

8th November 2017 Planning Committee – Additional Representations

Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
189	85 Rotherfield Crescent, Brighton	BH2017/02273	<p>Correction to officer report: One letter received is a duplication and it is confirmed that 10 letters of objection have been received.</p>
203	Land to Rear of 62-64 Preston Road, Brighton	BH2017/02137	<p>Amend Refusal Reason 2 to read: The proposed extension, by reason of its excessive height, depth and bulk as well as its proximity to neighbouring dwellings, would result in a significant loss and outlook, particularly in reference to the rear windows of the existing flats within 60, 62 and 64 Preston Road. The mass and scale of the extension would also result in an overbearing and oppressive impact to 60 Preston Road. Furthermore the standard of accommodation for future occupiers is unlikely to be satisfactory, particularly with reference to the third floor flat, due to its limited and cramped floor area and layout. It is considered that the development would therefore cause significant harm to the amenity of the adjoining and future occupiers and would be contrary to policies QD14 and QD27 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan.</p> <p>Corrections to officer report; Paragraph 8.14 refers to the floor area of the smallest flat located on the third floor. The report states that the floor plan is showing a single bedroom. This should be corrected as the floor plan indicates that it is intended to be a double room as a double bed is included on the plans. The bedroom would have a floor area of 10.2sqm and the entire flat measures 42sqm. The Nationally Described Space Standards recommends that a double bedroom should have a floor area of at least 11.5sqm. On that basis a one bed flat with a double bedroom would be considered a 1 bed 2 person dwelling, which the guidance states should have a minimum of 50sqm. This shortfall in floor area would result in a cramped form of standard of accommodation to the detriment of the amenity of future occupiers. Accordingly, the harm identified forms a reason for refusal and further highlights the over development of the site.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.14 refers to No. 60 this should read No. 64.</p>

Paragraph 8.15 states that there would be no outdoor amenity space for the upper floor flats. This should be corrected to note that these flats would be provided with a small rear balcony/terrace.

A **representation** has been received from the applicant in response to issues raised in the published officers report:

The letter outlines a number of areas which the applicant feels were not raised as issues in the previous application, but are now considered as fundamental concerns within the current scheme. This includes;

- The harm caused by the design and siting of the balconies as referred to in Section 8.10 of the report.
- The harm caused to the adjoining ground floor flats of No. 60, which the applicant believes the officer was aware that these were in residential use. The applicant states that only one of these units would be affected due to the layout.

Officer response: Every application is determined on its own merits. The fundamental concerns of the scheme were addressed in the previous application, however the scheme was considered again as part of this current application and as outlined within section 8 of the report, it was felt that there were further areas of concern that should be included within the grounds for refusal.

In response to the use of the ground floor, the previous report refers to only the maisonette at No. 60 as being in residential use. During the course of the current application it has come to light that the ground floor is in use as residential. Whilst it is acknowledged that these properties have not objected to the development, the Local Planning Authority is duty bound to fully assess the impacts of proposed development on neighbouring residential properties. As stated in section 8 of the report, significant harm to these properties has been identified. The report refers to both units at ground floor, as it is unclear of the exact internal layout and whether both flats have access to the rear outdoor amenity space, regardless of whether one or both flats would be affected, the harm is considered significant and therefore warrants refusal.

The letter also states the following points:

- The report is incorrect within section 8.15 as it states that no outdoor amenity space is provided for the upper flats.

Officer response: The report has been amended accordingly. The lack of amenity space is not considered to form a ground for refusal, as outlined in section 8.15 of the report.

- The reasons for support are limited in respect of the letters of support received.

Officer response: The list included in the report summarises the cumulative response from the representations received. All representations are available to view as part of the public file. Furthermore all key material planning considerations are assessed within section 8 of the officer's report.

- Section 8.21 should refer to 64 and not 60.

Officer response: This is an error and the report has been amended accordingly.

- If the committee members were to approve the scheme, a condition could be attached to ensure that the windows at 1st/2nd and 3rd floor to the south elevation are obscured glazing.

Officer response: Notwithstanding the refusal reasons 1 and 2 (as recommended in section 1 of the report) in the event that planning permission is granted a condition could secure the obscured glazing of the windows. This would mitigate some of the harm identified in respect of the potential overlooking and loss of privacy caused by these windows.

- The reference to the zinc roof in section 8.9 of the report is incorrect as it refers to small areas of glazing when it is broken up by a patio door set and three good sized windows along the North flank.

			<p><i>Officer response: The windows may be considered as 'good size' for the purpose of a window opening, however there would still be large blank areas of zinc. The harm this causes is outlined in section 8.9 of the report.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The applicant disagrees with section 8.3 of the officer report and states that there were no significant concerns regarding the appearance of the development from the committee members. <p><i>Officer response: The committee members determined the previous application in line with the officer's recommendation. Whilst a discussion may have been had that there were notable areas of the scheme that could be improved, the proposed revisions have been fully considered and officers do not feel that the concerns of the previous application have been satisfactorily addressed.</i></p>
--	--	--	--

NB. Representations received after midday the Friday before the date of the Committee meeting will not be reported (Sub-Committee resolution of 23 February 2005).