

8th June 2022 Planning Committee – Additional Representations

Item /Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
Item B, page 27.	St Catherine's Lodge	BH2022/00670	<p>Eleven further representations received, objecting to the scheme on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on the conservation area • Property value • Residential amenity • Noise and nuisance • Overdevelopment • Listed building • Design • Traffic <p>One further representation received, supporting the scheme.</p> <p>Officer Response: No further issues raised other than those already addressed in the Officer Report.</p>
Item F, page 102	16 Wilbury Villas, Hove	BH2021/03826	<p>Objections received from Ward Councillors Jackie O'Quinn and John Allcock (copies attached), raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed works are overdevelopment and will create a dominating, overbearing appearance • The proposed three-storey extension will block a critical area of sky and sun to rear of no.18. • Single-storey rear extension is too large, results in loss of too much garden. • Loss of privacy and noise nuisance from balconies • Loss of light from balconies and associated screening • Environmental Health have not provided comments • The proposed works to the rear would create a cluttered appearance. <p>Officer Response:</p>

Item /Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
Item F, page 102			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed works at ground floor level would not result in any significant or valuable area of biodiversity; this area is already overshadowed by the existing outrigger and has been paved over. No.16 would retain the majority of its rear garden space, and all valuable biodiversity. • The Environmental Health team is providing comments only when their technical expertise is essential (such as applications where land contamination is a factor), and it is not considered that this application meets the necessary criteria. • All other issues raised by the Councillors have been addressed within the Officer Report.
Item I, Page 145	Hove Town Hall Ground Floor Front Church Road Hove BN3 4AH	BH2022/01015	<p>Comments from Conservation Advisory Group recommending planning permission be refused.</p> <p>[Note: comments were omitted from report in error]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Group agrees with the Heritage Officer's comments. • The drawings are poorly presented and conflict with the Design and Access Statement which illustrates the removal of several trees and shrubs but the proposed block plan shows all trees will remain. • The existing planting area, located between both the entrance to PLATF9RM, has been omitted from the existing block plan, and from the application. This area is where one of the proposed decking areas is to be constructed. • The decking and seating detract from the host building. • The Group regrets the proposed festoon lighting (light pollution). • The proposals would be harmful to the character of the conservation area. <p>One further representation received, objecting to the scheme on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current use of part of Hove Town Hall is unlawful, as Platf9rm have not discharged one pre-commencement condition • Loss of public space • Loss of public seating • Fire safety, with regards to having timber decking adjacent to the building

Item /Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
Item I, Page 145			<p>Eighteen further representations received, supporting the scheme on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improvement to visual amenity - The existing space is underused and not attracting people to the area nor supporting commercial activity. - The proposed development would encourage use of the square as a community hub. - The proposed development would improve the facilities of PLATF9RM <p>Officer Response:</p> <p>The reported 'unlawful' use of part of Hove Town Hall as the business known as PLATF9RM has been forwarded to the Enforcement Team for further investigation. No further action is considered to be required with regards to this planning application. The erection of decking is considered on its own planning merits and the lawful status of PLATF9RM is not a determinative factor.</p> <p>The proposed development would result in the loss of an insignificant area of public space immediately next to the building; it is not considered that the viability of the square as a public space would be significantly impacted upon.</p> <p>The proposed development does not include the removal of any public seating. The two areas of decking do not displace any public seating. Although the submitted drawings do erroneously omit one or more items of street furniture, this is not determinative with regards to the erection of the areas of decking. As mentioned in the Officer's Report, the proposed use of the square for events is not considered to constitute development and is not under consideration.</p> <p>Fire Safety is not a planning matter, but it is noted that wooden decking is by no means an unusual feature next to buildings. In the event planning permission is granted, the development would be required to be constructed in accordance with Building Regulations.</p>

