



## PLANNING COMMITTEE LIST

### **Brighton & Hove** COUNCILLOR REPRESENTATION **City Council**

**Cllr. Jackie O'Quinn**

**BH2022/01629 – 64, 66, 68 And 68A Old Shoreham Road**

**29<sup>th</sup> June 2022:**

I wish to object to the following planning application:

BH2022/01629 | Remodelling of 4no. detached dwellinghouses including raising roof heights to create additional storeys, alterations and extensions. | 64, 66, 68 And 68A Old Shoreham Road Hove BN3 6GF

This is a very unusual application in that the owners of nos 64, 66 and 68A objected to previous applications put forward by the owner of no 68 Old Shoreham Road – BH2021/03419 – which was refused and then was appealed – the appeal has been withdrawn, I understand – and then BH 2022/00142 which was withdrawn. Nos 64, 66 and 68A were vehement in their condemnation of the applications, especially Mr Bowen, at no 66 who felt that the extra storey(s) would lead to an 'impact on local amenity, incursion into privacy' and 'highly controversial and potentially hugely damaging to our area'. It now seems that Mr Bowen, who has put forward this application on behalf of the other properties, believes that quadrupling such a negative impact would somehow make the application acceptable.

The Planning Statement talks about other 'modern' properties in the area. Indeed, there are, but they are not 'mini-estates' such as is being proposed in this application. Other properties used as examples in the Planning Statement are single properties, such as no 33 Old Shoreham Road, which is very striking but can hardly be seen from the road as it is set so far back and has a garage with a green 'meadow roof' and driveway at the front. It thus does not impinge in a negative way on the street scene at all and neither do the other examples of 'modern' houses that are given in the Planning Statement as all are well set back from the road. This is unlike numbers 66 and 68, which have increased the footprint of their properties at the front in the application, thus creating a more dominant and overbearing look to the street scene by bringing them closer to the pavement. Some properties displayed in the Design Statement are flats but apart from 9 Upper Drive, it can be argued that they have little to no architectural merit and are anyway of little relevance to this application which pertains to houses.

The application would create an overbearing and dominant 'block' of buildings and be totally out of step with the street scene which consists mainly of detached one to two storey buildings. The 2nd floor balconies would create overlooking of gardens in surrounding buildings in Old Shoreham Road and The Drive, and also of Caister Close, which mainly consists of bungalows and is an oasis of peace and quiet at present.

The Planning statement lists the previous planning applications from all of the properties in the application, so they have all been, or in the case of no 68, about to be, significantly extended. No 66 also has a 2 bedroom building in the back garden so these properties are already provide considerable accommodation for a family. There has been speculation that



## PLANNING COMMITTEE LIST

### **Brighton & Hove** COUNCILLOR REPRESENTATION **City Council**

the owner of no 68 who is an HMO property developer, wishes to turn his property into an HMO, but I suspect that is a battle for another time.

This application will only have a negative impact on this area, as already stated by 3 of the applicants in their objections to the previous applications from no 68. I totally agree with their previous criticisms, and I urge the committee to refuse this application. I also wish to speak at the planning committee when this application comes before it.