</td> <td>14 January 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed Drawing</td> <td>YO275 - 201</td> <td>I</td> <td>14 January 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed Drawing</td> <td>YO275 - 202</td> <td>I</td> <td>14 January 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed Drawing</td> <td>YO275 - 203</td> <td>C</td> <td>14 January 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed Drawing</td> <td>YO275 - 300</td> <td>D</td> <td>14 January 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed Drawing</td> <td>YO275 - 301</td> <td>A</td> <td>14 January 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed Drawing</td> <td>YO275 - 302</td> <td>D</td> <td>14 January 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed Drawing</td> <td>YO275 - 303</td> <td>D</td> <td>14 January 2021</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Updated Extension of Time:</b> An extension of time to 7<sup>th</sup> August 2021 was agreed by the applicant</p> <p><b>Comments received from Arboriculture:</b> Arboriculture would not support removal of a highways asset (street tree) to enable vehicle access relocation or widening.</p>	<b>Plan Type</b>	<b>Reference</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Date Received</b>	Location Plan	YO275-015		14 January 2021	Proposed Drawing	YO275 - 120	C	14 January 2021	Proposed Drawing	YO275 - 121	H	15 June 2021	Proposed Drawing	YO275 - 122	L	14 June 2021	Proposed Drawing	YO275 - 123	H	14 January 2021	Proposed Drawing	YO275 - 124	H	14 January 2021	Proposed Drawing	YO275 - 125	G	14 January 2021	Proposed Drawing	YO275 - 126	H	14 January 2021	Proposed Drawing	YO275 - 200	I	14 January 2021	Proposed Drawing	YO275 - 201	I	14 January 2021	Proposed Drawing	YO275 - 202	I	14 January 2021	Proposed Drawing	YO275 - 203	C	14 January 2021	Proposed Drawing	YO275 - 300	D	14 January 2021	Proposed Drawing	YO275 - 301	A	14 January 2021	Proposed Drawing	YO275 - 302	D	14 January 2021	Proposed Drawing	YO275 - 303	D	14 January 2021
<b>Plan Type</b>	<b>Reference</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Date Received</b>																																																																					
Location Plan	YO275-015		14 January 2021																																																																					
Proposed Drawing	YO275 - 120	C	14 January 2021																																																																					
Proposed Drawing	YO275 - 121	H	15 June 2021																																																																					
Proposed Drawing	YO275 - 122	L	14 June 2021																																																																					
Proposed Drawing	YO275 - 123	H	14 January 2021																																																																					
Proposed Drawing	YO275 - 124	H	14 January 2021																																																																					
Proposed Drawing	YO275 - 125	G	14 January 2021																																																																					
Proposed Drawing	YO275 - 126	H	14 January 2021																																																																					
Proposed Drawing	YO275 - 200	I	14 January 2021																																																																					
Proposed Drawing	YO275 - 201	I	14 January 2021																																																																					
Proposed Drawing	YO275 - 202	I	14 January 2021																																																																					
Proposed Drawing	YO275 - 203	C	14 January 2021																																																																					
Proposed Drawing	YO275 - 300	D	14 January 2021																																																																					
Proposed Drawing	YO275 - 301	A	14 January 2021																																																																					
Proposed Drawing	YO275 - 302	D	14 January 2021																																																																					
Proposed Drawing	YO275 - 303	D	14 January 2021																																																																					
	22																																																																							

Item	Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
				<p>From looking at the road it would not be feasible to relocate a tree pit in proximity and we have moved away from basic tree pit construction due to the root disruption this inevitably causes to surrounding infrastructure by inadequate pit volume, making long term tree retention unviable. It will be necessary to construct a build out into the carriageway, requiring the loss of a resident parking bay, these have been constructed elsewhere within the city at significant cost (minimum £5000). Arboriculture do have a specification for this if required.</p> <p><u>Officer comment:</u> The loss of the street tree is very unfortunate, but it will be mitigated against via a replacement street tree. This may be within the pavement or a build out. The condition detailing landscaping will be amended to allow for a greater flexibility in the location of the replacement tree in the event that no suitable location immediately adjacent to the site can be found.</p> <p><u>Amended condition 26 to now read:</u> Notwithstanding the hard and soft landscaping proposed as shown on the submitted plans, no development above ground floor slab level shall take place until details of a revised hard and soft Landscaping Scheme for areas within and immediately adjacent to the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscaping scheme shall include details of hard surfaces, means of enclosure, additional planting areas within the site, and details of species, to include some food bearing plants, and shall include a replacement semi-mature street tree within the public highway in <u>either Vallance Road/Hove Street/Vallance Gardens/Church Road/New Church Road/Sackville Road</u>. Details of the type and size of tree <u>and tree pit (which may require a build out into the carriageway)</u> shall be submitted.</p> <p><i>Reason: To enhance the appearance of the development in the interest of the visual amenities of the area and in the interests of highway safety and biodiversity and to compensate for the loss of a street tree as part of the scheme, to comply with policies</i></p>

Item	Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
	33			<p data-bbox="887 276 2134 341"><i>QD15, QD16, QD18 and TR7 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan and, CP10, CP13 and CP12 of the Brighton &amp; Hove City Plan Part One</i></p> <p data-bbox="860 384 2175 450"><b>Replace sections 8.5 to 8.7 of report (relating to amenity) with below</b> (additions underlined):</p> <p data-bbox="902 512 2130 651">8.5. The main consideration in terms of impact on neighbouring properties is the potential for <u>loss of privacy</u>, overshadowing and loss of light to neighbours to the east (residential) and the south (office). There is also a six storey residential block of flats to the north, however, this is across a road and is thus less affected.</p> <p data-bbox="902 676 2130 1002">8.6. To the east of the site at 18 Vallance Road, lies a single storey residential bungalow separated from the new building by a small access road. The proposed development would, to an extent, impact on the <u>privacy</u>, light levels and sense of enclosure to the rooms on the west side of this property. However the impact on these rooms has been lessened to an acceptable level by the amendments made to the scheme, especially the reduction in size of the fourth storey, which has pulled it back from the edges. <u>The windows on the east elevation of the development have the potential to overlook the neighbour at 18 Vallance Road. This has been lessened to an acceptable level by the proposed installation of external louvres to all windows on this elevation.</u></p> <p data-bbox="902 1078 2114 1289">8.7. Based on information provided by the occupant of this bungalow and a previous planning application, it has been possible to ascertain that none of the windows in this elevation are the sole windows to primary accommodation rooms. While it is recognised that there will be some degree of loss of light to these rooms and an increased sense of enclosure, it is not considered to be significant enough to warrant refusal.</p>

Item	Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
B	43	27 - 31 Church Street	BH2020/02801	<p><b>Amended Heads of Terms:</b></p> <p>The financial contribution towards the Local Employment scheme has been amended to reflect the lower GIA, as set out below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A financial contribution of <b>£36,250</b> towards the Local Employment Scheme</li> </ul> <p><u>Deleted item:</u></p> <p>The Highways Works requirement for a replacement motorcycle bay on Church Street is no longer required as the bay has already been relocated by the Highways Authority and can therefore be removed from the heads of terms.</p> <p><b>Amended Conditions:</b></p>
	47			Condition 10 for ground levels is no longer required as levels have already been clarified within the application submission.
	46/48			References to demolition to be removed from conditions 8 and 14 (no demolition required).
	48			<p>Condition 14 to be amended to read as follows:</p> <p>14. The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced (<del>other than demolition works</del>) until a detailed design and associated management and maintenance plan of surface water drainage for the site using sustainable drainage methods as per the recommendations of the Preliminary Drainage and Flood Strategy <del>15648/01/FRA 1662/SB/IB</del> submitted with the application has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved drainage system shall be implemented and maintained in perpetuity accordance with the approved detailed design.</p>

Item	Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
				<i>Reason: To ensure that the principles of sustainable drainage are incorporated into this proposal and to comply with policy SU3 of the Brighton &amp; Hove Local Plan.</i>
<b>C</b>	95  81  86	Former Dairy 35 - 39 The Drove Hove	BH2020/00931	<p><b>Additional comment from City Regeneration Team:</b> City Regeneration has no further comments in regards to the changes to the employment space with the additional Class E units. There is however an adjustment to the development contributions.</p> <p>City Regeneration requests a contribution through a S106 agreement for the payment of £8,100 towards the council's Local Employment Scheme in accordance with the council's Developer Contributions Technical Guidance.</p> <p><b>Action –</b> Amend recommended s106 Heads of Terms to provide £8,100 developer contribution (rather than £11,100) toward the Council's Local Employment Scheme</p> <p><b>Amended Conditions:</b> Updated Condition 17: 17. Notwithstanding the plans hereby permitted, prior to the commencement <u>occupation</u> of the development, details of secure, accessible and inclusive cycle parking facilities for the occupants of, and visitors to, the development, shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved facilities shall be fully implemented and made available for use prior to the first occupation of the development and shall thereafter be retained for use at all times.</p> <p><i>Reason: To ensure that satisfactory facilities for the parking of cycles are provided and to encourage travel by means other than private motor vehicles and to comply with policy TR14 of the Brighton &amp; Hove Local Plan and National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 110.</i></p>





Item	Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
				<p>(d) timetable for implementation, demonstrating that works are aligned with the proposed phasing of construction;</p> <p>(e) persons responsible for implementing the works;</p> <p>(f) initial aftercare and long-term maintenance (where relevant);</p> <p>(g) disposal of any wastes arising from the works.</p> <p>The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained in that manner thereafter.</p> <p>Reason: To protect species identified in the ecological surveys from adverse impacts during construction and to avoid an offence under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended.</p> <p><u>Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP)</u></p> <p>9. A landscape and ecological management plan (LEMP) for the reptile receptor site shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority prior to the commencement of the development. The content of the LEMP shall include the following:</p> <p>(a) description and evaluation of features to be managed;</p> <p>(b) ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management;</p> <p>(c) aims and objectives of management;</p> <p>(d) appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives;</p> <p>(e) prescriptions for management actions, together with a plan of management compartments;</p> <p>(f) preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period);</p> <p>(g) details of the body or organisation responsible for implementation of the plan;</p> <p>(h) ongoing monitoring and remedial measures.</p> <p>The LEMP shall also include details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the</p>

Item	Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
				<p>management body(ies) responsible for its delivery. The plans shall also set out (where the results from monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the LEMP are not being met) how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme. The approved plan will be implemented in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: Reptile receptor sites should not be subject to planning or other threats in the foreseeable future and should be subject to a written, agreed and funded pre- and post-translocation management agreement. The implementation of a LEMP will ensure the long term management of habitats, species and other biodiversity features.</p> <p><u>Lighting Design Strategy for Light-sensitive biodiversity</u></p> <p>10. Prior to occupation, a “lighting design strategy for biodiversity” shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The strategy shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) identify those areas/features on site that are particularly sensitive for bats and that are likely to cause disturbance in or around their breeding sites and resting places or along important routes used to access key areas of their territory, for example, for foraging; and</li> <li>b) show how and where external lighting will be installed (through the provision of appropriate lighting contour plans and technical specifications) so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent the above species using their territory or having access to their breeding sites and resting places.</li> </ul> <p>All external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the strategy, and these shall be maintained thereafter in accordance with the strategy. Under no circumstances should any other external lighting be installed without prior consent from the local planning authority.</p>

Item	Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
				<p>Reason: Many species active at night (e.g. bats and badgers) are sensitive to light pollution. The introduction of artificial light might mean such species are disturbed and /or discouraged from using their breeding and resting places, established flyways or foraging areas. Such disturbance can constitute an offence under relevant wildlife legislation.</p> <p><u>Ecological Design Strategy</u></p> <p>11. No development shall take place until an ecological design strategy (EDS) addressing mitigation for the loss semi-improved grassland and scrub, protection of retained habitats, and enhancement of the site for biodiversity, in line with the recommendations made in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (The Ecology Co-op, dated 20/11/19) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The EDS shall include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) purpose and conservation objectives for the proposed works;</li> <li>(b) review of site potential and constraints;</li> <li>(c) detailed design(s) and/or working method(s) to achieve stated objectives;</li> <li>(d) extent and location /area of proposed works on appropriate scale maps and plans;</li> <li>(e) type and source of materials to be used where appropriate, e.g. native species of local provenance;</li> <li>(f) timetable for implementation demonstrating that works are aligned with the proposed phasing of development;</li> <li>(g) persons responsible for implementing the works;</li> <li>(h) details of initial aftercare and long-term maintenance;</li> <li>(i) details for monitoring and remedial measures;</li> <li>(j) details for disposal of any wastes arising from works.</li> </ul> <p>The EDS shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and all features shall be retained in that manner thereafter.</p>

Item	Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
	124			<p><i>Reason: To ensure that any adverse environmental impacts of development activities can be mitigated, compensated and restored and that the proposed design, specification and implementation can demonstrate this, and to provide a net gain for biodiversity as required by Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, paragraphs 170 and 175 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and Policy CP10 of the Brighton &amp; Hove City Council City Plan Part One.</i></p> <p><b>New Comments from County Ecologist (received after publication of agenda):</b></p> <p>The proposed development is not designated for its nature conservation interest, although the South Downs National Park lies c. 8m to the north, across Fox Way. Foredown Allotments Local Wildlife Site (LWS) lies c. 153m north, Emmaus Gardens &amp; St Nicholas LWS lies c. 291m south and Benfield Valley LWS lies c. 340m east. Given the nature, scale and location of the proposed development, there are unlikely to be any impacts on these or any other sites designated for their nature conservation interest.</p> <p>The site currently comprises rough semi-improved grassland with young scrub, brash and wood piles, with tall ruderal vegetation along the eastern boundary, a species-rich hedgerow along the northern boundary, and a hedgerow with trees along the southern boundary. The hedgerows along the northern and southern boundaries are of the highest ecological value; these are to be retained, with access created through the eastern boundary where there are no trees or hedgerows. The hedgerows are, however, likely to be indirectly impacted by the development by an increase in noise and light, and potentially increased predation from domestic pets. Hedgerows should therefore be protected during construction, and it is recommended that a buffer is provided between the plots (including the gardens) and the boundaries.</p> <p>The proposed development would result in the loss of the majority/all of the rough grassland, young scrub and tall ruderal vegetation which is of moderate ecological value as it provides food sources for invertebrates which in turn provide food for birds, bats and</p>

Item	Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
				<p>reptiles. The PEA states that without mitigation, this loss of habitat will have a significant negative impact at the site level, and therefore recommends that at least a quarter of the grassland should be retained, preferably around the boundary edges, plus landscaping should use native tree and shrub species with a variety of flowering and fruiting trees. The current layout plan shows no retained habitat and no buffer to the hedgerows.</p> <p>The PEA also states that a new species-rich hedgerow must be planted along the western boundary, to mitigate for the loss of habitat and to provide an increase in habitats of high value within the site. The current site layout plan does not show a new hedgerow along the western boundary, and no mention of this, or any other mitigation measures required for biodiversity, are included in the Sustainability Checklist or the Design and Access Statement (Lewis &amp; Co Planning, March 2021). Whilst the principle of development on the site is accepted, the layout should be amended to incorporate the recommendations made in the PEA, otherwise the biodiversity impacts will be significant.</p> <p>Badgers are protected under the Protection of Badgers Act 1992. No signs of badgers were recorded, but there is suitable habitat on site and in the surrounding landscape. The PEA proposes no mitigation measures. However, it is recommended that best practice working methods are employed to ensure protection of badgers during construction.</p> <p>All species of bats are fully protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended, and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, as amended, making them European Protected Species. There are no buildings on site which could be used for roosting and trees bordering the site have been assessed as offering negligible bat roost potential. However, the tree line and hedgerows along the northern and southern boundaries offer potential for foraging and commuting. A sensitive lighting scheme should therefore be required by condition.</p> <p>Scrub, saplings, trees and hedgerows on site have the potential to support breeding birds. Under Section 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended, wild birds are</p>

Item	Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
				<p>protected from being killed, injured or captured, while their nests and eggs are protected from being damaged, destroyed or taken. To avoid disturbance to nesting birds, any demolition of buildings or removal of scrub/trees that could provide nesting habitat should be carried out outside the breeding season (generally March to August). If this is not reasonably practicable within the timescales, a nesting bird check should be carried out prior to any demolition/clearance works by an appropriately trained, qualified and experienced ecologist, and if any nesting birds are found, advice should be sought on appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>Slow worms, grass snakes, common lizards and adders are protected against intentional killing or injuring under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended. Surveys have recorded low populations of common lizard and slow worm on site. A translocation exercise to a suitable offsite receptor site is therefore required.</p> <p>Best practice guidance is that suitable receptor sites should ideally: a) be local to the donor site and as close as possible to it; b) not currently support a population of the species to be translocated, for known reasons, but be capable of supporting them given suitable remedial works if necessary; c) not be subject to planning or other threats in the foreseeable future; d) be subject to a written, agreed and funded pre- and post-translocation management agreement; e) be subject to a written, agreed and funded pre- and post-translocation monitoring agreement. B) above is important because the translocation should result in no net loss of sites. Exceptions may be made for single or very low numbers of animals unlikely to form a viable breeding population if introduced to an unoccupied site. As juveniles of both species were recorded on site, indicating breeding populations, this is unlikely to be applicable in this case.</p> <p>A survey for a suitable receptor site may entail a period of several weeks as it can be difficult to ascertain without repeat visits whether a particular site is suitable and does not support the species concerned. Furthermore, if enhancement works, such as scrub removal, are required to make a site suitable, it may take some time before a receptor</p>

Item	Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
				<p>site is ready to receive animals. It is therefore important that sufficient time is built into the development programme.</p> <p>The Reptile Report identifies six potential receptor sites but notes that these will need to be surveyed to assess whether they are suitable. Of the six sites identified, at least two (Benfield Valley and Golf Course) are known to support reptiles already and/or are subject to development pressure, and as such, are unlikely to be suitable.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation strategy set out in the Reptile Report is broadly suitable but the following should be noted. The minimum trapping effort for low populations of common lizard and slow worm is 60 suitable days (not multiple visits in the same day). The trapping period can potentially be reduced provided it can be demonstrated that sufficient effort has been made and there are at least 10 suitable days (not visits) without reptile presence being recorded. In addition to any brush and green waste piles being dismantled by hand under the supervision of a suitably qualified ecologist, it is also recommended that the trapping is followed by a destructive search, in line with best practice. Heras fencing will not prevent reptiles moving back into the site; reptile fencing should be installed around the construction site.</p> <p>The site offers some potential for hedgehog. The hedgehog is listed under Section 41 of the NERC Act as a Species of Principal Importance, populations having suffered significant declines in recent years. Care should be taken during site clearance and any hedgehogs found carefully moved to retained habitat. Loss of foraging habitat should be compensated through a new boundary hedgerow and all boundary fences within the site should include hols to ensure hedgehogs can move through the site.</p> <p>Large numbers of spindle ermine moth caterpillars have been recorded on site. As recommended in the PEA, vegetation should not be removed whilst covered in ermine moth caterpillar webs.</p>

Item	Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
	130			<p>The site is unlikely to support any other protected species. If protected species are encountered during development, work should stop immediately and advice should be sought on how to proceed from a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist.</p> <p>In addition to the mitigation measures required, the site offers opportunities for enhancement which will help the Council address its duties and responsibilities to provide biodiversity net gain under the NPPF and local planning policy. As stated above, the current proposed layout does not mitigate for the loss of habitat and will result in a net loss of biodiversity. It is therefore recommended that buffer zones are provided to the boundaries, that a portion of the grassland is retained, and that a species-rich hedgerow is planted along the western boundary. Native species of known value to wildlife should be used in the landscape scheme, and bird, bat and insect boxes should be provided. Bird boxes should target species of local conservation concern, including house sparrow and starling.</p> <p>In light of the above, and in line with BS42020:2013 Biodiversity – code of practice for planning and development, if the Council is minded to approve, it is recommended that planning conditions in respect of a Biodiversity Method Statement, a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP), a Lighting Design Strategy for Light-sensitive biodiversity and an Ecological Design Strategy are applied.</p> <p><b><i>Additional Paragraph 12.1:</i></b></p> <p>12.1 In the event that the S106 agreement has not been signed by all parties by the date set out above, the application shall be refused for the following reason:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed development fails to provide necessary affordable housing contribution and therefore fails to address the requirements of Policy CP20 of the Brighton and Hove City Plan Part One.</li> </ol>



Item	Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
				Affordable housing is required to be provided because the proposed development involve the provision of more than 5 units of residential accommodation and to comply with the requirements of City Plan Part One Policy CP20.
<b>F</b>	149	4 Keymer Road	BH2021/01013	<p><b>One (1)</b> further neighbour representation has been submitted <u>objecting</u> to the application, raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant impact on outlook and living conditions;</li> <li>• Similar in footprint and size to application refused in 2017;</li> <li>• Report has no assessment of impact on their property and no photographs from rear of house.</li> </ul> <p><b>Officer Comment:</b> The potential impact of the scheme on the amenity of residents of Fernhurst Crescent has been set out in paragraphs 9.31 – 9.37 of the Officer Report. Notably, the report concludes that the impact on neighbouring properties would not be materially different to that resulting from the 2017 application which was refused, but then approved on appeal.</p>
<b>I</b>	202	Garages opposite 6-10 St Johns Road, Hove, BN3 2FB	BH2021/01163	<p><b>Three (3)</b> additional neighbour representations have been submitted <u>objecting</u> to the application, raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of notification of neighbours;</li> <li>• Submitted drawings vague;</li> <li>• Would result in much greater overshadowing, loss of light, and sense of enclosure for neighbouring rear terrace and rooflights/windows serving ground and basement flats;</li> <li>• Front elevation would add storey to garage beyond applicant's site;</li> <li>• Needs to retain 'means of escape' for numbers 25 and 26 Adelaide Crescent;</li> </ul>

Item	Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would alter character of Grade II* listed buildings and environs and other heritage issues;</li> <li>• Would alter skyline;</li> <li>• Would reduce sunlight/daylight/outlook to adjacent properties;</li> <li>• Increased traffic congestion;</li> <li>• Impact on ability to repair properties;</li> </ul> <p><b>Officer Comments:</b> It is considered that sufficient information has been provided to assess the impact on no. 27, which is not considered so significant as to warrant refusal. The impact on no. 27 is not considered to be significant given that the fenestration for the amenity space on the lower ground floor / basement flat is already significantly compromised in respect of light, outlook and sense of enclosure. Even building two storeys high in this location adjacent to the rear boundary is not considered to result in a harmful impact such that this application should be refused. The light and outlook from the rooflights serving the ground floor flat would be unaffected by the proposal because both of these are provided by the sky overhead.</p> <p>Emergency escape and maintenance access are not relevant planning considerations and therefore these matters have not contributed to the recommendation.</p> <p>The impact on the conservation area, streetscape, neighbouring amenity and traffic have been considered within the report. The proposal would not result in job loss or loss of businesses as the garages are all used as storage by individual. No additional issues have been raised beyond those given in objections summarised in the report, and access for repairs is not a relevant planning consideration and therefore this matter has not contributed to the recommendation.</p>

Item	Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
J	221, 232- 233	1-13 Shelldale Road, Portslade, BN41 1LE	BH2021/01360	Removal of Condition 9 relating to the restriction on the opening hours of the commercial uses 07:00 and 19:00 on Mondays to Fridays and 08:00 and 17:00 on Saturdays.  Reference to this in paragraphs 8.25 and 8.31 can be ignored.

