

3rd November 2010 Planning Committee – Additional Representations

Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
9	Mitre House, 149 Western Road, Brighton	BH2010/01966	A letter has been received from 22 Hampton Place <u>objecting</u> to the application for the reasons outlined in section 5 of the report.
45	25 Hazeldene Meads	BH2010/01610	Error in the Plans List. The description in the schedule of applications at the front of the Plans List incorrectly refers to 9 solar panels. The scheme proposes 7. The description should be: Roof extension to South end over existing garage, 2 front dormers, extended front porch and installation of 7 solar panels.
53	13-14 George Street, Hove	BH2010/02009	The applicant has provided additional information on the installation costs of the attenuators and revised fan positions and the resulting reductions in noise levels. The additional information states:- <i>“The attenuators have been designed to achieve around 10 dB(A) and a noise level of approximately 38 dB(A) at the nearest noise sensitive dwellings. The measured background level in the nearest gardens is around 45dB(A), therefore with the attenuators installed the resulting noise will be more than 5dB below background (noise) level.”</i> On this basis the attenuators would comply with the Council requirement that noise from plant and machinery does not exceed a level 5dB below existing background noise level and this is also required by condition 4 of the recommendation. The additional information also states:- <i>“The cost of the attenuators is £2,500 which the applicants are willing to install to overcome the concerns from the nearest neighbour regarding noise. The proposed attenuators would achieve what has been required by the Environmental Health Officer. Without the attenuators the noise levels from the existing equipment would simply return to the current noise levels that are causing objections. Given the background information supplied with the application and the recommended conditions query the usefulness of a temporary permission. Such is a condition is unnecessary and unreasonable and would therefore fail the test.....for imposing conditions set out in Circular 11/95.”</i>
74	162 Carden Hill	BH2010/02489	4 letters of <u>support</u> have been received from the Occupiers of No. 11, 15, 19, 27 Chelwood Close.

78	24 St. James's Street	BH2010/02677	<p>No additional officer comment.</p> <p>A letter of <u>support</u> has been received from Councillor Brian Pidgeon on the grounds that there would be no change to the character and appearance of the surrounding street scene, and there are many full width dormers in the area. A site visit has been requested.</p> <p>A letter has been received from an occupier of no. 23 Longhill Road (the owner of Flat 3 Dorset House) objecting to the proposed development on the grounds that the building is too high.</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).