

## 20 April 2016 Planning Committee – Additional Representations

Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
13	St Aubyns School, 76 High Street, Rottingdean	BH2015/03108	<p><b>Two (2)</b> representations have been received from <b>74 Saltdean Drive and Pax, The Green</b> <u>objecting</u> to the application on the following grounds;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development not in accordance with national or local policy or the planning brief,</li> <li>• Misleading and inaccurate transport assessment, contradicted by recent highway authority traffic counts,</li> <li>• Air quality impacts,</li> <li>• Traffic impacts including construction traffic,</li> <li>• Development on part of playing field,</li> <li>• Care home. Including it being unneeded, the size, depth, width, height and massing having an adverse impact on the amenities of neighbours and result in overlooking, loss of privacy and a visually overbearing impact,</li> <li>• Inaccuracies of and methodologies used in transport and air quality assessments,</li> <li>• Demolition of Listed Building,</li> <li>• Harm to Listed Building,</li> <li>• Not a sustainable development,</li> <li>• Lack of affordable housing provision,</li> <li>• Supposed benefits do not outweigh the many adverse impacts of the development,</li> <li>• EIA screening opinion based on different development,</li> <li>• Lack of local infrastructure,</li> <li>• Impact on Conservation Area and its setting, and</li> <li>• Viability issues, including reports not being public for scrutiny.</li> </ul> <p>Query from <b>unknown address</b> whether any S106 contributions would include mitigations for increased air pollution. Would not want to see any air quality mitigation balanced off with cycle paths/bike vouchers/cycle standard etc.</p> <p><b>SAFE Rottingdean:</b> There is an error in para 5.13 of the report. The corrected</p>

			<p>version reads 'SAFE contend that the scheme is viable without building on the playing field.'</p> <p><b>Saltdean and Rottingdean Medical Practice:</b> <u>Object</u> on the grounds that the proposal would cause considerable impact on the local medical facilities given that the proposed care home would house 62 elderly and infirm patients with a focus on dementia. Are the only GPs in the village and unless there is a private provision of medical care it is assumed that practice will be expected to take on the entire population of the proposed care home as patients at the practice. Have considerable difficulties managing current workload with existing practice list and there are no additional doctors willing to joining practices as a partner to reduce workload.</p> <p><b>Officer response:</b> Whilst a screening opinion was issued relating to a slightly different development it is not considered that the development set out in the application would be an EIA development.</p> <p>The objection raised by the local GP practice are noted however it is not considered that the application could be refused on this basis.</p> <p>The other representations received raise no new material considerations which are not already addressed in the committee report.</p> <p><b>County Archaeologist:</b> <u>Comment</u> 8/4/2016 following receipt of further information/ minor amendments. Comments remain as those of 9/10/2015 regarding the original submission.</p> <p><b>Flood Risk Management Officer:</b> <u>Comment</u> 15/04/2016 following receipt of further information/ minor amendments. Comments remain the same.</p>
159	Mile Oak Inn, Mile Oak Road, Portslade	BH2015/04564	<p><b>Twenty Three (23)</b> letters of <u>support</u> have been received, from <b>363, 365A, 398 Mile Oak Road; 3 Tophill Close; 34 Beechers Road (x4); 4 Nursery Close; 4 Delfryn, Southern Close (x2); 35 Stanley Avenue; 69 Graham Avenue; 5 Westway Close; 21 Millcroft; 9 Dean Gardens; 44 Drove Crescent; 5 Gladstone Road; 11 Sherbourne Close; 25 Heathfield Crescent; and Unknown (x4).</b></p>

			<p>A petition with <b>162 signatories</b> has been submitted in <u>support</u> of the proposal.</p> <p><b>Councillor Atkinson</b> has <u>objected</u> on the grounds of impact on traffic and local environment, and has requested members undertake a site visit prior to determination. Copy attached.</p> <p>The applicants have submitted a Statement of Community Involvement, including surveys, setting out how they have sought the views of the community on their convenience shopping needs and responses to the proposals.</p> <p><b>Officer response:</b> The above information does not alter the officer recommendation.</p>																																
179	14 Portland Villas, Hove	BH2015/04574	The application has been <b>deferred</b> from this meeting to enable the applicants to submit amendments to the scheme and for re-consultation to be undertaken.																																
191	8 Roedean Terrace	BH2015/04646	<p>Three amended plans have been received to accurately reflect the existing elevations and proposed development. Condition 2 has therefore been updated as follows:</p> <p>2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings listed below. <b>Reason:</b> For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.</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 plan</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>23.12.2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Block Plan</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>08.04.2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Existing ground floor plan</td> <td>001</td> <td>-</td> <td>23.12.2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed ground floor plan</td> <td>101</td> <td>A</td> <td>23.12.2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Existing first floor plan and second floor plan &amp; section</td> <td>002</td> <td>A</td> <td>08.04.2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed first floor plan, second floor plan and section</td> <td>102</td> <td>D</td> <td>10.03.2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Existing and proposed front elevations</td> <td>003</td> <td>E</td> <td>08.04.2016</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received	Location plan	-	-	23.12.2015	Block Plan	-	-	08.04.2016	Existing ground floor plan	001	-	23.12.2015	Proposed ground floor plan	101	A	23.12.2015	Existing first floor plan and second floor plan & section	002	A	08.04.2016	Proposed first floor plan, second floor plan and section	102	D	10.03.2016	Existing and proposed front elevations	003	E	08.04.2016
Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received																																
Location plan	-	-	23.12.2015																																
Block Plan	-	-	08.04.2016																																
Existing ground floor plan	001	-	23.12.2015																																
Proposed ground floor plan	101	A	23.12.2015																																
Existing first floor plan and second floor plan & section	002	A	08.04.2016																																
Proposed first floor plan, second floor plan and section	102	D	10.03.2016																																
Existing and proposed front elevations	003	E	08.04.2016																																

			Proposed garage plan and elevations	103	D	10.03.2016
			Existing garage plan and elevations	004	-	23.12.2015
			Existing and proposed section A-A	005	B	10.03.2016
			<p><b>Officer response:</b> The above information does not alter the officer recommendation.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.6 of the Committee Report should read as follows 'The proposed extension features a pitched roof when viewed from the street scene with an area of flat roof set behind.'</p> <p>Further representations have been received from <b>1, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 (x2) Roedean Terrace</b> <u>objecting</u> to the application on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development will set a precedent</li> <li>• At present the cottages are visually the same</li> <li>• Concern over multiple occupancy of the property</li> <li>• Lack of parking</li> <li>• Concern over access to Roedean Terrace</li> <li>• Proposed development out of scale and character with the terrace</li> <li>• Concern of the garage forming a separate residential unit</li> <li>• Increased noise disturbance</li> </ul> <p><b>Officer response:</b> The above information does not alter the officer recommendation.</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).