

## **Appendix 1 – Informal Consultation Response and Analysis**

### **Analysis of Representations**

Total Number of Responses	75
Q. Do you agree that the proposed Article 4 Direction will help preserve the distinctive character and appearance of the Queen’s Park conservation area?	
Number of Representations that Strongly Agree	31 (41%)
Number of Representations that Agree	18 (24%)
Number of Representations that neither Agree or Disagree	7 (9%)
Number of Representations that Disagree	8 (11%)
Number of Representations that Strongly Disagree	11 (15%)
Q. Which, if any, of the following works to the front of buildings should require planning permission within the Queen’s Park conservation area?	
None	18 (24%)
The change of colour to all front elevations of buildings, including eaves, guttering, downpipes, exterior woodwork, windows, doors, railings, as well as changing the colour of existing rendered surfaces and existing boundary walls/railings.	25 (33%)
The removal of render from existing front elevations facing the street/road.	27 (36%)
The painting of existing brick elevations facing the street/road	30 (40%)
The change of roofing materials	24 (32%)
Installing or enlarging rooflights to any roof slope visible from the street or road	27 (36%)
Installing, altering or replacing solar panels or solar thermal equipment on roof slope visible from the street or road	21 (29%)
Replacing or altering windows and doors visible from the street or road	38 (51%)
Changing existing wooden or metal balcony railings to a different material or pattern	33 (44%)
Erecting a front porch to the front of a building	41 (54%)
Demolishing or altering or erecting a front boundary wall, fence, gate or railings or changing wall finishes	44 (58%)
Providing or replacing a hard surface within the front garden of a house	29 (36%)
Removing traditional tiled surfaces to paths, steps and entrance thresholds	36 (48%)
Installing satellite dishes to the front of buildings	48 (64%)
The installation, alteration, removal or replacement of a chimney, flue or soil and vent pipe on the front of a dwelling house	25 (33%)
Other, please give details	5 (7%)

**Summary of Comments**

Please use this space to provide comments on why you have taken this view on the proposed Article 4 Direction

1	Painting images of Greta on house walls	Noted
2	Comprehensive Article 4 Directions are a powerful tool for preserving and enhancing the character of a Conservation Area. Works affecting chimneys, flues and soil and vent pipes should include waste pipes and gas pipes. External lighting, intruder alarms and CCTV on the front of buildings should also require planning permission.	External lights, intruder alarms and CCTV on the front elevations on dwellinghouses have not been identified as having a deleterious impact on the local amenity.
3	I have no objection in principle to planning controls on certain kinds of work, but I ticked no items on the list above - even those which seem justified to me - because I do not wish to be counted as 'in favour of tighter controls'. I believe that broader criteria of good architecture - including building performance - should be applied, rather than requiring that the conservation area should look Victorian in every detail. It is still the case that the planning function stresses aesthetics and largely ignores building performance and environmental impact. Traditionally, building performance has been a matter for Building Control. In a time of climate emergency, this situation has to change. Planners have heard this many times before, many are individually exasperated by it, and in Brighton and Hove I believe there have been modest efforts to make planning guidelines 'greener'. But bolder action is needed. There is massive support for the Green Party and Extinction Rebellion in this area. Queens Park could be a showcase for creative ways of preserving a historic district while aiming for a zero-carbon future. At the very least, no resident or owner should be prevented from installing solar panels or external wall insulation just because the property is in a Conservation Area. Climate change is not something that only happens on the other side of Egremont Gate.	<p>The installation, alteration or replacement of solar panels will not be controlled by the proposed Article 4 Direction due to lack of support from the consultation.</p> <p>Council has a Planning Advice Note on Householder guidance on energy efficiency for historic buildings in conservation areas. The document aims to clarify how energy efficiency improvements can be made in a sensitive and effective way.</p>
4	Queen's Park itself is in poor condition for a key community asset and within a conservation area. Consideration should be given to 'minimum standards' to be upheld for prevention of drug use in the park etc. I do not agree that new windows should be timber, however would endorse a change to UPVC sash effect windows - giving the correct look and feel but without the maintenance issues. Finally, the main issue with the area is the high level of HMO's. These need to be phased out, as well as having minimum standards of external appearance. 216 Queen's Park Road (externally) is a disgrace.	<p>HMO's within the city have been addressed in the recently adopted Citywide Article 4 Direction for HMOs. The citywide HMO Article 4 Direction will come into effect on 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2020.</p> <p>216 Queen's Park Road is located outside of the Queen's Park conservation area.</p>

5	I think that while removing wooden sash windows is undesirable for appearances sake we have to be realistic. Sash windows in uPVC look pretty much the same unless you look very closely and are a practical and reasonably cost effective alternative.	UPVC is a non-renewable resource and current technology cannot match the fine detailing of historic timber windows, especially Queen Anne style multi-paned windows which are common throughout the Queen's Park conservation area.
6	I am interested in the overall aesthetics and appearance. HMO's on my road do the area a disservice on this issue.	HMO's within the city have been addressed in the recently adopted Citywide Article 4 Direction for HMOs. The citywide HMO Article 4 Direction will come into effect on 3 <sup>rd</sup> June 2020.
7	The thought of having to ask permission concerning colour of the house fronts is just ridiculous. If visuals like that are under consideration why are the unsightly, and in summer, smelly, black and green bins allowed to remain on the front pavements in this conservation area?!	A suitable colour scheme will accompany the Article 4 Direction providing a number of colour options for the painting of front elevations. This will be similar to other Article 4 Direction painting schemes covering conservation areas in the city.
8	It is absurd, in a situation where even the existence of humanity is at risk from global warming, for the Council to do anything whatsoever that might make insulating houses, or improving their energy efficiency harder or more expensive.  Things change, get used to it.  Mike	Council has a Planning Advice Note on Householder guidance on energy efficiency for historic buildings in conservation areas. The document aims to clarify how energy efficiency improvements can be made in a sensitive and effective way.
9	I live on Freshfield Road, just outside of the conservation area. I can see how damaging to the environment the works currently being carried out on local houses (for instance on my road - the Cuthbert pub for one particularly dreadful example) can be to the ambience of an area and would hate to see the small conservation area within Queens Park going further this way. I was an owner occupier on Queens Park Terrace until a few years ago and recognise the blight of some houses having plastic windows and cheap doors.  Architectural signifiers such as railings, gates, front gardens and lamp posts, though expensive to replace	Works proposed to trees within conservation areas with a diameter exceeding 75mm when measured at 1.5m from ground level require 6 weeks notification to Council prior to the works being carried out.

	like for like, should be kept as symbols of our once beautiful Victorian city. As should trees and windows, doors and roof slates.	
10	<p>Particularly in relation to solar panels and any other climate friendly amendments, the council has a responsibility to make it as easy as possible for residents to make positive change.</p> <p>More broadly, I think that this is an active, lively area where changes to houses are generally of necessity and those listed are unlikely to damage the look and feel of the area as a whole. The eclecticism of the area is part of its charm.</p> <p>The decorative panels on the front of some of the redbrick houses should be preserved but I don't think there's a need for anything more than this.</p>	Council has a Planning Advice Note on Householder guidance on energy efficiency for historic buildings in conservation areas. The document aims to clarify how energy efficiency improvements can be made in a sensitive and effective way.
11	Incremental changes may not seem to impact on their own but the impact of several over time do have an adverse effect	Noted
12	To help halt the loss of original frontages (gates etc) to the Edwardian and other houses around the park and to encourage the authentic restoration of original lost features .	Noted
13	Article 4 is incredibly restrictive, there is already planning permission required for many aspects of developing a house within the conservation area. The beauty of the area is unaffected by the colour or style of somebodys guttering or front door style, by the fact that it is tree lined, near the park etc, and has a view of the sea and sunset. Installing conservation style fittings, eg, replacement wooden sash windows etc comes at a huge cost that many cannot afford despite the postcode! A premium council tax is already in place in this area, are tenants to be penalised further when it comes to wanting to protect our home further by fitting affordable, robust style fittings. The front of these houses take a battering from the sea direction and being so high up, any wooden detailing is rotten despite any maintenance attempts. Article 4 would make it expensive, difficult and a long protracted process to make changes, when the street behind can do anything they want! Very unfair.	<p>Development proposed to require planning permission under the Article 4 Direction is currently allowed under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended)</p> <p>Council has a Planning Advice Note on Householder guidance on energy efficiency for historic buildings in conservation areas. The document aims to clarify how energy efficiency improvements can be made in a sensitive and effective way.</p>
14	The area's appeal is due to a certain 'look' - another appeal of a seaside town is the idea of somewhere being durable. Keeping a similar aesthetic aids this. Also ostentatious displays of wealth only serve to divide an area that already has an 'us & them' undercurrent.	Noted
15	We live on Queen's Park Terrace and love our house and those along the road. Why should we have to pay to apply for planning permission to make improvements to the front of our house such as rotten windows or changing the colour of the gutters?	On 17 <sup>th</sup> January 2018, the Central government revoked the exemption of planning fees for planning applications required under

	<p>We are already restricted as to what we can/cannot do to our house so why extend this further?</p> <p>I strongly object to imposing more red tape which would result in delays, extra cost and unfairness to residents in the area wanting to improve and maintain our properties.</p>	<p>an Article 4 Direction.</p> <p>Planning fees are set by the Central government and are standardised across England.</p> <p>An Article 4 Direction does not necessarily mean that an application will be refused. It allows the Council some control over design and detailing.</p>
16	<p>We live in a modern world that is changing all the time. If we try to preserve everything as it was, then like the dinosaurs we will become extinct.</p> <p>Our cultural diversity introduces us to new ideas all the time and why should we stick with what suited the Victorians? From a purely practical point of view, planning rules and applying for permission are unclear, unhelpful and unwieldy and trying to comply, almost inevitably heaps an enormous extra cost onto the job, which may well make it untenable . . . then what are we conserving?</p>	Noted
17	<p>A conservation area is meaningless if this range of alterations can be made to properties. The look of an area is the sum of the look of the buildings.</p>	Noted
18	<p>I think it's important to preserve architectural features while balancing the need for modernisation and necessary change.</p>	Noted
19	<p>Because it will become impossible for the average householder to carry out simple works to their house when an Article 4 direction is in place. I completely agree when it's a homogenous terrace which has remained unchanged for years such as Palmeira Square or the like, but this is totally unnecessary in this conservation area - the restrictions of that are enough.</p> <p>Queens Park Conservation area has had so many changes and alterations made such that certain parts are no longer homogenous and an Article 4 direction will not make any difference to what has already been done. Let things develop and grow and change - what about all the black and white painted cobbled houses in town - they were once called Blue and buffs - due to the colour of the materials - now they are black and white - they have evolved over time and no one is clammering to change them back to how the originally were - why is this Amy different?</p> <p>I wholeheartedly disagree with an Article 4 direction. It is too prescriptive, restrictive and very costly for home owners (having to make applications to the LA) simply wanting to make simple changes and in some cases maintenance or security measures.</p>	<p>As existing, there are very few additional planning restrictions on properties within conservation areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demolish a building with a volume of 115 cubic metres or more.</li> <li>• To demolish any gate, fence, wall or other means of enclosure with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ a height of one metre or more if next to a highway (including a public footpath or bridleway), waterway or open space; or</li> <li>○ a height of two metres or more elsewhere</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>An Article 4 Direction does not necessarily mean that an application will be refused. It allows the Council some</p>

		control over design and detailing.
20	<p>Article 4 is not necessary in this area, there is already a conservation order in place which places enough restrictions on building and alteration work to homes that people want to make. This is following reasons why I am against this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is extra cost to apply for planning permission ( but financial gain for the council).</li> <li>- It is is a long time consuming process.</li> <li>- If somebody is refused, they have to appeal, if they lose they cannot make improvements to their own home that they own.</li> <li>- It is a stressful process.</li> <li>- How does the colour of peoples brickwork and style of their gates affect the beauty of living in an area like Queens Park.</li> <li>- Article 4 is an archaic and draconian infringement on homeowners right to do as they wish to their house that they have bought themselves.</li> <li>- Why should a minority flag up issues that THEY have with peoples homes when it is nothing to do with them.</li> </ul>	<p>As discussed above, there are very few additional planning restrictions on properties within conservation areas</p> <p>The proposal to implement Article 4 Directions within the Queen's Park conservation area was a recommendation of the Queen's Park Conservation Area Character Appraisal adopted by Council in September 2018 and was prepared with the assistance of a community steering group.</p>
21	<p>Original features should be kept or refurbished if possible but as a resident I understand the considerable cost this incurs. We have not been able to replace metal windows back to original timber sash because of cost. This means higher maintenance and loss of heat as metal windows are prone to high levels of condensation. I do not consider painting of brick exterior front facing as desirable for the area and it would be hard to then remove.</p> <p>It would be nice if the traditional lamp posts removed from Folkstone street many years back had been refurbished and returned but I appreciate the council replacing with timber windows in council owned houses. Although these need to now be maintained as looking shabby.</p> <p>The introduction of wheelie bins to the road has had the most detrimental impact to the look of the road. Far worse than uPVC windows and modern doors.</p> <p>There is no off pavement space for them and the street is now cluttered with them especially at the queen's park end of the road. This is of no fault of the residents living there. It is a shame as the council did originally say we would not require them due to it being a conservation road.</p>	Noted
22	Planning permission is important to preserve the character of the houses facing Queens Park as a conservation area.	Noted
23	Whilst I respect that some of the area has certain period features which would be nice to keep, Tower Road should not be included in this as the majority of the houses were built in the 1970/80s. This had led to	The boundaries of the conservation area were reviewed as part of the process of creating the

	<p>unnecessary confusion and potential cost. The area definition should be clarified.</p> <p>Many of the above are improvements reflecting modern life and energy efficiency should be the main driver not the sensitivity of a passerby.</p>	<p>Queen's Park Conservation Area Character Statement in 2018. The assessment was as follows:</p> <p><i>There is a variation of architectural periods including the late Edwardian and inter-war period, the 1960s and 1970s. Although there is a degree of cohesion with the staggered 1960s dwellings, they are considered to be of neutral value.</i></p>
24	To preserve the look of our Victorian buildings and to control the amount of lighting filtering out and disturbing sleep patterns. Unsightly satellite dishes are also a hazard in high winds.	Noted
25	I love walking around the Queens Park conservation area, and adore the architecture in the surrounding area. Brighton has lost a lot of its character over the last century and although I respect the owners' prerogative to make changes to their own property, I think the overall feel of the area should stay as close to the original condition as possible. I think the consultation with residents is more important than with people like me, but I feel a great childhood attachment to this ward, and would love to live there myself one day!	Noted
26	As a resident of East Drive, I think we should act now to preserve the look of our lovely Housing stock. The Area has suffered a lot in the past with lots of front gardens lost for drives and inappropriate Windows being installed. There are lots of people in the summer who enjoy looking at the Houses around the park, I am also concerned about the Tennis Club on East Drive Planning to install 10 x 25ft hi steel flood lights! that would be clearly Visible, This dystopian plan for Galvanized steel posts with Flood lights would dominate the sky line when entering the park down North Drive and around, and would make a mockery of these Article 4 plans, also their plans have to be commented on by 21st Feb so probably trying to get them through before Article 4 plans could stop them.	<p>Noted</p> <p>The planning application for lighting to the Queen's Park Tennis Club is being assessed by the Development Management team.</p>
27	<p>Comprehensive Article 4 Directions are a powerful tool for preserving and enhancing the character of a Conservation Area.</p> <p>Works affecting chimneys, flues and soil and vent pipes should include waste pipes and gas pipes.</p> <p>External lighting, intruder alarms and CCTV on the front of buildings should also require planning</p>	<p>External lights, intruder alarms and CCTV on the front elevations on dwellinghouses have not been identified as having a deleterious impact on the local amenity.</p>

	permission.	
28	The council have allowed some horrendous developments over the last 35 years, maybe they can do something to look after the existing character	Noted
29	Satellite dishes are an ugly addition to the front of a house specially when they go rusty	Noted
30	<p>I have no objection in principle to planning controls on certain kinds of work, but I ticked no items on the list above - even those which seem justified to me - because I do not wish to be counted as 'in favour of tighter controls'.</p> <p>I believe that broader criteria of good architecture - including building performance - should be applied, rather than requiring that the conservation area should look Victorian in every detail.</p> <p>It is still the case that the planning function stresses aesthetics and largely ignores building performance and environmental impact. Traditionally, building performance has been a matter for Building Control. In a time of climate emergency, this situation has to change.</p> <p>Planners have heard this many times before, many are individually exasperated by it, and in Brighton and Hove I believe there have been modest efforts to make planning guidelines 'greener'.</p> <p>But bolder action is needed. There is massive support for the Green Party and Extinction Rebellion in this area. Queens Park could be a showcase for creative ways of preserving a historic district while aiming for a zero-carbon future.</p> <p>At the very least, no resident or owner should be prevented from installing solar panels or external wall insulation just because the property is in a Conservation Area. Climate change is not something that only happens on the other side of Egremont Gate.</p>	Council has a Planning Advice Note on Householder guidance on energy efficiency for historic buildings in conservation areas. The document aims to clarify how energy efficiency improvements can be made in a sensitive and effective way.
31	When graffiti and anti-social behavior occurs within Queen's Park itself, it gives an idea as to what the area could result in if the aesthetics are not properly controlled. I live on Queen's Park road (close to the park itself), and wish to see it maintain the character and charm it has as the rest of Brighton develops into a more modern city. Maintaining the historic character is advantageous for residents, renters, and tourists.	Noted
32	So much of Brighton and Hove character is being lost. We cannot afford to lose any more. If people want to live in a modern property, they should buy a modern property, not ruin a heritage one.	Noted
33	Queen's Park itself is in poor condition for a key community asset and within a conservation area. Consideration should be given to 'minimum standards' to be upheld for prevention of drug use in the park etc. I do not agree that new windows should be timber, however would endorse a change to UPVC	UPVC is a non-renewable resource and current technology cannot match the fine detailing of historic timber windows, especially Queen Anne style multi-

	<p>sash effect windows - giving the correct look and feel but without the maintenance issues. Finally, the main issue with the area is the high level of HMO's. These need to be phased out, as well as having minimum standards of external appearance. 216 Queen's Park Road (externally) is a disgrace.</p>	<p>paned windows which are common throughout the Queen's Park conservation area.</p> <p>HMO's within the city have been addressed in the recently adopted Citywide Article 4 Direction for HMOs. The citywide HMO Article 4 Direction will come into effect on 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2020.</p> <p>216 Queen's Park Road is not within the Queen's Park conservation area.</p>
34	<p>I agree that the conservation area in this part of the city should be preserved and maintained for the benefit of local residents. Tighter controls are required. I disagree that satellite dishes should be on the front of building as they are unsightly. They should be high up on the roof.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
35	<p>I think that while removing wooden sash windows is undesirable for appearances sake we have to be realistic. Sash windows in uPVC look pretty much the same unless you look very closely and are a practical and reasonably cost effective alternative</p>	<p>UPVC is a non-renewable resource and current technology cannot match the fine detailing of historic timber windows, especially Queen Anne style multi-paned windows which are common throughout the Queen's Park conservation area.</p>
36	<p>Any improvements/alterations which are more sympathetic to the original build materials should be encouraged e.g. the replacement of concrete roof tiles back to the original roof tiles</p>	<p>Noted</p>
37	<p>So much of Brighton's architectural heritage has been lost / mismanaged. This needs to stop before this part of Brighton is lost forever. It should be managed sympathetically not a fine revenue generating scheme for the benefit of the council. Features should be replaced / put back not just accept a fine as settlement if the desecration.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
38	<p>Queen's Park is a distinct residential district from neighbouring Hanover, Kemp Town, etc. It's a worthy ambition to retain this distinctness/uniqueness which adds to the vibrancy of the city as a whole. The urban environment and its aesthetic is worth maintaining: it aids wellbeing and has other benefits. I am particularly keen that front gardens are not paved over: these green oases provide much needed havens for wildlife and are seemingly disappearing.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
39	<p>You have already restricted what I can do with my property while all around the boundary houses have</p>	<p>The boundaries of the conservation area were</p>

	<p>loft conversion with large dorms. If you own a home in the conservation area you cannot have but it ok for us to see everyone else's, so all the restrictions but non of the benefits.</p> <p>A small part of a St Lukes in a conservation area while the rest is not, how does that work? Is the other half some how invisible.</p> <p>I have noticed that a the larger expensive house around the park seem to do what they want to the properties and now most of them have done is it time to put in restrictions.</p> <p>Then there is the cost of having repairs which are already expensive made even more expensive where is all this money going to come from? And the additional cost for planning applications will we get them for free?</p> <p>Is the council going to provide residents with grant to help pay the additional cost as you say the whole of Brighton will benefit from these restriction to our properties.</p> <p>You also want to stop satellite dishes so another restriction I'm going to be restricted on what I can watch as well.</p> <p>I just find the whole thing a waste of time and an extra burned to home ownership in the area. Where the residents in the area pay the cost for everyone else's benefit.</p> <p>NO!</p>	<p>reviewed as part of the process of creating the Queen's Park Conservation Area Character Statement in 2018.This document can be found on Council's website.</p> <p>The proposed Article 4 Direction will apply to all dwellinghouses within the boundary of the Queen's Park conservation area.</p>
40	<p>Because the distinctive architecture of the large houses around the park, the painted wood, red brick, tiled roofs, garden walls, garden walls,railings, stained glass, give the Conservation Area its character and charm. These elements are repeated in some surrounding streets, especially Queens Park Terrace, and the streets around St Luke's School, and are just as important</p> <p>There are enough exceptions- the tall houses in Queens Park Road, St Luke's School, the swimming pool, the Pepper Pot, the Gazebo and remaining walls and railings of Attree Villa, the Spa Nursery, Queens Park Villa, the park itself and the arches, to ensure that the conservation area is distinctive in its "bowl" setting.</p> <p>In order to maintain this character and charm it is also important to ensure the survival and where necessary replacement of street lights, railings and other incidental elements.</p>	Noted
41	I live in a 1970's terrace. These houses are pretty ugly	The boundaries of the

	<p>from the front compared to the surrounding area. I don't see why our houses or the flats in Atree Court etc should be subject to the article 4 direction as there is nothing of value to protect. All this will do is make our flats and houses look increasingly more dated and ugly as time goes by or inflict very high costs on the owners to require planning permission to make small changes.</p> <p>I agree with preserving the pepperpot, the park, the park gates etc - but the houses are all so different and interesting already - which is part of the character - why would we want to hold a load of 60s-70s builds in the past?</p> <p>I think the article 4 direction should be specifically clear as to which houses are covered and which are not.</p> <p>In particular, the changes made to the 70's houses towards the park end of Tower Road has made this street more interesting and more beautiful to look at. I fear that putting an article 4 direction on all the houses on this street will stop us and our neighbours from being able to make similar improvements to the area. Our houses will become the 'run-down' looking end of the street.</p>	<p>conservation area were reviewed as part of the process of creating the Queen's Park Conservation Area Character Statement in 2018.</p> <p>The proposed Article 4 Direction will apply to all dwellinghouses within the boundary of the Queen's Park conservation area. A map will accompany the Article 4 Direction.</p>
42	<p>Many of the properties around Queens Park and in the local area have been changed in the twenty years that we have been living in our house. This proposal is closing the stable door after the horse has bolted. If there is a desire to return the area to its previous appearance this proposal should be retrospective. This proposal will increase the cost of maintenance and improvement of the housing stock in the area. Money would be better spent on improving the lighting in the Park to make the area feel safer in the hours of darkness. This would also reduce the number of drug deals which appear to go on and are obvious to those of us who live around the Park.</p> <p>The children's play area in Queen's Park is in desperate need of new and safer equipment and some basic maintenance.</p>	Noted
43	<p>I think that all original features should be kept. Taking away the front walls to make parking spaces would be detrimental to the appearance of this area.</p>	Noted
44	<p>The removal of original features or replacing them with a modern alternative esp upvc windows removes the character, street continuity, and diminishes that which makes QP different to other areas of Brighton it all becomes homogenised. There are so many special architectural features and details to buildings which is so lovely to see and appreciate and should be preserved for future generations to appreciate and</p>	Noted

	enjoy	
45	I think that so many alteration have already taken place that this is potentially too late. However, the points that I have ticked above I do feel would help maintain the future of the area. I do feel we need to be realistic that we live in modern times and need to look at more efficient ways of creating energy etc hence why I feel that solar panels should not be included.	The installation, alteration or replacement of solar panels will not be controlled by the proposed Article 4 Direction due to lack of support from the consultation.
46	<p>1. I live on St Luke's Road and only part of the road is in a conservation area and therefore the fact that a few houses are included has always been wrong. I have no idea why my property is in a conservation area, given it's distance from the Park or indeed why other properties on the same street are not and equally why properties the same distance from my house on Queen's Park Road, are not in the same conservation area. If this is due to the school then all the properties opposite the school should be in a conservation area but of course they are not. This demonstrates real irrational and arbitrary decision making at some point by the Council. I would argue that St Luke's Road needs to drop out of the Conservation area.</p> <p>2. In the main people are sensible and sensitive in terms of making changes to their properties and therefore there is no reason now, in particular, on St Luke's Road ( or the area in general ) to bring in an Article 4.</p> <p>3. There is no reason given that St Luke's Road is far away from the Park for part of the Road to be in a conservation area and definitely no reason for an Article 4 to be imposed.</p> <p>4. Families live on St Luke's Road and you are simply making it impossible to live in this area for the every day working family, yet whilst round Queen's Park (properties that should actually be in the conservation area and remain so), can merrily do what they want, knock walls down, build big loft extensions, re-pave to make space for cars - it's a total injustice and irrational decision making by the Council/Planning Dept. Money (and a big house) seems to buy you power in Brighton . I have flagged this to the council for one particular property and was told that although their planning permission was rejected (they made the change anyway) but it was permitted i.e. to knock front wall down and to pave over front of house to make a drive.</p> <p>5. Preventing houses from having a satellite is essentially anti-competitive practice on the basis that only alternative is to have cable i.e. virgin so you are</p>	<p>The boundaries of the conservation area were reviewed as part of the process of creating the Queen's Park Conservation Area Character Statement in 2018.</p> <p>The proposed Article 4 Direction will only apply to elevations facing a street or road, not to the rear of a dwellinghouse (unless it faces a street or road).</p>

	<p>forcing properties to have to enter into contracts with a specific service provider - this cannot be right and I would challenge any decision on this with the completion commission.</p> <p>6. You need to understand that these houses need maintenance and many suffer from damp and therefore preventing owners from fixing issues with their properties or only being able to do so at a much greater cost (unless you are proposing to offer grants to residents covered by Article 4?) whether it's windows (double glazing reduces heat loss), rendering repairs damaged brick work and seals the property to prevent damp, boundary walls etc. is completely unreasonable given that you are considering this only now i.e. had you done this say 20 years ago then maybe but not now it's utterly pointless. Brighton is a bloody mess and trying to put lipstick on a pig is pointless. i.e. you have two wheelie bins outside every house on most streets clogging up the pavements, rubbish that is left uncollected and all over the street, broken pavements, potholes in roads and you think that an Article 4 is going to somehow preserve Brighton?!</p>	
47	because the area is being ruined by ad hoc & nasty alterations. the worst is garish house colours. Too much change being made to the fronts & i think everything that impacts on the view from the front should be subject to regulations	Noted
48	It is important to keep the character/conservation of the area	Noted
49	I believe it is important to preserve the integrity of our architecture - too much of our local heritage/architecture has already been destroyed in the Kemp Town/Queens Park area	Noted
4	<p>As an owner occupier of a house in Queens Park, I am very aware of the character of the area. However, there needs to be a balance between planning restrictions and allowing owners to carry out works to their property. Controlling the colour of street elevations comes down to a subjective decision, and who, therefore is to say what is right and what is wrong. Is there any evidence of the original colour houses in a Victorian/Edwardian terrace were painted? Did the original designers have any objection to houses being painted different colours? I am not suggesting that all streets should look like Blaker Street, and there is no real evidence of this having happened in any other streets, so I feel that this is a restriction too far. There is such a mix of roof coverings already, that further restriction would not make any real difference, there would still be a mix and no real uniformity so I feel that this is too restrictive. Rooflights on the front slope - to</p>	<p>A suitable colour scheme will accompany the Article 4 Direction providing a number of colour options for the painting of front elevations. This will be similar to other Article 4 Direction painting schemes covering conservation areas in the city.</p> <p>The installation, alteration or replacement of solar panels will not be controlled by the proposed Article 4 Direction due to lack of support from the consultation.</p> <p>Council has a Planning</p>

	<p>impose a restriction on this would be to prevent owners carrying out internal alterations/conversions in the roofspace which simply require a rooflight rather than a full blown dormer. This is often done to provide additional space within a property for families which are growing and may not be able to afford to move to a larger property. A simple conversion in the roofspace can often be the solution and to add even more planning restrictions to this would seem punitive. A simple flat unobtrusive rooflight is not harmful and in fact could be considered part of the organic growth of our City as families need to expand. This has been carried out in a number of properties along terraces in the area, and therefore any further rooflights in other houses would not be an issue - it might actually make the roof slopes more uniform! To restrict the installation and/or replacement of PV panels would be contrary to the Council's desire to reduce carbon emissions from homes, as this is one reasonably simple way of achieving savings when faced with an old house which does not lend itself to other less cost-effective means of reducing carbon emissions such as very expensive double-glazed timber sashes - as cheaper UPVC alternatives would not be allowed (which I agree with). I do not see the issue with replacing or providing a hard surface within the curtilage of a house - particularly the replacement. If this is required as it is in a poor state of repair, by restricting the replacement, it may be that owners just leave these untouched and therefore impact on the area by being in a poor state of repair. Please note that in the PDF issued with this consultation you mention "The erection, construction, maintenance, improvement or alteration of a gate, fence, wall or other means of enclosure". Surely restrictions shouldn't be placed on the maintenance of a gate, wall or fence? this is not reflected in the questions above, so there is an anomaly between the consultation document, and the list of elements above. I do support the principle of restrictions in Conservation Areas in order to protect their character, but there needs to be a balance between the need to look after, maintain and perhaps improve your property and restrictions which make this an impossibility and costly for owners.</p>	<p>Advice Note on Householder guidance on energy efficiency for historic buildings in conservation areas. The document aims to clarify how energy efficiency improvements can be made in a sensitive and effective way.</p> <p>UPVC is a non-renewable resource and current technology cannot match the fine detailing of historic timber windows, especially Queen Anne style multi-paned windows which are common throughout the Queen's Park conservation area.</p>
51	<p>This is very much a case of shutting the stable door. Many of the properties have already had at least one of the list above developments done on their properties. Most hard standing was put in following the council's decision to impose parking controls in the area. If I want to change the wooden fence at the front of the property who is going to decide what is acceptable? Replacement of windows and doors can be very expensive so who is going to decide what is</p>	Noted

	acceptable. The same arguments apply to most of these proposals. It seems like a bureaucratic hurdle is being erected to prevent householders from making relatively minor changes to their properties.	
--	---	--

