8th March 2017 Planning Committee – Additional Representations

Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
1	113 Trafalgar Road, Portslade	BH2016/01784	**Correction** of site address to 113-115 Trafalgar Road, Portslade **Amend** Condition 2 to read: 2. The applicant has not committed to complying with the requested developer contributions, towards affordable housing, open space and indoor sport, sustainable transport, and the Council's local employment scheme, and has not justified this through a financial viability assessment of the scheme, contrary to Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One policies SA6, CP2, CP7, CP9, CP16 and CP20.
17	23A Third Avenue, Hove	BH2016/05687	Application has been **withdrawn** by the applicant.
31	Medina House, 9 Kings Esplanade, Hove	BH2016/05893	Following re-consultation of the revised plans and documents received on 9th and 13th February 2017 **Twenty One (21)** further representations of objection have been received. Additional points of objection raised are as follows: • Unable to determine precisely what the amendments are, • Loss of daylight/sunlight, overshadowing, loss of privacy and overlooking to neighbouring properties. Proposal does not comply with BRE Guidelines, • Dismissal by developer of some objections due to lack of proximity to site, • Damage/disturbance/disruption to neighbouring properties/local residents during demolition/construction, • Where is the evidence to support proposed ground floor height increase due to 'wave overtopping', height should be challenged in an effort to yield more height reduction, • Pavement outside development is not part of the Freehold of the developer, pavement material should match existing, • Impacts on local roads traffic flow and pedestrian safety from demolition/construction vehicles Amended height remains too high and amendment is an inadequate reduction, the light gained will not be noticeable, • The extension is not beneficial to the area and gives no cultural/historical reference to the original building,

			• Putting Medina House on a 'platform' would detract for the character of the building, • Allowing demolition sets a dangerous precedent • Loss of existing Medina House which is a historic building. Replacement building is higher so affects the proportions of the front elevation, which affects the ascetics and look so will look different and be out of place, • Materials should be in keeping with existing building especially on front elevation. Colour of brick should be decided prior to application being determined as is an essential part of proposal, • Proposal not sympathetic to area, • Impact on skyline, • Parking concerns. Object to any proposal to alter or re-site parking spaces in Sussex Road, • Eastern wing could be reduced in height and scale with accommodation moved into main section of dwelling, • Previous owner has allowed building to become dilapidated through misuse and neglect. Demolition has previously been refused, viability of renovation should be considered by an independent body before any permission for demolition approved, • Proposal does not accord with 2013 Planning Brief or planning policies, • Disappointed that the heritage Community is now supporting the build despite the only change being a small reduction in height, • Amendments are inadequate, represent a purely cosmetic change and do not address original concerns, Following re-consultation of the revised plans and documents received on 9th and 13th February 2017 **Six (6)** further representations of <u>support</u> have been received for the following reasons: • There are no negative reasons not to support the application, • It will enhance/improve the area which has been an eyesore for many years, • Impressed with proposed plans, will be of high quality design, • Existing building not worth retaining. Proposal will retain the character of Medina House while giving it a modern feel and will be an asset and will show strong respect to the site history, • The Texaco development was approved despite significant overshadowing to

			neighbouring properties so see no reason to delay consent for a project which retains the architectural character of the bathhouse using sympathetic materials. • Whilst overall support the application, this development , Rocco homes and King Alfred should have strictly timelines for implementation to avoid creating 5+ years of continual disruption to this small neighbourhood, Following re-consultation of the revised plans and documents received on 9th and 13th February 2017 **one (1)** further representations of <u>comment</u> has been received for the following reasons: • Paragraph 5.25 of the committee report does not consider impact on light levels to the rear patio areas of properties on Victoria Cottages**,** • Requests Committee Members visit the twitten access to the rear of properties on Sussex Road and Victoria Cottages and no. 13 Sussex Road in order to assess impacts upon these neighbouring properties, • The white brick is crucial to realisation of the design. Morrocco's is rendered and painted cream/white as are the Sussex Road dwellings. Nothing in the area exists to justify red brick being used. Same brick is used on the Magistrates Court Building in Lansdowne Road, • The S106 refers only to footpath improvements, there is supposed to be a public streetlight attached to the rear area of Medina House which should also go in the S106, • Local residents should have input into conditions, • Loss of light to neighbouring properties, **Councillor Wealls**: Further <u>objection</u>. Copy attached. **Officer comment**: Matters regarding damage to neighbouring properties during demolition/construction are beyond the remit of planning controls. Point 5.25 of the committee report refers to heritage issues only and therefore does not mention impact of the proposal upon levels of light to neighbouring properties. The other material planning considerations raised are covered in the committee report.

173	Russell House, Russell Mews, Brighton	BH2016/05662	**Additional condition:** 6. Prior to first occupation of the building, the central panes of the bay windows in the south elevation of the development hereby permitted shall be obscure glazed and non-opening, unless the parts of the window/s which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed, and thereafter permanently retained as such. Reason: To safeguard the privacy of the occupiers of the adjoining property and to comply with policies QD14 and QD27 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.

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).