

**Inspector’s Appeal Decision**

Whilst the Inspector’s decision to dismiss both appeals was principally based on design considerations relating to specific development proposals, he makes a number of other observations relating to the site and its surroundings which have been considered in the preparation of this brief. These have been summarised in the table below, together with an explanation of how these issues have been considered in the preparation of the brief:

<b>Theme</b>	<b>Inspector’s comment</b>	<b>Planning brief</b>
<b>Existing buildings</b>	“The existing buildings on the site are to be removed and as they are neither listed as being of architectural or historic interest nor sited within a conservation area, [this] may occur without further consent within the planning regime”.	The most attractive building, Park House, has been significantly altered internally and is in such a state of disrepair, it would be unduly onerous on the part of the brief to insist on its retention in a future redevelopment of the site.
<b>Character and appearance</b>	He considers it appropriate to have regard to the contribution that the buildings and spaces around them make to the character and appearance of the area. He states that “Park House is attractive and distinctive and its siting within a westward view along Old Shoreham Rd plays a part in the setting of Hove Recreation Ground and provides an urban edge to the wide expanse of that main road. Any new structure on this part of the site should....provide that edge and be a feature of interest”.	The landscaping of the site should be an intrinsic part of the overall design concept and make effective use of the existing landscape features. The design of the buildings should provide a varied roofline allowing views through the development and avoid monolithic, unrelieved facades. The choice of materials should reflect those used for buildings in the immediate vicinity of the site i.e. the area to the north of Old Shoreham Road. Development proposals should respond positively to the prevailing design characteristics of the local neighbourhood and reinforce its local distinctiveness.
<b>Density</b>	He “considers this the type and location of site that is suitable for residential redevelopment to a higher density in order to make the best use of land, to reduce pressure on less well suited or countryside sites and	The brief has taken a local contextual and urban design-led approach to the site, which will effectively determine the density of any new development and continues to reflect Local Plan policy QD3,

Theme	Inspector's comment	Planning brief
	<p>to contribute to the provision of the supply of housing in the city, in line with Local Plan Policy QD3 and advice in Planning Policy Statement 3 Housing”.</p>	<p>which seeks new development to make the most efficient and effective use of a site by incorporating an intensity of development appropriate to the locality and/or prevailing townscape. Since the publication of the inspector's report on 1 April 2010, the new government has published a revised planning policy statement on housing (PPS3, published 9 June 2010) to that referred to by the inspector. The new PPS includes a revised approach to the issue of housing densities, including the removal of indicative minimum density provisions, reflecting the new government's move towards an increased focus on local context, which includes the Secretary of State's intention to abolish regional housing targets</p>
<p><b>Height</b></p>	<p>Regarding the developer's specific proposal for the site, he states that the “plan form and main building heights are acceptable in this location”. However, he also states that Scheme 1 “utilises an incongruous top storey (fifth storey) building form which would cause harm in middle and near views and would not relate well to the surrounding townscape”.</p>	<p>The brief sets out some basic height considerations based on the site's context, which any development proposals should address. Urban design analysis, undertaken in the preparation of the brief, establishes a generalised height line for different sections of the site (see Section 5.6) based on the surrounding area. The brief requires development proposals to incorporate a varied and interesting roofline. The height of development should not rise significantly above the generalised height line or break the skyline in long views. All planning applications would need to be accompanied by a robust</p>

Theme	Inspector's comment	Planning brief
		Design and Access Statement and Visual Impact Assessment which demonstrated that the proposal would have no significant negative impacts on the townscape and local amenity.
<b>Mediate between separate characters</b>	He "sees no compelling reason for the treatment of the appeal site to be similar to the treatment of either of the adjoining building forms (i.e. the lower density housing to the north or the urban semi-detached villas to the south)". However, he felt there is a need for the future development of the site to mediate between the separate character areas to the north and south of the site.	The brief requires any future development to mediate between and respond to the different character areas to the north and south of the site.
<b>Parking</b>	The appeal development would provide only a part of the possible demand for parking space, in line with policies aimed at reducing dependence on the motor car. He notes "the restrictions in nearby roads to discourage commuter parking, by a ban during one hour at mid-morning, and also to ensure a turnover of spaces for users of the park by various time limits. Peak demand from the proposed development would tend to be at the non-commuter times". He therefore concurs with the views of the council and appellant, that the proposed level of parking should not be a reason for refusal.	National policy guidance relating to parking considerations has changed since the Inspector wrote his report. The guidance within PPG13 Transport was amended in January 2011 and now states "it should not be assumed that where a proposal accords with the local parking standard, it is automatically acceptable in achieving the objectives of PPG13. Whilst a minimum amount of on-site parking may meet local plan policies, local circumstances such as on-street parking controls and the availability of local transport options should inform the level of parking realistically required for development in this location". This revised approach is particularly pertinent to the Park House

**Item 124 Appendix 3**

<b>Theme</b>	<b>Inspector's comment</b>	<b>Planning brief</b>
		site which is in an area of low public transport accessibility and where parking restrictions are prevalent. In line with this recent guidance, the brief's car parking requirements are based on an assessment of the site and its surroundings.