

## **Hove Civic and Regency Societies Joint Planning Forum**

Notes of the meeting held at 7:30pm on Tuesday 12<sup>th</sup> June 2018 at 12 Abbots, 129 Kings Road, Brighton BN1 2FA

Present:

Hove Civic Society: Helmut Lusser

Regency Society: Richard Carrol, Kate Jordan, Roger Hinton (chair), Kate Ormond, Richard Robinson

1. Matters arising from the previous meeting on 8th May 2018
  - 1.1 Middle Street Synagogue: it was noted that negotiations are underway regarding the conversion of the building for a non-religious use, but with the preservation of its heritage and religious features, both internal and external.
2. Consideration of significant planning applications:
  - 2.1 BH2018/01016 Former Site Of North District Housing Office Selsfield Drive Brighton BN2 4HA

Erection of a 7 Storey over lower ground floor building, comprising of 30no residential dwellings (C3) with associated hard and soft landscaping, works to provide public realm, private and community amenity space, car parking and relocation of existing UK Power Networks Networks electricity sub-station.

It was agreed that while the Regency Society welcomes the Council's project to develop housing on surplus land within its ownership, the is scheme should be opposed. The main reason was that it would be entirely out of keeping with the "garden suburb" character of the nearby Moulsecoomb estate, which deserves to be protected, The proposed design of the building in itself is reasonably good bit it is too high in relation to neighbouring buildings.

KJ will draft an objection for submission to the Council by the Regency Society.

- 2.2 BH2018/01410 59 Dyke Road Avenue Hove BN3 6QD

Erection of first floor side extension and lower ground floor rear extension, new front entrance, extension to roof with new dormers to front, alterations to fenestration, removal of trees, landscaping works, increase to on-site parking and associated alterations.

The application lacks clarity on some details of the proposed changes. Generally, it was felt that the scheme was "unexciting", but would represent an improvement to the existing building. No comment will be made.
- 2.3 BH2018/01147 85 St James's Street Brighton BN2 1TP

Removal of existing roof and additional of new third floor inside a mansard roof.

The main change proposed was the addition of a third floor at roof level. This would be largely invisible from street level. No comment will be made.
- 2.4 BH2018/01336 Land At Rear Of 1-45 Wanderdown Road Brighton

Erection of 4no residential dwellings comprising of 3no four bedroom dwellings and 1no three bedroom dwelling incorporating parking, landscaping and associated works.

Hove Civic Society takes the view that the site should be developed at a much higher density, ideally after acquiring the neighbouring site to the east. Urban fringe sites of this kind need a high level of density if the City Plan's housing figures are to be met.

The Regency Society felt that an effort should be made to understand why a density higher than four homes was not being proposed. RC will investigate the City Plan figure for the site.

Neither society will comment on this application but it should be kept in mind when commenting on Part 2 of the City Plan.

- 2.5 BH2018/01289 Spindrift Cottage 3 Roedean Way Brighton BN2 5RJ  
Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 4no bedroom two storey house incorporating garage and associated works.

This application was not considered since it had already been approved.

- 2.6 BH2018/01444 46 Tongdean Avenue Hove BN3 6TN

Erection of 6m flagpole in front garden.

There was a suggestion that the application should indicate the nature of the flags to be flown. It was agreed to make no comment.

- 2.7 BH2018/01456 11 - 13 Ship Street Brighton BN1 1AD

Change of use of first, second and third floors from offices (B1) to 3no two bedroom and 1no 3 bedroom flats (C3). Erection of office block (B1) at rear of the site with associated works.

Concern was expressed that inconsistency in the way that the elevational drawing had been produced makes it difficult to understand the proposed appearance of the street façade. There was also a feeling that the proposed office building in the carpark would represent over-development.

However, these concerns were not considered serious enough to merit an objection.

- 3 Update on applications considered

The update was noted.

4. London Road Student Living

LT had attended the public exhibition and introduced the discussion by suggesting that the proposed new building would probably continue the general improvements to the area that has resulted from other recent new developments.

However, concern was expressed about a general decline of London Road as a shopping street: many of the premises now operate as charity shops. An increase in student residences was not thought likely to remedy this decline.

No comment will be considered until a planning application has been made.

5. Royal Pavilion Gardens

There was considerable discussion of the proposal to enclose the gardens and secure them at night. It was recognised that the current management had given an undertaking that the area would continue to be freely accessible to the public during daylight hours. Even so, there was concern that the new railings and gates would significantly change for the worse the character of the area as a public space. There was some scepticism about the seriousness of the anti-social behaviour which is being quoted as a reason for night-time closure.

A decision on whether to provide a letter of support for the HLF grant bid will be made by the full committee at its next meeting.

6. Any other business

6.1 Brighton General Hospital: KO had attended the public consultation and outlined the main options for re-development of the site. NHS managers seem to prefer option 5 which would involve demolition of the ambulance station and construction of a tall building in its place to house the medical services currently being provided elsewhere on the site.

An alternative would involve a new, lower building with a larger footprint further back in the site. This would avoid the need for a tall building in such a prominent location, but would be less convenient for those using the NHS services.

It was pointed out that the NHS could sell the whole site and re-locate the existing services elsewhere.

It was decided not to comment on the public consultation.

7. Next meeting: Tuesday 10<sup>th</sup> July 2018