

Hove Civic and Regency Societies Joint Planning Forum

Notes of the meeting held at 7:30pm on Tuesday 12th December 2017 at 12 Abbotts,
129 Kings Road, Brighton BN1 2FA

Present

Hove Civic Society: Helmut Lusser

Regency Society: Richard Carroll, Roger Hinton (chair), Richard Robinson,
Kevin Wilsher

1. Matters arising from the previous meeting

There were no matters arising.

2. Consideration of significant planning applications:

2.1 BH2017/03563 Annunciation Church 89 Washington Street Brighton BN2 9SR

Conversion of existing vicarage into 1no two bedroom flat (C3) at lower ground floor level and three storey dwelling (C3) Revised fenestration to rear elevation, boundary wall alterations including re-instatement of pedestrian entrance and widening of existing vehicle crossover. Landscaping works to rear garden including removal of garage to facilitate 4no parking spaces with associated works.

Concern was expressed about the loss of the garden and the creation of 4 parking spaces; it was suggested that the central zone parking standard should be applied in this location which would result in just one parking space. **Helmut Lusser** will draft a letter of objection from Hove Civic Society and send a copy to the Regency Society for possible use as a basis for an objection.

2.2 BH2017/03565 11 - 13 Ship Street Brighton BN1 1AD

Change of use of first, second and third floors from offices (B1) to 6no self contained flats (C3), partial roof extension to extend fourth storey, erection of a four storey rear extension, providing new office space (B1) at ground floor. Erection of office block (B1) at the rear of the site.

It was noted that the buildings on either side of the site are listed. However, the feeling was that the proposed scheme will not affect them adversely, nor will it damage the character of the conservation area. No action will be taken.

2.3 BH2017/03651 Brighton Square And Units 12, 13, 14, 15 And 16 Brighton Square Brighton BN1 1HD

Erection of pavilion structure to Brighton Square for the creation of additional restaurant space (A 3). Alterations to dolphin fountain including new plinth & increased height of fountain. Installation of new shopfronts to 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16 Brighton Square.

No concerns were expressed about the proposed development of the existing building on the north side of the square.

Regarding the plan for the square itself it was noted that Brighton Square is private land; so, while it is an open space it is not a *public* open space.

There was a lengthy discussion of the proposed “pavilion structure”, from which two conflicting views emerged, with fairly equal support for each.

One view was that the scheme should be welcomed on the grounds that Brighton Square is now a bleak, dated and underused area in which businesses struggle to succeed, as evidenced by the rapid changes of ownership. This view is apparently supported by the large number of letters of support from neighbouring businesses.

The second view is that the scheme would represent the undesirable loss of one of the few open spaces in the Old Tow; it would undermine the design of the square which received a Civic Trust award when originally built and would diminish the impact of the much-loved dolphin statue.

It was agreed that neither society would comment.

- 2.4 BH2017/03293 Garages Rear Of 187 Kingsway Hove BN3 4GL
Demolition of existing garages and erection of 2no 2 storey plus basement residential dwellings.

There had been at least two earlier attempts to design a suitable development for this site. Although it is bordered by tall properties, the planning authority is likely to reject anything above two storeys because of the existence of nearby windows.

It was generally felt that the design proposed was a reasonable attempt to make use of the site and neither society will object.

- 2.5 BH2017/03566 Brighton Hove And Sussex Sixth Form College 205 Dyke Road Hove BN3 6EG

Erection of a 4no storey teaching block replacing existing temporary modular classrooms and incorporating general teaching spaces, flexible student study, learning areas, resource areas and performance spaces with associated hard and soft landscaping and relocated car parking.

This new building will front onto the old Shoreham Road and will be of a similar design to the recently completed new building on the opposite side of the site, fronting Dyke Road.

Neither society has any objection. Hoe Civic Society may suggest the planting of trees between the buildings and the road, funded by a S.106 contribution.

- 2.6 BH2017/03843 29-42 Windsor Street Brighton Brighton BN1 1RJ BN1 1RJ

Demolition of 2no existing dwellings and erection of a 5 storey building comprising of 2no two bedroom flats and 6no one bedroom flats (C3). 7 - 8 Windsor Street Brighton BN1 1RJ

There was much criticism of this scheme. Members felt that while the proposed building is an interesting design in itself, it is quite inappropriate in the context of neighbouring properties. It would be significantly higher than its neighbours and the red brick would be out of place in a street where most of the buildings are traditionally designed terraced houses with rendered facades.

It was agreed that **Roger Hinton** would submit an objection on behalf of the Regency Society, including comments received in writing from David Robson.

2.7 BH2017/03840 Land At Varndean College Surrenden Road Brighton BN1 6WQ

Outline application with some matters reserved for erection of 10no residential units (C3), comprising 1no two bedroom, 6no three bedroom and 3no four bedroom houses, with new access from Surrenden Road, associated car and cycle parking and approval of reserved matters for access and layout.

There was support for the principal of residential development on this area of “rough ground” at the northern edge of the Varndean College site.

However, it was agreed that the density of the development was far too low and would represent a missed opportunity to contribute to the city’s need for new homes.

Both societies will object. The Regency Society will submit an objection which Hove Civic Society may then use as a basis for its comment.

3. Peacock Industrial Estate

There was general support for the outline plans for the development of this back-land site. The proposed barrier wall between the housing and the railway was welcomed.

Disappointment was expressed that there was no possibility of an entrance to the site from the north-east corner because of land ownership; it was agreed to suggest consideration of a compulsory purchase order to overcome this problem.

Richard Robinson will draft a letter of the support to the developer from the Regency Society, which Hove Civic Society can also use as a basis for their response.

4. Toads Hole Valley

It was noted that St Congar, working with the land-owners, has produced an outline master plan for the site, but that land will be parcelled for sale to other developers.

It was agreed that the proposed traffic access arrangements were unacceptable because of the multiple new junctions which would be required in King George VIth Avenue.

It was also agreed that the proposed housing density was probably too low, while the level of parking provision was too high. A higher density scheme with less parking would enable a more frequent bus service to be provided.

It was suggested that a joint response to St Congar should be drafted by Richard Robinson and Bob Ryder proposing an increased housing density, revised traffic plans and the need for a good bus service.

5. 239-243 Kingsway

The proposed development was noted and it was agreed that no comment would be made until the full planning application was available.

6. Arrangements for meeting with Liz Hobden (10am Monday 18th December)

The arrangements were noted and it was agreed that those attending would convene in the lobby of Hove Town Hall at 9:50 am.

7. Any other business

7.1 Richard Carroll reported on the “Design Charrette” organised by design Southeast, which he had recently attended. The title of the event was “Building at density: what does good look like?” The following points were noted:

A remarkably flexible digital modelling system called “City Model” was demonstrated and it was noted that work was underway to apply it to Brighton and Hove under the name “Vu City”.

There was a lot of discussion of the use of medium rise development (7-12 floors) as a basis for meeting housing needs.

Richard Wilson from Camden spoke about the borough’s policy of no-car developments. He emphasised the efforts to enable collaborative working between all parties involved in a development; this could involve several years for a large scheme but could result in a “win-win” outcome.

Discussion of this idea resulted in the conclusion that the city of Brighton and Hove has no “ambition”.

8. Date for next meeting: 7:30pm Tuesday 9th January 2017

RH 13/12/17