

28<sup>th</sup> January 2015 Planning Committee – Additional Representations

Page	Site Address	Application No.	Comment
21	Land South of Ovingdean Road Brighton	BH2014/02589	<p>A further 4 letters of representation has been received from the <b>Deans Preservation Group</b> <u>objecting</u> to the proposal on the following grounds;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8 public views will be severely affected by the proposed development,</li> <li>• site is at the centre of the Happy Valley landscape, contributes to the landscape setting of Happy Valley and is an integral part,</li> <li>• site is a major part of the narrow neck of land separating the two parts of the National Park,</li> <li>• the Group is not convinced that the issue regarding surface water flooding have been dealt with satisfactorily,</li> <li>• A Landscape report has been commissioned by the Group as part of their objection that the landscape is too valuable to build on,</li> <li>• The land is of clear value to the South Downs National Park. It was originally included in the Perspective South Downs National Park but was excluded in the final enquiry. Believe the decision to exclude it was mistaken and therefore unsound. Had the site been included in the South Downs National Park as it should have been, the case for developing the land would not have been substantially weaker.</li> </ul>
			<p>A further representation from <b>3 Wanderdown Way</b> has been received, <u>objecting</u> as feel that this particular proposal is totally in the wrong location. All surrounding main roads and junctions cannot cope with the existing volume of traffic; therefore additional cars will make the situation far worse for everybody. The loss of the field will be the beginning of the end of the beautiful area of the City, and with the next applications that will surely follow, if this application is granted, then Woodingdean, Ovingdean, Rottlingdean and Saltdean will lose their individual identity and become one large urban sprawl. This is not why the existing residents moved here and they do not want this kind of major change. There are numerous other reasons why the development should not go ahead including the existing infrastructure not being able to cope.</p>
			<p>A further representation has been received from <b>74 Saltdean Drive</b>, <u>objecting</u> to the application as the traffic report submitted omits several very serious, evidence based</p>

131	361-367 Old Shoreham Road, Hove	BH2014/03426	<p>objections. The provision of 85 homes as the proposals residual cumulative impacts are severe. As per the NPPF the application should be refused on transport grounds. Also object that 'no mitigation' has been proposed although the development has substantial material impact.</p> <p><b>Officer response:</b> There are no new issues raised by the additional representations which are all covered in the Committee report.</p> <p>An amended plan has been received which show proposed elevations for a plant room to the rear of the proposed car wash building.</p> <p><b>Officer response:</b> The plant room is indicated on the proposed block plan submitted with the application and would be located adjacent the southern boundary of the site. The proposed plant room does not raise any new material planning considerations.</p>
157	70 and site of Chrome Productions Limited, Goldstone Lane, Hove	BH2014/03605	<p>Following re-consultation 4 further responses have been received from <b>East Sussex County Council Ecologist; ESCC Archaeologist; Sussex Police and Environment Agency.</b> <u>No further comments to make in addition to those reported previously.</u></p> <p><b>Officer response:</b> Re-iteration of previous comments made. No further considerations required.</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).