

## 13<sup>th</sup> December 2017 Planning Committee – Additional Representations

Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
	2, 3, 4, 5 And 6 Pelham Terrace Brighton	BH2017/02156	<p>The following additional submissions have been received from the Applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An additional sunlight and daylight report which sets out the light levels which the second floor north facing windows, serving student studios, would receive.</li> <li>• A letter and marketing details from Graves Jenkins detailing the marketing of the public house which took place from January 2015 onwards.</li> <li>• Additional floorplans, sections and an elevation which show the relationship of the proposed building and first floor terrace area with the residential properties behind the site (The Deco Building).</li> <li>• The scheme complies with Policy HO20 (a) and (b) and an objection on the basis of Policy HO20 is not justified.</li> <li>• The scheme provides purpose built student accommodation and the applicants have written support from Kings Education and have met and discussed the scheme with both Brighton University and the University of Sussex and those discussions will continue. The applicants have agreed to enter into a Section 106 Agreement (the approach adopted on other nearby schemes) which limits occupation of the accommodation to those in full time education within Brighton. The scheme is therefore considered to accord with Policy CP21.</li> <li>• The original planning statement sets out why the applicants consider the loss of the retail unit to be justified in the light of other shops within the vicinity which are available or will shortly be available.</li> <li>• Disabled parking could be provided on site but was omitted in response to advice from the Highway Authority as there is on-street disabled parking very close by.</li> <li>• Confirmation that the applicants are happy to accept a condition requiring a detailed landscaping scheme to be submitted and agreed before the development</li> </ul>

proceeds.

Officer response:

The additional sunlight and daylight report demonstrate that the north facing windows at second floor level would not receive ideal levels of sunlight but the levels would be adequate to ensure a good standard of accommodation for future occupiers. The windows further up the building to the north elevation would benefit from better light levels.

The marketing letter and marketing details evidence the information put forward in the Applicant's submission re the marketing of the property for Public House use which took place following the purchase of the property in January 2015. These matters are addressed in the report to committee.

The additional floorplans, sections and elevation drawing clearly demonstrate the relationship between the proposed development, and particularly the proposed first floor terrace area, with the residential buildings behind the site (The Deco Building). The proposed terrace floor level is well below the height of the neighbouring facing windows and would be screened by an existing boundary wall. Two windows which do face directly over to the terrace serve a garage rather than any habitable room. The resultant relationship would be acceptable; harmful overlooking would not be caused. As set out in the report to committee it is recommended that the hours of use of the terrace be restricted to between 09.00 and 21.00 only.

The issues relating to Policies HO20, CP21 and the loss of the retail unit are addressed in the report and the reasons for why the scheme is considered to be acceptable with regard to these issues fully explained.

The Highway Authority confirmed in their representations on the scheme that the lack of disabled on-site car parking in this instance is not considered to amount to a 'severe' impact in transport terms. Therefore, refusal would not be warranted on these grounds.

			The confirmation of a landscape condition being acceptable is welcomed.																				
	28 Braybon Avenue	BH2017/02745	<p>Amended drawings were requested to provide satisfactory detailing to show clearly that access to the roof would not be required and would not be used as a terrace.</p> <p>Amended proposed drawings have now been received.</p> <p>Officer response: The amended drawings are considered acceptable. Condition 1 will be updated to reflect these changes and the list of approved drawings will be:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Plan Type</th> <th>Reference</th> <th>Version</th> <th>Date Received</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Location and block plan</td> <td>PR-PL-01</td> <td>A</td> <td>28 September 2017</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Floor Plans Proposed</td> <td>PR-PL-01</td> <td>C</td> <td>30 November 2017</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Elevations Proposed</td> <td>EX-PR-EL-01</td> <td>D</td> <td>30 November 2017</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sections Proposed</td> <td>EX-PR-SE-01</td> <td>D</td> <td>30 November 2017</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received	Location and block plan	PR-PL-01	A	28 September 2017	Floor Plans Proposed	PR-PL-01	C	30 November 2017	Elevations Proposed	EX-PR-EL-01	D	30 November 2017	Sections Proposed	EX-PR-SE-01	D	30 November 2017
Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received																				
Location and block plan	PR-PL-01	A	28 September 2017																				
Floor Plans Proposed	PR-PL-01	C	30 November 2017																				
Elevations Proposed	EX-PR-EL-01	D	30 November 2017																				
Sections Proposed	EX-PR-SE-01	D	30 November 2017																				

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).

