

BH2022/00456 Former Dairy 35-39 The Droveaway, Hove

Councillor Bagaen Comments

Thank you for informing us of the latest proposals for the above property with the new planning application. It is very hard to follow this whole process as lay people and hard to find accurate plans within the newly added documents to the portal and to understand the latest changes (if any) to the developer's proposals. It appears that it is mainly an official application to deal with the changes the developer wanted to make as minor changes, but this assumption can mean other details go under the radar.

We are surprised to see that the applicants continue to make further revisions to the scheme using what appears to be completely new architects. This in itself raises the question as to whether the proposed changes are 'minor in nature' as, if they were, surely, they wouldn't justify completely new drawings produced by a different architectural practice?

Anyway, the main reason that we wish to record as objections to these drawings are as follows:

- Changes to the proposed development within the new plans (especially for Unit 12) are **not minor in nature**.
- In the latest plans the applicants have moved Unit 12 (house) and possibly Units 13-19 (although not totally clear on the drawings) **closer to No.6 Mallory Road** by '2.4 metres'. This is not **a marginal amount** as stated by the applicants and represents some 26% of the current distance between the dairy building and the existing retaining wall adjacent to this property. If built as shown, this will create increased overshadowing and a further reduction in privacy.
- The property of Unit 12 is now significantly larger in volume than the existing consent and its roof pitch at its maximum height (the roofline) extends further in a westerly direction, which will cause increased overshadowing to properties and gardens.
- The **peak** height (not the average height) of the development of the building closest to No.6 Mallory Road (Unit 12) appears to have risen yet further in these latest plans.
- The spacing and layout appears to have inconsistencies between the artist impression and the plans / elevations (all drawings do not seem to match up correctly in respect of Unit 12 - gaps shown on plans and visuals).
- The design of Unit 12 has a number of features which appears incongruous and extends through the entire height of the building up to the roof as well as the open roof element which is not an attractive feature. We are concerned at the lack of privacy given by the former and potential for light pollution. In terms of the latter, the applicants appear to be saying that the roof of the terrace block is in a single line of roof height for

'simplicity' however the individual house has a very unorthodox shape to its roofline and does not 'successfully fit within Mallory Road.' Inconsistent arguments are being applied to the rationale for the designs being proposed for the house at Unit 12 and for the terrace block. Also, the roof materials for Unit 12 appear different to the terrace block and it appears it is not proposed to use tiles.

- The design of Unit 11 appears very poor (very small narrow building in contrast to its proposed neighbour) and not in keeping with the rest of the development.
- It appears that part of the retaining wall in the north east corner (a partial circle shape at present) is removed from the latest plans. This needs to be retained.
- There is limited detail given for the landscape plan including the proposals for the 'buffer' between the site and No.6 Mallory Road. It would appear that it is not continuous along the whole length of the rear gardens of the terrace block. Retaining walls between properties should be properly protected and maintained within any new plans.
- The space between 11 and 12 has grown as Unit 12 has shifted towards No.6 Mallory Road. Unit 11 appears very small and boxy and out of balance with its neighbour.
- In terms of fenestration - the windows on the first and second floor elevation are considerably higher than the equivalent windows in the terrace block which again has impacts on overlooking.
- We would like to meet with the urban design officer mentioned.
- We seek confirmation that no construction traffic or parking will be allowed access to Mallory Road.
- We would like to see details of all the points relating to the CEMP before approval and project commencement, including how contractors will liaise with residents.
- Also, we did note the developer now plans to remove the beautiful, healthy, mature tree on Mallory Road (photo attached to email which is totally unacceptable). This was retained in all previous plans but has now suddenly has a note added saying 'tree to be removed as agreed with Council and replaced with two new trees.' It is madness and totally wrong for so many reasons to cut down a perfectly healthy, mature, flowering cherry tree that has stood for years and is enjoyed by everyone in the street as well as numerous wildlife. By all means plant more new trees as part of the development but don't destroy existing!

- The application mentions a new pedestrian route to the highway, but I can't see any marked on the plans. We strongly oppose any pedestrian route through from Mallory Road (a cul-de-sac) to the development as this will completely change the character of the road for those living here.
- Finally, one of the plans is marked up as Phase One and Phase Two. Phase Two is shown as the rear of the site which seems strange in terms of construction access to this once the front of the site is built out. It is important that construction traffic for Phase Two does not seek to access the site via Mallory Road.

