

A recent history of Round Hill's planning concerns 2016-2017

	CONTENTS	Page
15 Jan 2016	Demo against - City Parks Rangers' cuts.	2
12 Feb 2016	Removal of street lights.	2
26 Mar 2016	Say "No" to industrial / commercial waste at Hollingdean Depot	3
6 Apr 2016	Application for 4 two bedroom houses on land to rear of 28A Crescent Road	4
7 Sep 2016	Land to the rear of 101 Roundhill Crescent: Erection of 1 three bedroom dwelling incorporating alterations to boundary wall. 2nd application.	5
20 Oct 2016	Object to operating Hollingdean Depot on Boxing Day	7
8 May 2017	Application for flats in place of the Signalman pub garden.	7
2 Aug 2017	Concerns about neighbourhood policing	8

https://roundhill.org.uk/main?sec=gardens&p=City_Park_Ranger_Cuts

https://roundhill.org.uk/main?sec=history&p=Street_lamps_correspondence

https://roundhill.org.uk/main.php?sec=planning&p=Veolia_0000_index#indust

https://roundhill.org.uk/main.php?sec=archives&p=Crescent_Road_2016_Approval

https://roundhill.org.uk/main?sec=planning&p=Crescent_Rd_0000_indexv

https://roundhill.org.uk/main?sec=planning&p=Daubigny_Rd_and_RH_Crescent_background

https://roundhill.org.uk/main?sec=planning&p=Save_The_Signalman_Pub_Garden

https://roundhill.org.uk/main.php?sec=community&p=Sussex_Police_and_Crime_Commissioner

https://roundhill.org.uk/main.php?sec=community&p=Police_Community_Support_Officers

https://roundhill.org.uk/main?sec=community&p=Safer_in_Sussex_Community_Fund

15 January 2016 - Demo against - City Parks Rangers' cuts.



19th January 2016 from 3pm outside and before the Council's Environment Committee meeting at Portslade Town Hall, Victoria Road BN41 1YF where councillors will look at the proposal to cut the Brighton CityPark Rangers from its team of nine to three!

Cityparks rangers ensure everyone enjoys our public open spaces safely. Working alongside local preservation and horticultural groups, they ensure our parks & countryside are maintained to the highest standard possible.

What do the CityParks rangers do? [See the Council's website]

<https://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/libraries-leisure-and-arts/parks-and-green-spaces/park-rangers>

Such drastic reduction of the CityParks Rangers' numbers will disable them from carrying out the huge range of work they currently undertake to protect and sustain Brighton and Hove's special environment.

If our public open spaces go unmaintained, don't be surprised if parts of them become unavailable for public use and therefore less able to justify their place within the public realm. When Councils perform their open spaces studies, factors such as accessibility and use are instrumental in deciding where public money is spent. Future cuts may take away the spaces themselves.

12th February 2016 - Removal of street lights

I remember well the long email exchanges which you, Peter, and Rob have had with the Council on street lighting.

https://roundhill.org.uk/main?sec=history&p=Street_lamps_correspondence



Although the street lamps which have been removed this month are not among Round Hill's most historic ones, we all need to be vigilant so that those which have been included on our city's list of heritage assets do not get the same treatment.

Check to see if lights in your street already appear and are "recommended for inclusion" on The Council's thematic survey on street lighting:

[https://roundhill.org.uk/main?sec=history&p=Local list of heritage assets](https://roundhill.org.uk/main?sec=history&p=Local%20list%20of%20heritage%20assets)

<https://ww3.brighton-hove.gov.uk/sites/brighton-hove.gov.uk/files/LLHA%20Street%20Lighting.pdf>

I note too the concerns expressed by other residents about inadequate street lighting in parts of Round Hill.

If street lights do have to be replaced, it's a great pity that the Council cannot afford to pay for something not quite so bland as what we have been getting. Funds could be released through savings in running costs without residents having to dip further into their own pockets to get something in keeping with the character and appearance of our conservation area.

Our local ward Councillor, Pete West, reported at our Round Hill Society committee meeting, last Tuesday, that the Green Investment Bank has just launched a new low rate fixed loan, available to Local Authorities, to help them to make the switch to low energy street

lighting.

The UK's 7 million street lights clock up an annual energy bill of over £300 million, but fewer than 1 million of these lamps are low energy. Street lighting can therefore account for as much as 30 per cent of a Local Authority's energy consumption, while the low efficiency of old types of bulb unnecessarily involves a high carbon footprint, also throwing light where it is not needed. Let's encourage Brighton and Hove City Council to take advantage of the opportunity offered at

Green Investment Bank - GIB launches new loan to finance low energy streetlighting | GIB

26th March 2016 Say "No" to industrial / commercial waste at Hollingdean Depot

https://roundhill.org.uk/main.php?sec=planning&p=Veolia_0000_index#indust

Brighton and Hove City Council jointly prepares the Waste and Minerals Site Plan with East Sussex County Council and the National Park Authority. Specific areas of land are then allocated where it is considered that the management of waste and production of minerals could take place in the future to meet identified needs.

Hollingdean Depot currently handles domestic waste only, but the above plan floats a proposal (which could be followed by a planning application) to extend the site's use to commercial and industrial waste.

Public consultation on this has already been completed. However, the responses to public concerns, several of which are speculative, lack sensitivity to the nuisances which immediate neighbours already suffer. They overlook the evidence of poorly located buildings, inadequately landscaped to the south, and of unfit design to contain the odour of rotten food wasteto prevent nuisance from industrial noise. Further details on the Waste and Minerals Plan can be found at <http://consult.eastsussex.gov.uk/portal/wmsp>.

6th April 2016 - Application for 4 two bedroom houses on land to rear of 28A Crescent Road



Formal open space assessment needed
Amenity-value to those in Belton Rd

<https://roundhill.org.uk/main.php?sec=archives&p=Crescent Road 2016 Approval>

A new application, BH2016/00862 has been registered on 29th March 2016, so the formal period for submitting objections will expire roughly at the end of the third week in April 2016.

The proposed site for four residential homes is the very narrow strip of land backing onto gardens to the west of Crescent Road and to the east of Belton Road. The sole access

for these homes would be from the single opening onto the west side of Crescent Road. There would be no parking on the application site.

The Round Hill Society needs to hear what immediate residents' concerns are fairly quickly. While it is demoralising to get a proposal - so little changed in the amount of overdevelopment requested - so soon after a successful campaign, the residents most immediately affected will always be the voices that a planning committee or appeal inspector will want to hear first. Instead of 3 houses + 2 flats (refused last year), the new application is for 4 houses. There is some reduction in window area of the proposed houses, but canted windows and a sunken garden- common signs of overdevelopment - are still offered to address the problem of overlooking.

For more info click on the application number above or take the links from The Round Hill Society's website at <http://www.roundhill.org.uk>

Ted

7th September 2016 - Land to the rear of 101 Roundhill Crescent: Erection of 1 three bedroom dwelling incorporating alterations to boundary wall (2nd proposal)

[https://roundhill.org.uk/main?
sec=planning&p=Daubigny_Rd_and_RH_Crescent_background](https://roundhill.org.uk/main?sec=planning&p=Daubigny_Rd_and_RH_Crescent_background)



To be decided by Brighton and Hove City Council's planning committee on Wednesday 14th September 2016.

If successful proposal [BH2016/00752] would:

- effectively plug one of The Round Hill conservation area's best long views
- reduce our neighbourhood's open-feel, and
- create a sense of enclosure for neighbouring flats

Disappointingly, the officers' recommendation is "to grant". See the Case Officer's PLANS LIST, the document used to guide the planning committee, which includes a summary of the comments made by local residents during the formal consultation period.

On reading the officers' recommendation "to grant", the planning system still allows you to email members of the planning committee and make counter arguments. Try not to leave this to late. It rarely helps to bombard elected Councillors on the day of the planning meeting.

Starting points for further comment are:

1. The previous application was unanimously refused, but the main grounds for refusal then have hardly been addressed in the new plans: see all 7 grounds within the previous decision document and isolate those most important to you.

The proposed building would still effectively block out a much valued long public view fronted by a historic section of wall along a vista forming the setting of several listed buildings. This long view, looking up to the ridge of the neighbouring hillside (and by no means trashed by the Sainsbury building) contributes to the open-feel of an already very densely populated neighbourhood and connects us with a wider section of E. Brighton.

The current proposal still brings development within the setting of a listed property and uncomfortably near several flats, which would create a feeling of enclosure for the tenants living in those listed properties.

2. Urge the members of the planning committee to check that their Council remains consistent in its decision-making unless there is a change of policy. The CURRENT PLANS LIST recommending "grant" contains arguments which wholly conflict with those stressed in THE PREVIOUS PLANS LIST recommending "refuse".

For example, it offers entirely the wrong incentive to developers to argue this time round that promises to reverse neglect and poor maintenance of a listed property outside of the application site should make a planning proposal acceptable.

THE PREVIOUS PLANS LIST makes it clear that promises which are not written into an application (and which there is therefore no way of enforcing) should be ignored. [Scroll to page numbers 79-111 or enter a print range of 87-119 for hard copy if you have the patience to explore the previous plans list.]

FURTHER REFERENCE:

Land to the rear of 101 Roundhill Crescent

What have residents living in D'Aubigny Road put in their objections?

Read sample objections from resident 1 | resident 2 | resident 3

The applications were refused on ed 12th October 2016

At the request of Cllr Hyde, The Planning Committee used a new procedure (I believe for the first time ever!) allowing them to **change the Officers' recommendation from "GRANT" to "REFUSE"**.

20th October 2016 - Object to proposal to operate Hollingdean Depot on Boxing Day

Please read the item (below) and borrow from the sample letters of objection (linked to below) if you agree that we need to make a stance to stop conditions on the operating hours at Hollingdean Depot from being further relaxed.

If we can get as many as 5 objections, the planning application now under consideration will probably have to go before the Planning Committee. There it would hopefully be discussed by elected representatives and not delegated to Council Officers who may be working closely with Veolia.

If you are disturbed by the industrial noise &/or think that the planning application is unreasonable, please consider submitting an objection (whatever length you can manage) before 28th October 2016. Many thanks, Ted

8th May 2017 - Application for flats in place of the Signalmans pub garden.

https://roundhill.org.uk/main?sec=planning&p=Save_The_Signalmans_Pub_Garden



76 - 78 Ditchling Rise Brighton BN1 4QQ

Description: Erection of a 3 storey building containing 3no two bedroom dwellings and associated cycle parking.

About 130 local residents have already commented objecting to this proposal which is unneighbourly both in relation to the adjoining properties, especially the terrace at the NE end of Shaftesbury Rd in terms of overlooking, loss of light, loss of end of terrace position, and to the local community - not only Ditchling Rise Area residents, but also to many

surrounding neighbourhoods (including Round Hill) who derive amenity from having the garden as a meeting place.

Please add your own objection by clicking [here](#) and selecting the COMMENT tab.

Campaign site:

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/292781901145809/>

UPDATE

Following circa 200 objections, the unneighbourly proposal to cram in 3no two bedroom dwelling ;to the current end-of-terrace at the NE end of Shaftesbury Road **has now been WITHDRAWN**. The scheme failed to consider:

- 1) the value of the pub garden to community
- 2) the architectural worth & relationship between *The Signalman Public House* (former *Railway Hotel*) and *London Road Brighton Station* - each of which are included on [The City's list of Heritage Assets](#)
- 3) the amenity (overlooking, loss of light/privacy) of neighbouring and opposite buildings in Shaftesbury Road.

2nd August 2017 - Concerns about neighbourhood policing

Although Round Hill does not have a neighbourhood watch, The Round Hill Community Noticeboard - a Facebook Group for people living in Round Hill - now has approaching 200 members (significant coverage of an area with circa 900 households). Recently, there has been useful sharing of information on people looking into windows, possibly seeking opportunities for burglary. The police have been alerted in one case.

The Facebook Group is independent of The Round Hill Society, though our residents' associations recent initiatives also reflect the concern that cuts in neighbourhood policing (especially to Police Community Support Officers) could be making it easier for burglars. Neighbourhood Watch implies a "watching" role (not one of "vigilantes") so care needs to be taken in publicising suspicious behaviour. Good police response times are needed if liaison with the service, which is ultimately responsible for protecting us, is to remain effective. The non-emergency 101 line needs to be the 'tool of choice' for responding to suspicious behaviour.

In April 2017, Sandy Thomas (from The Round Hill Society committee) wrote to The Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner seeking explanations for:-

- the severity of cuts to front-line neighbourhood policing (e.g. PCSOs' jobs) in the context of the overall policing budget,
- delays experienced by several Round Hill resident in getting through to Sussex Police on their non-emergency 101 line.

You can read Sandy's expression of Round Hill's concerns and the reply from Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner's Office at

[https://roundhill.org.uk/main.php?
sec=community&p=Sussex_Police_and_Crime_Commissioner](https://roundhill.org.uk/main.php?sec=community&p=Sussex_Police_and_Crime_Commissioner)

See also The Round Hill Society's page on cuts to Police Community Support Officers
https://roundhill.org.uk/main.php?sec=community&p=Police_Community_Support_Officers

Bidding for funding for Neighbourhood Watch. See:
https://roundhill.org.uk/main?sec=community&p=Safer_in_Sussex_Community_Fund