

Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
13	St Augustine's Church, Stanford Avenue	BH2010/00060	<p>48 letters in <u>support</u> of the application have been received from the occupiers of 2 Chatsworth Close (x2), 3 Collingwood Close (x2) & 3 Rayford Close, Peacehaven, 36 Juniper Close, 33 St Richards Road, Portslade, 17 Kingston Lane, 246 Harbour Way (x3), 20 Kings Court, 71a Old Fort Road & 169 Old Fort Road, Shoreham, 63 Longhurst & 96 Woodland Avenue, Burgess Hill, 241 Old Shoreham Road & 35 Richards Road, Southwick, 14 High Street Tarring, 18 Farlington Close Haywards Heath, 35 Shepards Walk Hassocks, 145 Chesswood Road Worthing, 12 Greenoaks North Lancing, 1 Popes Folly, 48, 121 (x2) Hollingdean Terrace, 16 Chatsworth Avenue (x2), 6 Clare Walk, 10 Pembroke Crescent, 17 & 120 Stanford Avenue, 43 The Vale, 14 Kenure Avenue, 15 Darcey Drive, 95 Birchgrove Crescent (x2), 24 Eaton Road, 159 Havelock Road, 4 Dudley Road (x2), 20 Jubilee Court The Crescent & 3 Beaconfield Parade Beaconsfield Road.</p> <p>The grounds of support are as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development would provide a wide range of beneficial community facilities. • Additional housing would be provided. • The development would improve the appearance of a derelict site. • Development would create jobs. • Development would make use of an empty building. • The proposals would be sympathetic to the building and the residential character of the area. <p>Officer comment: It is acknowledged that bringing the church back into use and the provision of additional housing units would be of benefit. However, it is not considered that these benefits would outweigh the adverse affects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the listed building and the amenities of the existing and proposed residential occupiers.</p>
54	Wolseley Build Centre, 19 Bristol Gardens	BH2009/01355	<p>Letter received from agent Michael Cook Associates to confirm the following in response to Cllr Mitchell's objection letter:</p> <p>"Our client is happy for additional conditions to be put on the Planning Permission relating to the reconstruction/retention of the flint walls, and to remove the ability to provide roof terraces in the future. Furthermore, our client is prepared to put a restrictive covenant on the houses to specifically exclude roof terracing from being possible in the future.</p> <p>With regard to the fire strategy for the site, we have had a meeting with a Local Authority</p>

75	41 Ladies Mile Road	BH2010/01132	<p>Fire Officer to discuss the site. He is comfortable with the proposed solution; Plots 1-7 would be accessed from Prince Regent's Close in the event of a fire, with the 45m travel distance to any point in the properties achievable. Plots 8 and 9 can be accessed either from Prince Regent's Close or from Bristol Gardens, as the fire appliance could travel 20m down the access road before the 45m travel distance would apply.”</p> <p>Officer comment: The clarification is helpful, particularly in relation to the East Sussex Fire and Rescue Comments. In relation to potential roof terraces, this is already covered within the officer recommendation, at condition no. 20. In addition, the boundary wall treatment forms part of condition no. 14 (landscaping).</p> <p>The Food Safety Team have commented on the application; further information is required to ensure that the proposed kitchen facilities meet food hygiene standards.</p> <p>A letter of objection has been received from Councillor Brian Pidgeon who <u>objects</u> to the proposals (copy of letter attached).</p> <p>Additional letters have been received from the occupants of no. 5 Old Patcham Mews, and nos. 47, 47A, and 49 Ladies Mile Road <u>objecting</u> to the proposal on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed use should not be approved as it would be in close proximity to two schools which are promoting healthy eating. • The proposed use will cause traffic and litter, and encourage youths to gather leading to anti-social behaviour. • The proposed hot food takeaway is not needed or wanted. • The proposed use will adversely affect the existing Italian restaurant and takeaway at no. 47 Ladies Mile Road. • No. 41 Ladies Mile Road should remain as a retail outlet. <p>A letter has been submitted by the occupiers of no. 49 Ladies Mile Road, from the Headmistress of Patcham High School. The letter states that Year 11 students are allowed off the school premises at lunchtime, and that many of them choose to purchase food in the locality rather than within the school site. Students would therefore be likely to frequent the proposed hot food takeaway which would further undermine the school's attempts to encourage healthy eating. Concerns are also raised regarding increased litter which such students may cause. The application is therefore opposed.</p> <p>Officer comment: The concerns raised are addressed in the report.</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).



Councillor Brian Pidgeon

117 Ladies Mile Road
Brighton
BN1 8TB

Jonathan Puplett
Planning Officer
First Floor
Hove Town Hall
Norton Road
Hove
BN3 3BQ

16th June 2010

Dear Jonathan

Planning Application BH2010/01132 41 Ladies Mile Road

I have had very many residents contact me re the change of use of 41 Ladies Mile Road. Patcham has very many pizza shops, Indian Shops, Coffee shops, and Restaurant, and fast food shops, many residents are very concerned that if a another fast food shop opens many will not survive,

But the main problem is that it is very near Patcham School. A High Court Judge made a land mark legal ruling that councils must take into account the health and well being of pupils when making planning decisions. The unprecedented ruling follows a crackdown on unhealthy eating by national and local government. This shop will be very close to the school and open all through the lunch break. All of you will have seen the letter written by the Patcham School head teacher were she says that they are trying to get the pupils on to much heather food.

Mr Justice Cranston said that the councillors who had agreed to the take-away opening had been wrongly informed and had not taken into account how close the shop was to the school.

Last September we also opposed the application for other reasons which were, very bright neon lights, the amount of street rubbish it creates, noise and the increase in traffic ie delivery motor bikes and cars, attracts youths until late at night,

I have to inform you that a petition is being taken and very many are signing it.

The law has now been clarified and sets a bench mark that enable local authorities everywhere to take account of health and well being of all schoolchildren as factors in determining planning applications.

I ask this committee to refuse planning for this shop

I ask that this letter is published in the agenda; I confirm that I will be speaking at the Planning Committee.

Yours Sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'B. Pidgeon', written in a cursive style.

Councillor Brian Pidgeon
Patcham Ward