

PLANNING COMMITTEE ADDENDUM Item A - Presentation

2.00PM, WEDNESDAY, 25 MAY 2022

COUNCIL CHAMBER - BTH

Agendas and minutes are published on the council's website www.brighton-hove.gov.uk. Agendas are available to view five working days prior to the meeting date.

Electronic agendas can also be accessed through our meetings app available through [ModernGov: iOS/Windows/Android](#)

This agenda and all accompanying reports are printed on recycled paper

ADDENDUM

ITEM		Page No.
A	BH2018/03633 - Land at King George VI Avenue (Toads Hole Valley), Hove - Outline Application	1 - 22

Toad's Hole Valley, Land At King George VI Avenue

**Item A: (BH2018/03633 Withdrawal of
reasons for refusal at appeal)**



**Brighton & Hove
City Council**

Description of appeal proposal

Outline Planning Permission is sought for the following in principle:

- Up to 880 dwellings including 40% affordable (352 units), 30 custom/self-build plots
- 5ha of land for a 6-form entry secondary school for up to 900 pupils including community sports facilities
- 3.5ha land for office/research/light industry employment uses to accommodate 25,000m² of floorspace
- A neighbourhood centre including 790m² retail outlets, a 750m² doctors' surgery for 3GPs and 555m² community building
- Open space totalling 5.8 ha including landscaping, ecological buffers, open space and amenity areas. 0.58ha public food growing space and 2 children's play spaces.
- Enhancements and alterations to the 8.5ha Site of Nature Conservation Interest

'Un-reserved' (ie full and detailed) planning permission for: 3 main vehicular accesses onto King George VI Avenue with associated highway alterations.



3D Aerial photo of site



Aerial image of site looking north/east



Aerial view of THV from the south, looking north east, with A27 on the left and KGV Ave on the right.

Aerial image of site looking south/west



Brighton & Hove
City Council

Policy Context: site is allocated in City Plan (policy DA7)




Illustrative Masterplan



7


Set of Parameter Plans to guide RM applications

– see location of 3 vehicular accesses




8


Outline of main proposed highway works



Highway works to A27 dumbbell roundabouts



Highway works KGVII Ave (vehicular access 1 of 3 TOP)




Highway works KGV Ave (vehicular access 2 of 3 - MID)



Highway works KGV Ave (main vehicular access 3 of 3 – bottom)

Inset B - Alternative pedestrian crossing design



Highway works proposed (main access) opposite Goldstone Crescent- close up



Views from Hangleton Rd



View from Goldstone Crescent



16

Views along KGVI Ave



Views along KGVI Ave



Images of site (from KGVI Ave)



Brighton & Hove
City Council

Background/Key Considerations

At Planning Committee 21/3/22 it was noted that the transport case was significantly advanced and the proposals were considered acceptable in all other respects, except the council (and National Highways) did not have sufficient transport information to conclude:

- a) whether the traffic modelling was robust and whether the impacts to national and local highway networks would be acceptable (as no model audit)
- b) whether the proposed highway designs are safe (as no RSA)
- c) Whether the proposed highway mitigation measures are appropriate
- d) Whether the air quality assessment was robust (as it was partly based on the outstanding traffic modelling)

2 reasons for refusal were therefore put forward on this basis to form the council's case at appeal (see last slide).

The key consideration is therefore whether the outstanding transport information has now been submitted and whether it is acceptable. Key consultees confirm this is the case, and it is therefore recommended the 2 reasons be withdrawn.

Reasons for refusal (at appeal)

1. *There is a need for auditing of the latest iteration of the applicant's highway modelling to be completed, as well as for the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit to be completed and (if necessary) any safety matters resolved. As a result, there is currently insufficient information from which to determine: (a) whether the residual cumulative impacts of the proposal on the strategic and local road network would be acceptable; (b) whether the proposal avoids an unacceptable impact on highway safety; and (c) whether the proposed highway mitigation measures are adequate. As it currently stands, therefore, it has not been demonstrated that the proposal complies with relevant policies...*

2. *On the basis of the information provided within the Environmental Statement ('ES'), it would appear that the impacts of the proposal on air quality would be acceptable. However, the assessment of the air quality impacts of the operational phase of the proposal are predicated (at least in part) on the applicant's highway modelling. As this modelling is the subject of technical audit which has not been completed, there is currently insufficient information to determine whether information provided within the concerning air quality is robust. Accordingly, as it currently stands, it has not been demonstrated that the proposal complies with relevant policies.....*

