

## **Planning Application - BH2016/05893**

Comment reference number: 1059526

I object to the Planning Application

### **Sender's details**

Councillor Andrew Wealls  
Hove Town Hall, Norton Road  
BN3 3BQ

### **Comment**

Please note my continued objection to the revised application BH2016/05893 at Medina House, King's Esplanade. I request a site visit, particularly if possible from the interior of affected properties noted below.

My initial submission was principally concerned with loss of light to properties to the rear of the proposed development, particularly the height of the rear eastern 'wing'. The revision reduces the height of this wing by 42cm, and the parapet is lowered by 32cm. The dormer is removed. This has had no meaningful impact on the reduction in light. Unfortunately the Revised Daylight and Sunlight Survey of 13th February 2017 confirms that the impact on the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) of the changes on 13 Sussex Road is so negligible as to be within margins of error. The VSC losses there remain substantial. The incorrect designation of a lounge as a LKD remains. The detailed analysis of VSC which was not provided in the 17/1/17 letter shows significant losses at; 13 Sussex Road (2 KD windows with VSD losses of over 30% and one bedroom window with a loss of 29.8%) 8 King's Esplanade (three bedrooms with losses 33-41% and an unknown use room -32.6%) 3 Victoria Cottages (Conservatory -22.5%) Similarly the Daylight Analysis at the above properties shows significant losses; 13 Sussex Road (up to 21.4%) 8 King's Esplanade (bedrooms up to 30.8%) 3 Victoria Cottages (Conservatory -10%) And lastly the Revised daylight Distribution Analysis shows significant loss of amenity at these properties; 13 Sussex Road (DDA improvements are insignificant) 8 King's Esplanade (data shows negative impact is significant in all bedrooms, dining room) 3 Victoria Cottages (more modest losses at bedroom and attic room. Given the revisions to the development make no meaningful improvement to the negative on the amenity of the residents of these neighbouring properties, I remain opposed.'

