



**Brighton & Hove
City Council**

PLANNING COMMITTEE ADDENDUM

2.00PM, WEDNESDAY, 8 AUGUST 2012

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

ADDENDUM

ITEM		Page
42.	PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT	1 - 4
45.	TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS	5 - 6

Subject:	Petition(s)		
Date of Meeting:	18 August 2012		
Report of:	Strategic Director, Resources		
Contact Officer:	Name:	Ross Keatley	Tel: 29-1064
	E-mail:	ross.keatley@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
Key Decision:	No		
Wards Affected:	Central Hove St Peters & North Laine		

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 To receive any petitions presented at Council, any petitions submitted directly to Democratic Services or any e-Petition submitted via the council's website.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.2 That the Committee responds to the petition either by noting it or writing to the petition organiser setting out the Council's views, or where it is considered more appropriate, calls for an officer report on the matter which may give consideration to a range of options, including the following:

- taking the action requested in the petition
- considering the petition at a council meeting
- holding an inquiry into the matter
- undertaking research into the matter
- holding a public meeting
- holding a consultation
- holding a meeting with petitioners
- referring the petition for consideration by the council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee
- calling a referendum

3. PETITIONS

3. (i) To receive the following e-Petition submitted via the council's website by Valerie Painter. The final number of signatures obtained will be advised at the meeting.

Planning Brief for Medina House

We the undersigned petition the council to Urgently produce a Planning Brief for Medina House. Planning Brief ground rules, over and above existing council policy documents and the Local Plan, are needed for

any further Medina House planning applications as a matter of some urgency and in order to help bring the present stalemate situation with its owners to an end. We ask that BHCC considers (a) Giving first preference to restoration/redevelopment that brings the existing, historically important, building back into use, and if for housing, that it be confined to the present envelope, and car-free. (b) Considers non-housing use-class designation for the site in order to provide public facilities and/or employment opportunities for this section of Hove's seafront area, and (c) Restricts redevelopment at Medina House to the existing height level in order to protect tiny, historic, Sussex Road and Victoria Cottages dwellings (which abut the back wall of Medina House) from unacceptable overshadowing and light loss.

Justification:

Medina House was built as a saltwater bathhouse in 1893. The Royal Doulton tiling of the main pool area was distinctive and remains of importance historically and socially. At the time of Hove Borough Council's sale of the building in the late 1990's, it was tenanted by a firm of diamond cutters.

The very small cottages of Sussex Road and Victoria Cottages shelter behind and abut the rear wall of Medina House with about a metre clearance only. These, with Medina House are all that is left of the original seafront development along the King's Esplanade apart from Marrocco and St. Aubyns Mansions. Together they are a significant, single, unified historic remnant area within the Hove back-story.

Low-rise planning consent for demolition and redevelopment was obtained by the new owners soon after purchase but never used. The the pool area was, however, infilled with concrete and some of the Royal Doulton tiling removed. Several proposals, failed planning applications and Appeals later, only use by squatters and two s215 Enforcement orders to restore external appearance and clean up the pool area have been 'achieved' by the owners of this important site.

The future remains a problem as the owners continue to aim for demolition of a highly valued historic building that is still in good structural condition and to believe planning consent for a tall building on the site is achievable. We believe a Planning Brief is now an urgent imperative.

The e-petition and accompanying paper version will be presented to the Planning Committee on the 8th August, 2012.

- 3. (ii)** To receive the following e-Petition submitted via the council's website by Richard Green. The final number of signatures obtained will be advised at the meeting.

Support of Level Skatepark Planning Application BH2012/01598

We the undersigned petition the council to Approve planning application BH2012/F01598 so that The Level can have the skatepark it deserves.

Justification:

The legendary (34 year old) Level Skatepark is a highly valued, well-used and badly needed public facility.

This winter the Level skatepark is going to be destroyed by the council.

Unless the planning application for the new Level skatepark is approved, there is a real danger that the Level will lose it's historic place in skatepark history forever.

Page	Site Address	Application No.	Update
17	The Level, Ditchling Road	BH2012/01598	<p>Four (4) further letters of representation have been received from 44 Baden Road, an unknown address, 7 South Avenue & 90 Fairfax Rd (Teddington) <u>supporting</u> the application for the following reasons:</p> <p>The Level Skatepark has been a pioneering, influential and productive environment of its time. Brighton has many sub-cultures, which attract people, including the Skatepark for people of Brighton and tourists/visitors. BMX and skating is as much part of Brighton community and culture as is bohemian art. A Council decision not to replace the Skatepark would look terrible in light of its relations with the BHSA, along with the detrimental effect on the majority of youths who do not participate in mainstream sports. With extreme sports featuring the Olympic Games for the first time this year it would be tragic to lose another Park close to London where BMX riders are prevalent. Even Brighton University have a BMX sports club.</p> <p>These facilities are important. Extreme sports are time-consuming and can play a huge part in a life. Apathy and stagnation is an endemic problem for the young generation. These sports act as a vent for all frustrations of life, whilst remaining fun and social, and can teach people how to become disciplined and motivated. Improving these facilities is an opportunity for local residents, as well as those further afield to take up such activities, giving them opportunity to improve their lives, youths and adults alike.</p> <p>A further third letter of representation has been circulated to Members of Planning Committee from 4 Park Crescent. To summarise, the letter details the individual's circumstances, campaigning to have the Skatepark rebuilt on its existing site. It also includes issues about the consultation not shown in any of the papers submitted for the Skatepark application. The letter passes on information from the HLF, questions whether a build in the southern end could be considered as an alternative, concluding with comments and questions including whether this is a destination Skatepark, what inequality issues have been considered, health & safety issues and why none of the recommendations in the noise assessment report have made it on to the plans and why the 3-point noise assessment has not been conducted properly. In addition, there is a specific reference to a Town Green Application put in December 2011 and questions whether Councillors and contacted parties were aware of the application. Stating that the people involved represent a small sample</p>

113	8 & 8A Western Street	BH2012/01358	<p>of the community and their views should not be ignored and that the application was rejected on technical grounds and sits on hold as significant financial help to pay for required legal advice.</p> <p>Officer response: An application for Town Green status has been previously considered and rejected under separate legislation.</p> <p>Letter (address not given) received reminding Council of its duty under the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard, inter alia, to eliminating discrimination and advancing equality of opportunity in carrying out its functions.</p> <p>Officer response: The Council's Senior Solicitor (Planning) has advised that the determination of the application does not breach the public sector equality duty contained within the Equality Act 2010.</p> <p>Three (3) additional representations have been received from 45 Bowen Court, 31-35 The Drive, Basement Flat, 29 Cambridge Road and one letter via the clinic in Eastern Road from existing clients. They have stated that, as users of the Rock Clinic, they <u>support</u> the application. It provides much needed services for people on low incomes with professional staff and it makes sense for them to have another building in the west of the city.</p> <p>MP Caroline Lucas <u>supports</u> the application as its patron. She comments that the clinic is an excellent charity that benefits the community by offering low cost counselling. She has been assured by the clinic that they are willing to respond to issues raised by local residents. She is also pleased to hear of statements of support from people living close to the existing clinic. It is hoped the planning office is able to work with Association to ensure this valuable service can be extended to the west of the city.</p> <p>Section 8.2 of the report states that the address of the existing clinic is 279 Eastern Road, Brighton. The correct address is 270 Eastern Road.</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).