Gareth Giles

From: Veronica Symons
Sent: 08 May 2018 10:31

To: Gareth Giles; Nicola Hurley

Subject: Objection to Kings House application

Wasn't sure if you had seen this

٧

From: Clare Moonan Sent: 04 May 2018 4:21 PM

To: Planning Applications; Liz Hobden

Subject: Objection to Kings House application

Dear Planning Committee members

I am writing to object to the King House development, application numbers BH2018/00868 and BH2018/00869, on the grounds outlined below.

My objections are based on the significant feedback I have received from residents. I was present at two very well attended residents meeting from both Second and Grand Avenues where I was able to listen to residents' concerns, and also I have had direct correspondence with individual residents. Before I outline my concerns, I will add that I do not object to the development of the site in principal and in particular I welcome the plans for the listed Kings House building.

My reasons for objection are:

1. The level of affordable housing

The developers are proposing 0% affordable housing. Bearing in mind that our Brighton and Hove policy is for all development of this size to have 40% affordable, this is totally unacceptable. We have very high levels of housing need in the city and in the Central Hove area. A development of this size should provide its share of much needed affordable housing to meet the needs of all local residents, not just those who can afford the very high prices that these properties will be sold for.

2. Parking

The development is situated in Controlled Parking Zone N. This zone moves through periods of having, and not having, a waiting list and the demand for parking is very high. Although currently there is no waiting list, if all the properties were to obtain parking permits the pressure on the surrounding areas would be unmanageable. The increased demand for spaces would cause displacement throughout the N zone, which covers many blocks, and would be a considerable inconvenience and unacceptable disruption to residents. The additional burden of cars will also add to

traffic congestion and pollution in the area. The proposed 80 spaces that are planned for the development should be sufficient and the remaining properties should be car free. Consideration should also be given to changing some of the nearby pay and display areas to controlled parking only, as during the summer there is significant pressure put on local parking from visitors to the sea front.

3. Bulk and scale of the two new blocks on both Second and Grand Avenues. In principle, the proposal for two new blocks is welcomed as it will provide much needed additional housing. However, the height, bulk and scale are overbearing and out of keeping with the surrounding properties. Both blocks should be lowered to bring them more in proportion with the neighbouring properties and also to make them clearly subservient to the grade two listed Kings House, which should be the clear architectural focus for the bottom of the block. There is also quite limited space between the blocks which creates a closed in and overbearing feel.

4. Street scene and conservation area

The development is in the middle of The Avenues conservation area, with Second Avenue in particular having an important and historic street scene. The improvement to the listed Kings House is very welcome and will enhance the conservation area. However, the designs of the two new block are totally out of keeping with the local areas and will do little to enhance the neighbourhood or the conservation zone. In addition, the design of the new blocks is such that the floor levels are not the same as the neighbouring properties and therefore they will look awkward and unsympathetic.

5. Loss of light and overlooking

Due to the close and overbearing nature of the two new blocks, several adjoining properties (in particular 2 Second Ave and 1 Grand Ave) will have a loss of light and will be overlooked. Both of which are material planning considerations.

6. Type of units proposed

I believe the proposed development does not include the recommended number of three bedroom properties and also there are no wheel chair accessible properties. In both these regards the development is not policy compliant.

I hope as a Planning Committee you will take into account the above objection and the strength of feeling among the local community, and amend the developers plans accordingly. This site has much to offer the local community and the city but this should not be at the expense of the character of the area and the quality of life of the local residents.

Regards,

Cllr Clare Moonan

Labour and Co-operative Councillor for Central Hove ward