

## A recent history of Round Hill's planning concerns 2004-2005

|                    | <b>CONTENTS</b>  | Page |
|--------------------|--|------|
| <b>8 Oct 2004</b>  | Concern RE threat to our green space   | 2    |
| <b>13 Nov 2004</b> | Conservation Area Character Statement review and Open Space audit  | 3    |
| <b>18 Dec 2004</b> | Commenting on Carelet's proposal for 33 flats  | 4    |
| <b>15 Jan 2005</b> | Carelet 339 letters of comment. Further infill 56-58 Roundhill Crescent  | 6    |
| <b>9 Feb 2005</b>  | Importance of wildlife. <a href="http://citywildlife.org.uk">citywildlife.org.uk</a> . Sites of Nature Conservation Importance | 7    |
| <b>11 Feb 2005</b> | Roundhill Crescent proposal REFUSED. Carelet proposal recommended for REFUSAL, but to be heard on 23rd February                | 8    |
| <b>16 Feb 2005</b> | Carelet scheme (33 flats) to be decided on 23rd February. Presence at site visit and in public gallery.                        | 9    |
| <b>21 Feb 2005</b> | Demonstrate with placards outside Hove Town Hall   | 9    |
| <b>23 Feb 2005</b> | Carelet's 33 flats REFUSED. Plans for Hollingdean Depot loom   | 10   |
| <b>27 Feb 2005</b> | Parents against the proposed Dump at Hollingdean Depot   | 11   |
| <b>4 May 2005</b>  | Planned demonstration by the Dump The Dump campaign  | 12   |
| <b>7 May 2005</b>  | Carelet appeal against refusal announced   | 13   |
| <b>10 May 2005</b> | Dump the Dump demonstration planned  | 14   |
| <b>22 May 2005</b> | Comments to the Appeal Inspector on Carelet's 33 flat scheme. Policies.  | 14   |
| <b>9 Jun 2005</b>  | Meeting organised by The Dump The Dump campaign  | 16   |
| <b>14 Jun 2005</b> | Carelet's site clearance: / destruction of habitat   | 17   |
| <b>2 Aug 2005</b>  | Brighton's Open Market   | 18   |
| <b>4 Aug 2005</b>  | Carelet's 2nd Application before the result of their 1st appeal  | 19   |
| <b>25 Sep 2005</b> | Carelet's appeal on their 1st application DISMISSED  | 20   |
| <b>3 Oct 2005</b>  | tree felling on the NE border of Round Hill by Network Rail  | 21   |

More information on <http://www.roundhill.org.uk>

[https://roundhill.org.uk/main?sec=planning&p=Carelet\\_0000\\_index\\_to\\_applications](https://roundhill.org.uk/main?sec=planning&p=Carelet_0000_index_to_applications)

[https://roundhill.org.uk/main?sec=planning&p=Veolia\\_0000\\_index](https://roundhill.org.uk/main?sec=planning&p=Veolia_0000_index)

[https://roundhill.org.uk/main.php?sec=history&p=The\\_history\\_of\\_the\\_Open\\_Market](https://roundhill.org.uk/main.php?sec=history&p=The_history_of_the_Open_Market)

## 8th October 2004 - Concern RE threat to our green space



I've just joined the Round Hill Yahoo group so first an introduction.

My name is Ted. I used to teach English as a Foreign Language at the English Language Centre in Hove. I ended up as their Teaching Resources Manager running a Self-Access Centre for learners after their afternoon classes.

My career was terminated when I was knocked from my moped by a car (that sped through a STOP sign) when returning home from work in November 1996. English teaching has also taken me to Algeria (as a VSO), Sweden and Spain.

I've lived in Princes Road since 1977 and my current concern is the threat to the gardens and green areas of Round Hill from developers interested in claiming these strips and corridors for new high-density residential developments. I've uploaded a campaign website to <http://www.RoundHill.biz> and all Round Hill residents will receive a flyer through their letterboxes inviting them to give their views. I've met more of my neighbours, who share similar interests, through getting involved with this campaign. We hope that the flyer will turn a small, cosy group of concerned residents into an adequate number for the campaign to have a chance of success.

## 13th November 2004 - Conservation Area Character Statement review and Open Space audit

Dear Round Hill residents,

The Conservation Area Character Statement for Round Hill is accessible from the 'Links' section of this Yahoo Group.

Lesley Johnston, the Senior Planning Officer on Brighton and Hove Council's Conservation Team is currently inviting Round Hill residents to comment on this draft document. The closing date for comments is 19th November. They can be sent to Lesley Johnston, ENVIRONMENT, Planning Strategy & Projects Group, Brighton & Hove City Council, Hove Town Hall, Norton Road, Hove BN3 3BQ or emailed to Lesley.johnston@...

The final Conservation Area Character Statement for Round Hill will be used as the context for planning decisions so it is very important that flaws in the current draft are corrected so that the Council is really aware of the conservation features of our area and what we truly value. My own concern is the lack of protection given to green vistas on back-land. I have copied my comments below in case they are helpful for residents with similar concerns. I urge Round Hill residents to submit their comments before 19th November.

Kind regards,  
Ted Power

---

Dear Lesley Johnston,

### RE: Conservation Area Character Statement for Round Hill Brighton

Our comments are posted at <http://www.btinternet.com/~ted.power/rharch.htm>  
The comments of many Round Hill residents have fed into the above web page.

Thank you for consulting residents on the draft character statement for Round Hill.

Several residents in Round Hill are involved in a campaign to secure additional planning guidance that will give some protection to the private gardens and back-land vistas which go far beyond our streetscapes in the amenity-value that they provide.

Lovely though some of our streetscapes are, we are disappointed at what is omitted in the draft character statement. In the absence of any public open spaces such as parks, recreation grounds, allotments or woodland on Round Hill, these 'green ribbons' which accommodate nearly all our wildlife (they include an award-winning wildlife garden) and remind us of our history (former drying fields and nurseries) go a long way towards meeting our 'open space needs'.

Round Hill is a special case as there is a lack of public open space.

Your draft document observes that this conservation area is mainly used by its own residents, so the vistas across private gardens on our backland, though often invisible from the streets, are accessible to most of us. This must be remembered when an audit is performed on our open space needs. The Inspectorate in the report on the Second Draft Deposit said in his appraisal on Open Spaces that such an audit is a first priority for the Council.

Criteria such as accessibility, quality, value and quantity need to take account of the accessibility, quality and value of back land 'for the people who live here'.

Streetscapes are beautiful but they do not account for all we value in our conservation area.

Our back land (i.e. the green ribbons), however, is quoted as the reason why several residents moved here and decide to stay here. This green space is seen to contribute above all to our amenity, leisure pursuits, health and sense of well-being (much more than 'washing or parking the car').

We need a character statement that accurately weighs the conservation features that residents actually value. Only a handful of residents can tell you about the architectural detail and street furniture, though I am not arguing that this should not be conserved too.

Seen from afar, the view of Round Hill includes the green spaces between the streets, which soften its appearance. The back land north-east of Princes Rd, which is currently threatened by an intended high-density residential development, provides a green boundary to the conservation area, which nearly a hundred Round Hill households have told me they value many in written comments. This land is within the conservation area as your map boundaries clearly show, though the text of your draft document appears not to recognise this fact. It is part of a long green vista across private gardens screened from the Centenary Industrial Estate by trees and vegetation in the garden of 81 Princes Road. The neighbouring railway corridor and the previous uses of this land have made it a haven for wildlife - it has been the site of a previous wildlife survey.

I trust that Round Hill residents' actual values are written into the final Conservation Area Character Statement. Though backland is privately-owned it is more accessible to Round Hill residents as open space than streets which provide an obstacle course for pedestrians and motorists alike. Selective (often out-of-date) description of street-furniture as an apology for completely ignoring the back-land that we value, will result in planning decisions based on fantasy and anachronisms (such as "the Welsh slate roofs").

It is most important that our Conservation Area Character Statement provides a true context for planning decisions. A statement which accurately reflects residents' values would also be helpful to us when the long overdue audit of our "open space needs" is performed.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.  
Kind regards,  
Ted Power

## **18th December 2004 Commenting on Carelet's proposal for 33 flats**

Dear all,

I should first like to thank Veronika for her kind offer to collect response letters and to take your comments to Hove Town Hall to avoid possible loss or delay in the Christmas post.

The closing date for comments has now been extended to 4th January, 2005. I would encourage any Round Hill residents living near to housebound or elderly people, who may wish to make their voices heard, to give similar practical help.

I had an interesting phone call yesterday from an elderly person in Princes Road, who had not previously made herself known, who gave me some very useful legal information about "ancient lights" i.e. the right to light. In addition, this lady's experience working with the Red Cross and paramedics also enabled her to make some interesting observations about the difficulties of evacuating residents from a badly designed development in the event of a coronary attack.

There are many residents living in Round Hill, who are reluctant to share their wisdom, unless others make them feel comfortable and make it clear that their contributions are appreciated.

There is a lot of hidden talent in the Round Hill area and hopefully a web group like this will uncover some of it, though there are also residents who do not have Internet connections with databases of knowledge in their heads.

For those who are reading this and therefore can access web sites, [www.Roundhill.biz](http://www.Roundhill.biz) (our campaign site) now has a COMMENTS PAGE, where some good letters of comment have been posted. These include the letter sent to Development Control by the Secretary of The Round Hill Society and the letters of Round Hill residents with special interests in wildlife and green open space.

There is also a link from nearly every page on [www.Roundhill.biz](http://www.Roundhill.biz) to the ONLINE COMMENT PAGE of Brighton and Hove Council's web site. Note that the right to comment extends to every resident in Brighton and Hove. So please email the web address to your local friends with a covering note.

The character and appearance of Round Hill, exemplified by the view from the top of Bear Road near the Race Course, should be something that the city treasures as much as the Royal Pavilion and Palace Pier.



This largely unspoiled view of period architecture (in the shape of a theatre with green shading between the tiers) has lasted for approximately 100 years and extends over a much larger area than other city landmarks. If Carelet get their foot in the door, even with a scaled-down version of their current proposals, the drip effect will ensure that little by little they will be permitted to turn Round Hill into Rectangular Hill with high-rise blocks that are quite out of character with a conservation area.

If any residents have the time, stop off at Brighton or Hove Town Hall and ask to look at Carelet's Design Statement: it's a small brochure in A4 format, which attempts to trash Round Hill. Their

colour photos have been set up to show the plot they want to ruin framed together with high building totally outside the conservation area (e.g. those at the top of Hollingdean Road). The actual location of their development is within Round Hill and is the very "greenfield" site that acts as a buffer zone between the built-area of Round Hill and the Centenary Industrial Estate. Carelet are desperate to merge the two, so that they will be allowed to do more. They are treating our open space as if it were a "brownfield" site and have not even ticked "change of use" on their planning application.

Many thanks to all residents who are supporting the campaign.  
Ted Power

## **15th January 2005 - Carelet 339 letters of comment. Further infill 56-58 Roundhill Crescent**

Dear all,

I have just learnt that at least 339 letters of comment have been received by Brighton and Hove Council concerning the Princes Rd back-land development. This magnificent response is much appreciated by the Princes Road residents under direct threat from the proposals.

I have also learnt of yet another development involving the construction of 4 one-bedroom houses on land to the rear of 56 to 58 Roundhill Crescent. Details and a sample letter of objection by a Roundhill Crescent resident are posted at <http://www.roundhill.biz>. Email me with your contact details if you would like me to put you in touch with the person in Roundhill Crescent who is leading the campaign.

The proposed houses will be just 10 metres away from houses in the existing terrace [Roundhill Crescent] considerably less than the minimum distance of at least 22 metres between facing windows required in order to prevent overlooking. Since the proposed new houses will be located to the south, the existing terrace will also suffer from considerable loss of light.

The proposed development also involves the erosion of yet another green space valued by neighbouring residents.

Although the amount of construction is considerably less than in the Princes Rd proposals, the effects of this unsuitable development on land between Roundhill Crescent and Upper Lewes Road are likely to be just as unpleasant to residents living close to the proposed buildings. An accumulation of unsuitable developments on a smaller scale leads in exactly the same direction. The next one could be near any one of us.

It would be heartening if we could get the same response (i.e. as many letters of objection as possible) in an attempt to protect and enhance this second area of Round Hill. This is another application lodged over the Christmas period while residents are occupied or on holiday. The closing date for letters of comment is 24th January, so there is a need to act fast in giving Roundhill Crescent and Upper Lewes Road residents our support.

The Princes Rd application goes before the planning committee in February (possibly on 2nd February). The Roundhill Crescent one will follow not long after.

Kind regards,  
Ted Power

## 9th February 2005 - Importance of wildlife. [citywildlife.org.uk](http://citywildlife.org.uk). Sites of Nature Conservation Importance

Dear all,

The Round Hill Society Committee has asked me if I could remind local residents of the RSPB's Big Garden Birdwatch online survey.

Details of this are posted at <http://www.rspb.org.uk/birdwatch/>

We have until 21st February to log birds spotted in our neighbourhood onto the RSPB's site at <http://www.rspb.org.uk/birdwatch/>. Results of this National survey will be published at the end of March.

By logging we ensure that our patches of back-land (our streetscapes too!) are represented in the survey. The RSPB survey is distinct from the logging that can also be done at any time by registering as a Nature Warden at Brighton and Hove Council's wildlife web site: <http://www.citywildlife.org.uk> Reasonably-sized [JPEG] picture files can also be uploaded to <http://www.citywildlife.org.uk> - a good community project for residents with digital cameras.



Both National and Local surveys could assist in our efforts to protect our back-land [green vistas across private gardens] from development. I recently received a reply from David Lepper [MP for our area], who has made enquiries within the Council [on behalf of Round Hill residents] about the possibility of "Sites of Nature Conservation Importance" designations on Round Hill. The Council

Planner questioned by our MP has already identified one Roundhill site, a private (and fairly extensive) wildlife garden, as a possible candidate for SNCI designation. There are 62 SNCI designations within Brighton & Hove, though not a single one yet on Round Hill. Designation would only confer the minimum level of protection (which may not be enough), but it would at least be a start in valuing COMMON urban wildlife.

The other assurance that David Lepper MP was able to confirm is that logging of wildlife by Roundhill residents on <http://www.Citywildlife.org.uk> contributes data that is actually taken into account when planning applications on our back-land come before planning committees. Roundhill residents may need to be both wildlife lovers and IT specialists (!) to make a success of <http://www.citywildlife.org.uk>. However, it is encouraging to have written assurance (from Council Planner: Martin Randall) that our Council ecologist's new web site is much more than a cosmetic exercise in valuing the city's wildlife.

The RSPB survey is the one that needs immediate attention. Closing date: 21st February 2005.

Ted Power

**11th February 2005 - Roundhill Crescent proposal REFUSED. Carelet proposal recommended for REFUSAL, but to be heard on 23rd February.**

Dear all,

I am pleased to report that the planning application to build a line of four houses (within the attractive segment defined by Roundhill Crescent and Upper Lewes Road) has now been refused.

The same planning officer (Sue Dubberley), to whom many of you sent letters of comment, has also "recommended refusal" RE Carelet's proposals to build 33 apartment/ a 6 storey block in Princes Road.

However, before opening the champagne please note that this major application still goes before the planning committee on 23rd February 2005, and members of that committee will make the final decision. The planning officer's "recommendation to refuse" is "good news" and we are fortunate that our local Councillor Keith Taylor has agreed to be present at the meeting to speak for us against Carelet's proposals.

The two sites are still owned by people who want to build on them and there will be better news to report once we have made progress in our campaign for additional planning guidelines and special designations (e.g. Site of Nature Conservation Importance), which will give at least a limited degree of protection to these open spaces and their wildlife habitats against speculative development. We also hope that the Council's revised Character Definition Statement for the Round Hill Conservation Area will be extended to value back-land and green vistas across private gardens in addition to our streetscapes. Without measures to protect our back-land, it will continue to be purchased by developers when properties come onto the market and we will be fighting one application after another.

With regard to the two sites directly threatened, it looks as if Round Hill residents will win "round 1", but we can expect the owners to revise their plans and submit them again. Winning the general battle is important if we are to avoid long drawn-out contests opposing individual applications.

Many thanks to everybody who has helped - let us hope that the planning committee on 23rd February follow the planning officer / Sue Dubberley's recommendation to refuse Carelet's proposals. The meeting is public, though speaking rights have already been allocated.

Kind regards,  
Ted Power



## **16th February 2005 - Carelet scheme (33 flats) to be decided on 23rd February. Presence at site visit and in public gallery.**

Dear all,

The Carelet scheme is to be decided on Wednesday, 23rd February, 2005

Round Hill residents - help to ensure a significant presence on the following dates by informing neighbours [Please attend the events if you can spare the time]:

3 p.m. TUESDAY, 22nd February in Princes Road: Planning Committee members (who decide the outcome) will perform a site visit.

2.p.m. WEDNESDAY 23rd February, Council Chamber Hove Town Hall: Meeting of Planning Applications Sub-Committee to decide on Carelet's Application.

Go to <http://www.Roundhill.biz> for a link to the page on the Council web site containing the various reports from Council planners on Carelet's proposals. The Council has listed all the households that have sent in objections - you may find your own!

Feel free to email me if you have suggestions RE next week's events.

Kind regards,  
Ted Power

## **21st February 2005 - Demonstrate with placards outside Hove Town Hall**

Dear all,

The following arrangements have been made for this Wednesday 23rd February in cooperation with the local Press.

MEET OUTSIDE HOVE TOWN HALL FROM 13.40 , IDEALLY WITH PLACARDS, FOR A BRIEF DEMO AND PHOTO OP FOR THE ARGUS.

THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE (OPEN TO THE PUBLIC) STARTS AT 14.00

Andy Tate from the Argus has phoned me to confirm that he is willing to give us a photo opportunity in the fifteen minutes before Wednesday afternoon's meeting outside Hove Town Hall.

The meeting itself is in the Council Chamber and starts at 14.00. We hope a significant number of Round Hill residents will attend. Members of the sub committee will decide whether or not we are going to have a new 6 storey building in Princes Rd within the Round Hill Conservation area. Andy Tate will prepare a report hopefully to appear in The Argus on Thursday.

If a reporter mentions the plight of homeless people, make the point that there are many organisations involved in responsible campaigns to help the homeless and Carelet is not among them. We are campaigning against over-development, showing complete disregard for both existing residents in a fully developed area and prospective tenants who deserve better living conditions.

As well as overdevelopment, placards could illustrate our concern for protection of open spaces, mentioning that Carelet's main freehold is a GREENFIELD SITE. Carelet's planning application should never have been registered by the Council since it wrongly assumes that the site is BROWNFIELD and they have deliberately omitted to apply for CHANGE OF USE.

AMENITY / WILDLIFE / RECREATION (Current value of backland: green vistas across private gardens the only support for wildlife habitats in Round Hill.

PRESSURE ON INFRASTRUCTURE / PARKING/TRAFFIC/NOISE/ is the other main area of concern. Incidentally, the location of the parking bay (a concrete platform within the Gatehouse) would mean goodbye to the horse-chestnut tree. It would be masked by the 5-story Gatehouse even if there were a remote hope of saving it.

Hope you can attend with a suitable placard.



Ted

## 23rd February 2005 - Carelet's 33 flats REFUSED. Plans for Hollingdean Depot loom.

Round 1 goes to Round Hill - we have opened the champagne! Round Hill residents have won their campaign to get Carelet's current proposals refused. Today's victory was emphatic.

Every single member of the committee voted for refusal. There will be a report in The Argus, which should appear tomorrow.

Carelet could now appeal to the Planning Inspectorate, but I very much doubt that they will having received such a battering today. Their architect's design came in for much criticism - even bordering on ridicule.

We have to remember that Carelet still owns the land, though planning law allows for community interest in the value of the site as an open space.

The Council has supplied me with guidelines, which Round Hill residents can follow if we want to assess the value of this open space to our community. Policy on "OPEN SPACE NEEDS" (e.g. recreational provision for existing Round Hill residents) is now locally-derived.

The Council is therefore keen for residents to perform their own assessments. They can then correlate our assessment with that of their planning team. Naturally, we have to be ready to oppose any revised plans.

Today's decision is a good step forward. The result confirms that we have established good communication with planning committee members, who are from a wide cross-section of political parties.

The campaign has already established good contacts from within the Local Press. The Editor of the Letters Page has highlighted our concern over pressures on parking and traffic volume in Round Hill in today's Argus: Reporter Andy Tate and his photographer were present at this afternoon's meeting - his report of our victory should appear on Thursday or Friday.

The more active members of this campaign will remain focused on any revised plans Carelet may come up with. Our involvement with planning issues has made us aware of other proposals that may impact badly on Round Hill and nearby. I believe there will be a meeting on Sunday afternoon at The Downs Infants School on the impact for plans for the Hollingdean Depot, where recycling will take place with comings and goings night and day.

Ted

## **27th February 2005 - Parents against the proposed Dump at Hollingdean Depot**

Local Parents Against Hollingdean Waste Transfer Station and Material Recovery Facility are inviting local residents to a meeting on development proposals that they fear will:

1. substantially increase the volume of heavy traffic near the Downs Schools
2. add to emissions and air pollution
3. lead to a significant increase in noise - vehicles will access the site night and day in addition to noise from the installation itself.

Parents against this development have circulated a leaflet and also have a campaign web site at <http://www.refuse-refuse.org.uk>

Their web page contains a link to the description of the development on the Council's web site as well as to the page where your comments can be transmitted to the Council online. The closing date for comment was 27th February, but has been extended. Application number is BH2005/00304/FP registered on 1st Feb 2005.

The parents' meeting for discussion and info is at Downs Infant School this Sunday 27th Feb at 2 pm. All welcome.

4th May 2005 -demonstration by the Dump The Dump campaign



The Refuse-Refuse (now known as the "Dump the Dump") campaign is planning a demonstration before the Annual Council meeting 12 May 3.45-4.45 at Brighton Town Hall.

One purpose of the Annual Council Meeting is to elect the new mayor, so it presents a good opportunity for local residents supporting the "Dump the Dump" campaign to make their voices heard.

Media coverage of the protest is anticipated and the organisers hope that 100s will come. They urge parents to bring kids and request that those with "Dump The Dump" T-shirts wear them. They also request that protesters carry a flower to symbolise the cleaner, better-smelling environment that campaigners would like to see Hollingdean enjoy.

There is still time to send in comments on the planning proposals for Hollingdean since a date has not yet been set for the planning committee meeting when the decision will be made.

New window posters (in support of the campaign) can be requested from info@.... There are many more of these on display in Round Hill/Hollingdean streets than election posters. Hopefully, our local representatives (many of whom already support the campaign) will take note of the strength of feeling on this issue.

## **7th May 2005 - Carelet appeal against refusal announced**

Dear all,

I've just learnt that Carelet Ltd has made an appeal to the Secretary of State against Brighton and Hove City Council's decision to reject their proposals for high-density development in Princes Road. They want to get the decision reversed.

Round 2 of the campaign is to persuade the Secretary of State to uphold the Council's decision. Comments made in opposing the application to the Council will be enclosed with the Council's submissions to the Secretary of State.

However, local residents have an opportunity to make further comments no later than 26 May [3 copies should be enclosed] to:  
The Planning Inspectorate,  
3/04a Kite Wing, Temple Quay House,  
2 The Square, Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN

Representations should be submitted no later than 26 May 2005. Please quote the details of the application, especially the Appeal Ref No.:

Appeal by: Carelet Ltd  
Regarding: Land behind no.s. 67- 81 Princes Road Brighton  
Application No: BH2004/03605/FP  
Appeal Ref No: APP/Q1445/A /A/05/1 178381

Please alert friends and other local residents to the renewed threat to the character and appearance of Round Hill [infrastructure, pressure on parking/pedestrian environment, congestion, noise, air quality, green vistas & open space, wildlife, amenity, view from afar etc].

If we can succeed in getting the appeal rejected, this will be a big setback to Carelet Ltd and they will at least be persuaded to scale down their plans.

It is not long before 26 May. Personal reasons limit my participation in this round of the campaign. Please help to `carry the can' by reminding friends and neighbours to act in good time so that the planning committee's decision of 24 Feb is not overturned. I continue to post the relevant information on our campaign web site at <http://www.Roundhill.biz> (where most voiced objections have been summarized) as well as on the Round Hill Society's web site at <http://www.Roundhill.org.uk> . The two Home Pages have just been updated.

Many thanks for continued support.

Ted Power

## **10th May 2005 - Dump the Dump demonstration planned**

I have just received this as an email from Sandra Staufer who coordinates the "Dump The Dump" campaign.

Re: Placards for demonstration, Thursday 12 May 3.45, Bartholomew Square Brighton

As you may be aware, we have organised a demonstration against the Waste Transfer Station and the Material Recovery facility at Hollingdean. This will be a good opportunity, as all of the councillors will be at the Annual Council meeting, when the Mayor will be elected.

We/ I would like to ask you if you could organise a placard for the demo, with one representative carrying this as well.

We would like to show that the demonstration represents many different organisations / groups / school etc of this city. We hope that many of the groups/ schools etc who oppose the development could make a placard saying: The Round Hill Society says no to WTS.

The councillors will notice that more than just moms and dads are concerned about this development.

If you can not do a placard (A3, or A2, A1), please let [info@refuse-refuse.org.uk](mailto:info@refuse-refuse.org.uk) know by Wednesday lunchtime, and with your permission, we will produce this placard for you. Please approach us then to pick it up at the demo, or tell us that we have to carry it for you. Of course we would appreciate if we did not have to do many of the placards, as we are very very busy.

With kind regards

## **22nd May 2005 - comments to the Appeal Inspector on Carelet's 33 flat scheme. Can include reference to planning policies .**

The closing date for residents' comments to the Planning Inspectorate is Thursday 26th May. If the appeal goes in favour of the developer Carelet Ltd, their five and six storey buildings will take about one year to erect. This will mean lorries carrying tons of concrete and building materials, increased noise, dust and increased traffic volume affecting both Princes Road and the surrounding streets.

This temporary inconvenience may not be judged by the Planning Inspectorate as valid grounds on which to oppose Carelet's proposals. Our letters of comment need to refer to planning policies in the Brighton and Hove Local Plan for maximum influence on the outcome of the appeal.

Carelet's appeal document, written by a chartered town planner, deals in policies. Brighton and Hove Council in its planning committee report listed 23 policies as relevant to the proposed development, but Carelet is now attempting to exploit the fact that only ten of these policies were referred to in the Council's refusal notice.

Carelet's first strategy in its appeal document is to steer the Inspectorate away from those policies it asserts that the Council are happy with. Just because the Council chose to hammer ten nails into Carelet's coffin rather than twenty-three, it is presumptuous of the developer to pretend that the following policies are not bones of contention:

### TR9 Safe routes to school and TR12 Cycle access and parking.

Carelet observes in its appeal document that considerable comment was made by local residents on the lack of on site parking, but they further assert that the Council's Traffic Manager raises no objection to their development on highway grounds. They fail to cite the planning committee

member's observation that it would be highly probable that their prospective tenants (given the location of the development) would want to own cars.

Policy HO6 in our Local Plan also makes the whole idea of Car free housing in this location highly questionable. This only allows car-free housing in locations with good access to public transport and local services where there are complementary on-street parking controls and where it can be demonstrated that the proposed development will remain genuinely car-free over the long term. It would be useful for Round Hill residents to emphasise in letters to the Inspectorate that the concept of car-free housing is inoperable where there is no on-site parking provision, where the only access to the development is on a 1:12 hill where no buses pass.

Policies HO2 and HO3 relate to affordable housing on 'windfall' sites and Dwelling type and size. The latter attaches a high priority to the provision of 3 bedroom houses and accommodation suitable for larger families as well as an element of larger (4+ bedroom) accommodation. Carelet's 33 units constitute a cramped over-development. These are predominantly units for 1 or 2 tenants, highly unsuitable for family, disabled or elderly occupants. Cramming 60+ adult tenants into this small space will have maximum spill-over effect on neighbouring streets in terms of car ownership. The development will contribute far more to social problems than to social need.

Policies HO5 and QD20, which Carelet also wants to remove from scrutiny, relate to the Provision of outdoor recreational space in housing schemes and Urban open space. New developments generate new requirements for outdoor recreational space.

Policy HO5 requires provision to be split appropriately between children's equipped play space, casual / informal play space and adult / youth outdoor sports facilities. Letters emphasising that existing residents' open space needs are poorly provided for in Round Hill, could counter the pretence by Carelet that all is OK.

Policy QD20 states that loss of areas of public or private open space important to people (because of their recreational, community, historical, conservation, economic, wildlife, social or amenity value) will only be considered in exceptional circumstances. This policy is crucial to the character and appearance of the part of our conservation area which Carelet's development would ruin. Letters are needed to emphasise the relevance of this policy to the appeal.

Carelet maintains that in the context of an urban location where there are already views of high tower-blocks, its own high-density development will simply involve loss of 'greening effect'. The design statement which Carelet has sent to the Planning Inspector contains photos and text deliberately framed to equate its main freehold to the industrial area north of the railway. We need to emphasise the importance of this plot (south of the railway) forming an attractive green vista across private gardens, a haven for wildlife and a boundary feature separating and screening the built area of Round Hill from the Centenary Industrial estate below.

The development site falls entirely within the conservation area and the stepped terrace of 59-81 Princes Road is what makes Round Hill look 'round' when viewed from Tenantry Down.

Carelet trashes these Edwardian terraced houses in its appeal document, calling them "substandard and in poor condition, especially when viewed from the rear".

Another policy that Carelet is steering the Inspectorate away from, is QD5 Design street frontages. This requires new development to present an interesting and attractive frontage particularly at street level for pedestrians. The Local Plan makes reference here to designs to avoid. These include "large bulky developments with no street activity and buildings with no proper street frontage."

The street frontage for Carelet's 5 and 6 storey towers housing 60+ residents on back-land north of Princes Road is no wider than the front garden of one of the small terraced house, but it will give us a bottleneck of activity, which will spill into other Round Hill streets. Access for refuse collection and all services will be through a small gatehouse.

The horse-chestnut tree with the TPO clearly presents an obstacle to Carelet's cramped scheme. They trash it as being "a poor specimen" in their appeal document and have recently been refused permission to take 25% off its crown. Permission was granted to remove the two lowest branches.

Carelet is attempting to give the Inspectorate an unattractive view of part of Princes Road which local residents value. They argue in their appeal document that the area needs "tidying up" and that their well thought-out development will do the trick.

We must challenge these assertions before they become 'popular wisdom' among the officials who will decide the future of our conservation area. Carelet knows that even if this appeal fails and it then re-submits plans on a reduced scale, some of its arguments may stick if it voices them repeatedly and boldly. The only way we can secure our victory is to counter these unscrupulous strategies and deliberate deceptions.

Refer to the policies of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan at [http://www.brightonandhovelocalplan.org.uk/contents\\_written.htm](http://www.brightonandhovelocalplan.org.uk/contents_written.htm) and go to the campaign web site at <http://www.Roundhill.biz> for the address of the Planning Inspectorate. Comments must be received by Thursday 26th May 2005.

Ted Power

## **9th June 2005 - Meeting organised by The Dump The Dump campaign**

GENERAL PUBLIC MEETING, HERTFORD ROAD INFANTS SCHOOL  
Wednesday June 15th 6.00 pm-7.30 pm

organised by The Dump The Dump campaign. The organisers write:

Many of you will have had a glossy letter from Onyx and Brighton & Hove City Council about a Waste Unit development on the former abattoir site in HOLLINGDEAN. It is misleading and does not give you the full FACTS

It is not as the letter says, simply a Waste RECYCLING unit. It will be taking ALL the waste from ALL of Brighton and Hove [and even surrounding counties]

Only 20%-30% would be recycled; the rest will be bin bags of dirty waste" which the council and Onyx intend to burn at Newhaven, should the incinerator be built.

Burnt waste is HIGHLY TOXIC - it contains dioxins, the most harmful and dangerous chemicals known to man. Poisonous forever.

Onyx in partnership with CityClean will mean a significant amount of HGV movements at this site per day.

It will be in the heart of our residential area.

It will be only a few metres from an infant's school playground.

It will create extra noise, pollution, congestion and unsafe roads.

It is an unsafe option for our children's future and for all future generations.

It is not a sustainable option.



## 14th June 2005 - Carelet's site clearance: destruction of habitat



During a wildlife survey carried out by Round Hill children in summer 2001 on land now under Carelet's ownership, 63 different creatures were documented including hummingbird hawkmoths, hawk dragonflies, rufous grasshoppers, toads, common newts and frogs.

Within the past 48 hours, Carelet's earth-digger has been stripping the land of trees and vegetation and systematically destroying precious wildlife habitats within the Round Hill conservation area just to the south of the railway corridor.

On Monday, 13th June, Carelet managed to squeeze a digger through the narrow access onto its main freehold and set about site clearance in spite of having planning permission for its high-density residential proposals emphatically refused. The developer hasn't even got the patience to await the outcome of its own appeal to the Planning Inspectorate against the Council planning committee's unanimous decision.

Pictures have been posted on our campaign web site at <http://www.Roundhill.biz> and also on the Round Hill Society's web site at <http://www.Roundhill.org.uk> showing what has now taken place.

Bare earth replaces what was part of an attractive green vista across back gardens. Much of the greening (trees and vegetation) which screens the NE border of the Round Hill Conservation area from the Centenary Industrial Estate, has already been removed. An unsightly gap, uncovering the first grey corrugated warehouse in the industrial estate, now replaces a line of trees and vegetation - previously an important boundary feature of the area.

The developer has even demolished the tree-house, which they say inspired their building design.

Local Councillors Keith Taylor and Sue Paskins have been informed. Both have contacted Maggie Brian, Head of Development Control, asking her to arrange an immediate investigation. Sue Paskins has just informed me that she has also told Miriam Wells of the Argus and I have also written to the journalist Andy Tate.

In terms of planning law, local residents are entitled to feel outraged. Carelet is clearly "jumping the gun". Under Government Guidance PPG17, proposals involving public or private open space need to demonstrate community support before approval is possible.

Policies in the Brighton and Hove Local Plan (e.g. QD20-23) recognise the amenity value of green open space, vistas across private gardens and wildlife habitats. Under PPG17, development on these plots is also subject to an assessment of the potential value of the site to community open space needs. The Council has recently completed an open space survey and Carelet's main freehold should by now come under some category. Councillors are well aware of local residents' interest in this site's potential as a gated allotment or community garden.

It is unbelievable that this site's existing uses are being removed by Carelet's earth-digger when planning permission has been REFUSED and when the proposals are subject to an APPEAL. The developer seems to be going ahead with "all but the buildings" completely ignoring the community's rights as stakeholders in the planning system.

When members of the Planning Inspectorate eventually perform their site visit, the "building site" which they will now see will create a completely different impression from the green open space inspected by members of the Council sub-planning committee on the site visit which helped to determine refusal. In spite of the loss of wildlife habitat, this is not a "fait accompli" for Carelet.

There are several other major reasons for refusal including the scale of buildings out of all proportion to existing properties and in unreasonable proximity to existing homes, lack of suitable access and the adverse effect on local infrastructure.

Wildlife habitat can still be restored on this site if a sufficient number of Round Hill residents make it very clear that we do not want our conservation area so starkly joined to an industrial estate with the features we most value removed. Actions and initiatives in support of the campaign would bring a little cheer to the residents closest to the epicentre.

Local residents have already given splendid support. It's unfortunate that we have to raise our voices again and again if action is to be taken on our behalf. I hope members of the web group will forgive me for using it repeatedly for this campaign. The developer wants to demoralise us. Every initiative and show of support from other residents encourages us.

I love reading about the cat, the fox, the birds and the frogs. Whatever they do to one another, it is heartening to feel that neighbours value the wildlife habitats on Round Hill. Please 'kick up a stink' to borrow a phrase from another campaign.

Ted

## **2nd August 2005 - 'Brighton's Open Market**

I've just updated the site at <http://www.openmarket.org.uk>

This started as a local history project, though I thought it would add colour if I included pictures of the current stalls. Those on the south side of the market seem to change most frequently, which means that my updates don't last long. The stalls which survive are those that have built up a regular clientele.

I make intermittent use of the market, but am always glad when I make the effort to go there. It would be sad if we lost this form of trading and we are lucky that it is located so near to Round Hill.



Business appears to have dipped a little recently, though traders keep on coming back with new ideas. I am hopeful that we will enjoy this amenity for a lot longer.

Ted Power

## **4th August 2005 Carelet's 2nd Application before the result of their 1st appeal**

Carelet Ltd has now registered a second planning application (with all the worst characteristics of the first). The best way to register effective opposition is to send in a letter of comment and persuade others to do the same. See the campaign web site at: <http://www.roundhill.biz> for help with comments. Key members of the campaign are on holiday - help with producing and distributing leaflets or any other ideas to harness letters of comment is urgently needed to ensure that we stop these equally dreadful proposals.

Letters of comment in writing no later than 23rd August 2005 to:  
Pete Johnson [Tel: 01273 292138 ]  
Development Control  
Brighton & Hove City Council  
Town Hall

Norton Road  
Hove BN3 3BQ

Application No: BH2005/02279/FP (Please quote in all correspondence)  
Site/Address: Land to the rear of 67-81 Princes Road Brighton  
Proposal: Erection of a 4/5 storey block of 21 flats at the rear  
(with 9 affordable units) and a gatehouse with two storeys onto  
Princes Road and 3 basement levels. Provision of communal gardens,  
refuse store, cycle storage and one car parking space.

1. Model your comments on Council's reasons for refusing Carelet 's first application if you agree that the reasons also apply to the second application.
2. Reiterate areas of concern to which Development Control and Council planning department managers gave insufficient attention first time round: i.e. protection of wildlife habitats & open spaces and traffic & parking.
3. Use comments to counter misrepresentations by the developer in its appeal document so that planners get the right information.
4. Structure your letter using the areas for comment given by the Council as 'valid matters'.

#### Other action

Write to one of the councillors (or more if you have time) who sit on the Planning Application Sub Committee, outlining why you oppose the application.

Bob Carden (Chair) Labour North Portslade  
Delia Forester Labour Queen's Park  
Leslie Hamilton Labour South Portslade  
Lynda Hyde Conservative Rottingdean Coastal  
Ken Norman Conservative Withdean  
Averil Older Conservative Central Hove  
Sue Paskins Green St Peter's & North Laine  
Roy Pennington (Vice-Chair) Labour Regency  
Carol Theobald Conservative Patcham  
Francis Tonks Labour Moulescomb & Bevendean  
David Watkins Liberal Democrats Brunswick & Adelaide  
Geoffrey Wells Conservative Woodingdean

Kind regards,  
Ted Power

## **25th September 2005 - Carelet's appeal on their 1st application DISMISSED**

The Planning Inspector has dismissed Carelet's appeal against Council's refusal of their first set of proposals. Carelet wants permission for high-density development on backland off Princes Road.

See <http://www.roundhill.biz> for full text of Inspector's Appeal Decision.

It is not too late for Round Hill residents to re-state their concerns RE Carelet's second application. The encouraging news is that the Government Inspector's decision will inevitably affect future planning recommendations and decisions. However, to avoid complacency we must lobby hard:

1. To ensure that the Highway Authority raises important traffic concerns in their next Traffic Manager's Report instead of completely ignoring those expressed by Round Hill residents in 300+ letters of comment. Now that the Inspector's Report echoes our concerns, we must press these points home. It would be most undemocratic if the Traffic Manager's Report RE Carelet's Second Planning Application makes no concession to local opinion or the Inspector's

opinion or what was in fact said at the last planning hearing RE the improbability of genuine "car-free development" in Princes Road.

2. To remind Council planners that we value the remaining green open spaces within Round Hill, especially a green lung on the NE boundary of our conservation area providing a buffer and a screen between a residential area and industrial estates generating an increasing amount of noise and pollution.

Pam Blackman reports that a large quantity of letters of comment have already been received by Council RE Carelet's second planning application. To achieve this result twice is a measure of local people's interest in the Round Hill Conservation area.

We are very pleased that the encouraging level of support, which clearly influenced the Inspector's Report, is still evident. We can win as long as we don't lose interest.

Many thanks,  
Ted Power

### **3rd October 2005 - tree felling on the NE border of Round Hill by Network Rail**

I've sent an email to Steve Marsh of <http://www.networkrail.co.uk> (this is the correct spelling) - a site which campaigns against unnecessary tree-felling by Network Rail.

I have asked about the results of the early day motion put down in the Commons by Steve McCabe (MP for Hall Green Birmingham) two years ago in an attempt to impose tighter legal obligations on Network Rail's tree-felling activities.

In the past, Network Rail has argued that a safety consideration will override their Corporate Responsibility (they actually have an 'Environmental Policy'!). If safety is involved, they argue that they can do what they like without consulting. Moreover, they are under no legal requirement to perform Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs).

The goal of Steve Marsh's campaign is for Government to oblige them to do an EIA. Currently, they commission a company called ADAS to do hazard assessments. The staff of ADAS are not trained as ecologists or environmentalists. An EIA would involve the necessary experts to cover wildlife considerations, local considerations such as loss of screen or security as well as added dangers which could be caused by removal of vegetation e.g. increased access to track and subsidence.

Go to <http://roundhill.org.uk> for further information. If anybody else finds any more info from their own contacts with the Council (i.e. was the Local Authority e.g. someone in the Conservation Team &/or the arboriculturalist section informed?) or from speaking directly to Network Rail (do they have a valid safety concern?) please make feedback known to RHS committee member prior to next Tuesday's RHS Committee Meeting. The Network Rail helpline is on 0845 711 41 41.

Ted Power