

LEGAL & DEMOCRATIC SERVICES
Brighton & Hove City Council
King's House
Grand Avenue
Hove BN3 2LS

Date: 1 June 2012
Our Ref:
Your Ref: RK/P
Phone: (01273) 291 064
Fax: (01273) 291089
Email: ross.keatley@brighton-
hove.gov.uk

Dear Councillor

PLANNING COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY, 6TH JUNE, 2012

Please find enclosed Wednesday, 6th June, 2012 meeting of the Planning Committee, the following reports that were unavailable when the agenda was printed.

Agenda Item 6 **Item: Late Representations List**

Yours sincerely

Ross Keatley
Democratic Services Officer

ncs

Please ask for:

Page	Site Address	Application No.	Update
23	189 Kingsway, Hove	BH2012/00982	<p>Additional drawings were received on 24th May 2012 detailing how the barrel vaulted roofline to the Kingsway terrace would function in terms of materials and drainage. These plans are for clarification purposes only and are not considered to alter the recommendation.</p> <p>Amend Informative 1 to read:</p> <p>This decision is based on the Planning, Design, Access and Heritage Statement received on 17th January 2012; the Density Statement, Lifetimes Homes Checklist, Sustainability Checklist, Noise Assessment and ‘breglobal’ pre-assessment and drawing nos. ST.01 – ST.05, ST.09A, ST.09B, ST.09C, ST.10A, ST.10B, ST.10C, ST.11A, ST.11B, ST.11C, ST.12AA, ST.12CA, ST.13A, ST.13B, ST.13C, ST.14 – St.20A, St.21 – ST.35, ST.37 & ST.39 received on 30th March 2012; amended drawing nos. ST.06 rev A & ST.07 rev A received on 11th May 2012; the supporting letter from Dean Wilson LLP received on 16th April 2012; drawing nos ST.12BA & ST.38 received on 18th May 2012; drawing nos. ST.06B, ST.07B & ST.08B received on 17th May 2012; drawing nos. ST.20 rev A & ST.36A received on 22nd May 2012 and drawing nos. ST.14, ST.15, ST.40 & ST.41 received on 24th May 2012.</p>
45	52 Church Road, Hove	BH2011/03483	<p>Heritage Team raise concern over the detail of the rear extraction flue. It is suggested this features must run up side of the building rather than wrapping around the fire escape structure as currently shown. Also It must not alter the substantial brick cornice at roof level.</p> <p>Officer Response:</p> <p>An amended drawing was received on 30th May 2012 which shows the flue would run through the redundant fire escape in a straight line rather than wrapping around, and is considered to be acceptable.</p> <p>Amend drawing condition to read:</p> <p>2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings no. drawing 1 received on 17th January 2012, proposed layout received on 27th January 2012, ‘proposed layout’ received on 10th February 2012, the proposed air conditioning units on 14th May 2012 and ‘details of kitchen extractor ductwork’ received 30th May 2012.</p> <p>An additional condition is recommended:</p>

55	Flat 6, Courtenay House, Courtenay Terrace, Hove	BH2012/00195	<p>The proposed rear kitchen duct hereby granted consent shall be fixed to the rear elevation of the property to ensure no damage to the brick cornice and no fixings for the kitchen are to be attached to this feature.</p> <p>Reason: To enable the easy reversal of this work in due course and in the interests of the historic character of the building in accordance with policy HE6 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan.</p> <p>Additional representation from 6 Albert Mansions <u>objecting</u> to additional noise pollution.</p> <p>Officer Response: Issues relating to noise disturbance are considered in the report.</p> <p>Additional representation from saveHOVE drawing attention to the Article IV Direction for the Cliftonville Conservation Area, whereupon there is a requirement for Courtenay Terrace to be painted white. The building has been wrongly painted a deep buff. Consider it would be appropriate for the LPA to take this opportunity to 'enlighten' the applicant to this requirement.</p> <p>Officer Response: Courtenay Terrace is located within the Article IV Direction for the Cliftonville Conservation area and does have a requirement that the building be painted white. However, the requirements of Article IV Directions do not apply retrospectively and there is no lawful requirement to change the paint scheme at this time. Upon the next re-painting of the building it would be expected that the original white colour is re-instated.</p> <p>The reinstatement of the original colour was not requested as to do so would be considered an unreasonable request in view that the application was not submitted by the freeholder or all leaseholders. In effect, to ask for the change would unfairly penalise other parties who have not applied for permission.</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).