



**Brighton & Hove
City Council**

PLANNING COMMITTEE ADDENDUM

2.00PM, WEDNESDAY, 3 AUGUST 2016

THE RONUK HALL, PORTSLADE TOWN HALL

ADDENDUM

ITEM	Page
36 APPEAL DECISIONS	1 - 6

03 August 2016 Planning Committee – Additional Representations

Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
61	1-6 Lions Gardens & the Coach House, Withdean Avenue, Brighton	BH2016//00803	Application <u>withdrawn</u> by the applicant.
87	Land adjacent to Wellsbourne Health Centre, 179 Whitehawk Road, Brighton	BH2016/01438	<p>Change recommendation to Minded to Grant subject a S106 agreement and the Conditions and Informatives set out in section 11 of the report.</p> <p><u>S106 Heads of Terms</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £14,500 contribution towards the Council's Local Employment Scheme. • Submission of an Employment and Training Strategy, with a commitment to using 20% local labour. • £54,421 education contribution. • £87,070 open space contribution. • £31,800 sustainable transport contribution towards real time public transport information at Wellsbourne Centre southbound bus stop on Whitehawk Way and pedestrian crossing and footway improvements at the junction of Manor Road and Whitehawk Road (including dropped kerbs and narrowing the junction to improve the crossing). <p>Delete Conditions 6 and 21 as the Employment and Training Strategy and sustainable transport improvements will be secured by the S106 agreement.</p> <p>Delete Condition 7 which is no longer necessary as Southern Water has <u>no</u> objection and has confirmed that the local infrastructure can accommodate the proposed development.</p> <p>Additional Condition to secure affordable housing: Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted a scheme for the provision of a minimum of 40% affordable housing, as part of the development, shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The affordable housing shall be provided in accordance with the approved scheme which shall include:</p> <p>i) the timing of the construction of the affordable housing and its phasing in relation to</p>

			<p>the occupancy of the market housing;</p> <p>ii) the tenure, mix and location of the affordable units, including floor plans;</p> <p>iii) the arrangements to ensure that the affordable housing remains as affordable housing for both first and subsequent occupiers of the affordable housing; and</p> <p>iv) the occupancy criteria.</p> <p>For the purposes of this condition 'affordable housing' has the meaning ascribed to it by the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the provision and retention of an appropriate amount of affordable housing in accordance with policy CP20 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One.</p> <p>Additional condition to secure wheelchair accessible dwellings: The wheelchair accessible dwelling(s) hereby permitted as detailed on drawing no. HOU010 005 received on 22/04/16 shall be completed in compliance with Building Regulations Optional Requirement M4(3)(2b) (wheelchair user dwellings) prior to first occupation and shall be retained as such thereafter. All other dwelling(s) hereby permitted shall be completed in compliance with Building Regulations Optional Requirement M4(2) (accessible and adaptable dwellings) prior to first occupation and shall be retained as such thereafter. Evidence of compliance shall be notified to the building control body appointed for the development in the appropriate Full Plans Application, or Building Notice, or Initial Notice to enable the building control body to check compliance.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure satisfactory provision of homes for people with disabilities and to meet the changing needs of households and to comply with policy HO13 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.</p>
107	Unit 4 Home Farm Business Centre, Home Farm Road, Brighton	BH2016/01414	<u>No objection</u> from County Ecologist .
139 & 159	Pembroke Hotel, 2 Third Avenue, Hove	BH2016/01318 & BH2016/01319	<p>Additional representation in support from Flat 2, Royal Court, 8 Kings Gardens.</p> <p>Officer response: Re-confirms support from previous letter. The points raised have been addressed in the report.</p>
175	The Hyde, 95 Rowan Avenue, Hove	BH2016/01931	<p>Reason for Refusal 2 amended to better accord with the report which accepts the form and density of the development:</p> <p>The proposal by virtue of its proximity to, and overlooking of, neighbours in Lions Gate and Maytree Walk, represents an unacceptable development which will cause a loss of amenity</p>

			<p>to these adjacent residents. In addition, the proximity of the proposed dwellings to the open space would prejudice the level of amenity future adjoining occupiers should reasonably expect to enjoy. Accordingly, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy QD27 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.</p> <p>Representations received in <u>support</u> from Councillors Barnett, Janio and Lewry (copy attached).</p>
227	238 Elm Grove, Brighton	BH2016/01000	Representation received in <u>support</u> from Councillor Page (copy attached).

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).

BH2016/01931 – The Hyde, 95 Rowan Avenue, Hove
22/06/16

Dear Stewart,

Request for this application to be heard at the next Planning Committee.

If officers are minded to refuse the application then Councillors Barnett, Janio and Lewry would state their support for the application. This is because they feel it is important for elected members to give their view on this issue which has rumbled on for so many years and left residents, developers and indeed the Council itself so unhappy.

They would also like the application heard in recognition of the amount of money that has been spent during this time. The three councillors really just want to see the issue resolved in a way that benefits all those in the city.

Councillors Barnett, Janio and Lewry
Hangleton & Knoll Ward

BH2016/01000 – 238 Elm Grove, Brighton
28/06/16

Dear Stewart,

I have as ward councillor been contacted by the landlord Mr Nash.

I am familiar with the site, where the ground floor extension is somewhat sunken, reducing its impact.

I cannot see any objection, e g from no. 236, and the other side does not overlook another property.

Another neighbour had concerns about another house in the garden, but none as to these extensions, which I understand to have been scaled back anyway (as well as the second house being scrapped).

It now looks to me like an appropriate development. If your view is different, I would like the Committee to decide.

Yours,

Dick Page,
Councillor (Hanover & Elm Grove).

