



18/10/2016

HOVE STATION NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

REPRESENTATION ON APPLICATION BH2016/02663, 1-3 Ellen Street, Hove

Hove Station Neighbourhood Forum strongly supports this application, subject to the resolution of significant concerns, particularly regarding the provision of public realm improvements.

1. Hove Station Neighbourhood Plan Context

The application falls within the statutorily designated Neighbourhood Area of the emerging **Hove Station Neighbourhood Plan (NP)**, which is being prepared by the **Hove Station Neighbourhood Forum** – a statutorily defined voluntary organization with over 200 members who live or work in the area.

The overarching aim of the emerging Plan is to secure the urgently needed redevelopment of the City Plan Development Area 6, through a process that establishes **Hove Station Quarter** as a new focal point for the city, based on a sustainable transport hub. This would avoid piecemeal redevelopment and thus ensure that, in terms of both public and private benefit, the sum will be greater than the whole of the individual parts.

The current Draft 2 Neighbourhood Plan is now being developed into the **Pre-submission Consultation Draft Plan** with a target date of early February, for the statutory six week consultation required before it is submitted to BHCC for independent examination.

<http://www.hovestationforum.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/2016-04-04-Hove-Station-Neighbourhood-Plan-2nd-draft.pdf>

This work involves ongoing discussions with major landowners (including BHCC) and two major new inputs delivered this month:

- the BHCC assessment of the scope of the statutory **Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)** which will be necessary in order to minimise any adverse effects and maximize the benefits of the NP
<http://www.hovestationforum.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Strategic-Environmental-Assessment-Determination-for-Consultation-BHCC-on-the-HSNP-draft-Oct-2016.pdf>
- the **Hove Station Quarter Concept Plan and Options Study**, funded by DCLG and prepared by AECOM on behalf of the Forum.
http://www.hovestationforum.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/2016-09-13-Hove-Design-Study_lowres_Draft-1.pdf

These documents are the product of work by the local community since our first Have Your Say Days in February and October 2013, which eventually led to the statutory designation of the Forum and the Neighbourhood Area by the Council at the end of 2014.

In this context the Forum Technical Team (all local residents – see appendix) had a dialogue with Matsim consultants structured around the evolution of the **Design and Access Statement**, through four versions in August, September, October 2015 and March 2016. Our contribution was from a ‘neighbourhood planning perspective’ which focused on two related dimensions

- the architectural **design quality** of the scheme within its curtilage – the need for a high quality scheme to kick-start the regeneration of DA6 south of the railway, which includes the Conway Street Strategic Allocation; and
- the need to ensure that the scheme minimized any adverse impact on **heritage assets**, provided **public realm benefits** proportionate to its scale and fulfilled the role of the **first phase of mixed housing and commercial redevelopment**, in a way that did not close off options for subsequent phases of the comprehensive redevelopment of the whole of DA6 south of the railway

This process was initially summarized in our March 2016 Statement of Engagement which is included in the planning application **Statement of Community Involvement** (as Appendix D) and is appended to this document. The Forum had no equivalent dialogue about the preparation of the **Planning Statement**.

Matsim’s pre-application consultation work included the exhibition of the proposals as part of the Forum’s Neighbourhood Plan Have Your Say Days in November 2015 and July 2016, both of which attracted 75 and 95 participants respectively.

The development of the site is envisaged in the emerging NP as the critical first phase in the comprehensive redevelopment of DA6 South of the Railway and the creation of the Hove Station Quarter – it will kick-start the transformation of an area which has been run-down for many years.

Our support for the application has been informed by a review of the BHCC officer comments from Planning Policy, Heritage, Highways, Housing, and Environmental Protection, all of which recommend refusal - and City Regeneration, which recommended approval .

However, these comments frequently refer to a lack of necessary information and specify the further work that is needed to meet the concerns expressed. Generally such comments appear to be valid and it is understood that the further work is being undertaken by the applicant to meet these concerns, in parallel with the processing of the application by the LPA. Our comments are based on the assumption that this further work will achieve a significant measure of agreement between the planning officers and the applicants on many of these outstanding matters, particularly public realm improvement.

2. Design Quality

The Forum strongly supports the very high quality design of the proposed scheme, which will deliver 2000sqm of the *Conway Street Strategic Allocation* target of 12,000 sqm employment space and 188 of the 200 residential units. Early in our work in 2014 we used some of our small government grant to commission a 'think piece', - a desk based project - to provide us with evidence of best practice in the design of high density urban residential environments. This identified the increasing application, in the UK and abroad, of the principles of 'parcellisation' to provide diversity and variety of design in contrast to the uniform 'estate style' design of much modern housing development

Hence the Forum fully supports the Hove Garden variety of heights, shapes and building materials which provide an imaginative 21st century urban design - an appropriate contrast to the repetitive uniformity of the adjacent mid-20th century Clarendon Estate 10 storey blocks which are now being renovated by BHCC. The contrast between the two will contribute to what the emerging NP envisages as the diversity and inclusiveness of the new Hove Station Quarter.

The mix of uses and very high density fully realize the potential of this key site, given its location immediately adjacent to the Station, the frequency of the bus services in Goldstone Villas , the taxi rank and the potential for improving conditions for cyclists.

The complexity and intensity of the design will deliver a high quality urban environment on **the key site** in the *Conway Street Strategic Allocation*, which will trigger the transformation of the long run-down Development Area 6 into the Hove Station Quarter.

The City Plan SPG 15 on tall building identifies the area adjacent to Hove Station as a node for taller developments of 8-15 storeys. The Second Draft Neighbourhood Plan (Policy 18.iv) states a preference for buildings of 8-15 storeys ' to peak at around 15 storeys or above'.

This proposal peaks at 17 storeys. However, it will provide a single 'beacon building' - a strong visual signifier of the proposed Hove Station Quarter. Such a tall signature building is a vital component of the place-making which the NP is seeking to promote. It is virtually adjacent to the Station and therefore visually defines the location of the sustainable transport hub - the core of the proposed Hove Station Quarter.

We are aware that a minority of residents are concerned about the potential impact of high buildings. But the evidence of our substantial community engagement work to date is that there is no groundswell of public opposition to a single very tall building. Moreover, the final Neighbourhood Plan for DA6 will make it clear that this height does not set a precedent for the rest of the redevelopment of the *Conway Strategic Allocation* and the rest of the *DA6 South of the Railway* as identified in the emerging NP.

Overall, we believe that the application meets the DA6 policy requirement for a high quality design which will deliver an ‘attractive and sustainable mixed use area’.

3. Conservation of historic assets in the new Hove Station Quarter

Our argument is that the ‘less than substantial’ demonstrable harm to the designated heritage assets, which has been identified by the BHCC Heritage Team, can and should be offset by the positive impact of the proposed development.

In our dialogue with Matsim consultants we stressed the importance of minimizing the visual impact of the signature tallest building on the **Hove Station Conservation Area** - by locating it to the west of the site – and this was agreed. Proposals for office development are now being developed by the bus company to replace the current bus park adjacent to the western end of the application site.

The Heritage Team expressed the view that, in the absence of ‘an overall master plan for the area’, the ‘incremental cumulative impact’ of tall buildings as the Conway Street Allocation is developed westwards is a significant concern. This key issue will be addressed in the ongoing development of the NP and the Hove Station Quarter Concept Plan – see section 6 below.

As residents we are fully aware that the tall buildings will be seen above the roof of the **locally listed Station pub** by people using a short stretch of Station Approach **looking west**. But the inset photograph (Design and Access Statement p29 and Camera 05 p 103) of the current setting of the Station pub unfortunately creates the impression of it being set in isolation. In fact, a view from a few metres further towards the station along Station Road shows the existing 10 storey Livingstone House between the southern wall of the pub and the northern most shop in Goldstone Villas. This current setting would be obscured by the nine storey building in the north-east corner of the site. This at least partially offsets the impact of the tall buildings on the roof line of the locally listed Station pub.

However, the limited negative visual impact of tall buildings can and should be offset by the public realm improvements that the *Design and Access Statement* illustrates for Ethel Street, which improve the view of the ‘rear’ of the Hove Station Conservation Area **looking east** from Conway Street and Clarendon Road towards Goldstone Villas - see section 4 below. This is a view which the many more residents of the NP Area walking east, rather than west, experience as they walk to the station, the bus stops and taxi rank outside the Station pub.

Moreover, the Forum is in close contact with the shopkeepers in the Hove Station Conservation Area, who view the prospect of many additional customers (both residents and workers) immediately behind

their premises as a promise not a threat. The additional 226 sqm of retail will not compete adversely with businesses such as the recently arrived *Small Batch Coffee Shop* and *The Watchmakers Arms* micro-pub and the soon-to-be expanded *Wolfies of Hove* fish and chip shop.

The proposed Hove Garden development will underpin recent private investment and stimulate more owners to invest in this small, but locally popular, parade of shops in Goldstone Villas , which is a core element of the heritage assets in the Hove Station Conservation Area. It quite credible to argue that the heritage benefits of this ‘small business uplift’, which are increasingly visible, will also encourage further private investment at the rear of the shops, down in Ethel Street, facing the proposed offices and retail provision. The recent investment in the shop in Ethel Street at the bottom of the stairs from Goldstone Villas - a new shop front and planters to improve the immediate environment – provides plausible evidence.

There is apparently no visual impact evidence to support the statement by the Heritage Team that ‘...the height and massing of the tallest buildings would also be very apparent in views from the **locally listed Hove Park**’. On the contrary, the evidence of Camera 09 shows that they are obscured by the existing 19th century development at the top of Fonthill Road, which reflects the fact that most of Hove Park is in the bottom of Goldstone valley on the other side of Fonthill Road from the proposed development. The Heritage team identifies ‘some harm’ on the Denmark Street Conservation Area (Camera 06), but limited to the winter months when the mature tree at the end of Cromwell Road has shed its leaves. Whilst the tree has yet to shed its leaves, it is the Forum’s view that ‘some harm’ will be absolutely ‘minimal seasonal harm’.

There is no explanation of why the detailed methodology for the creation of the images which was in the February 2016 draft of the Design and Access Statement was omitted from the submitted version. All our comments are based on the assumption that the Design and Access Statement images are accurate.

Overall we argue that the limited harm to heritage assets will be very substantially offset by a combination of improvements to the public realm immediately west of the Hove Conservation Area and by the sustained investment in the historic buildings themselves, as the ‘small business uplift’ will be underpinned by the proposed scheme.

4. Public realm improvements

The delivery of substantial public realm improvements in the Conway Street Area is a key requirement of BHCC City Plan Part 1 Policy for DA6. This has been a major issue for the Forum from the outset of its dialogue with Matsim. Much of this discussion was focused on the relationship between the scheme and the adjacent existing development which will remain long term i.e. the rear of the (five storey) commercial buildings of the Hove Station Conservation Area in Ethel Street and the Ellen Street boundary with the Clarendon Estate to the south.

Thus the scheme proposes

- a single one-way , access only , carriage way for Conway Street from east to west;
- a building design with the potential to convert the schemes office space at ground floor level to retail on both Conway Street and Ethel Street ‘...to secure better frontage and a degree of vibrancy to the street scene’; and
- to promote the physical design of these streets on a pedestrian priority shared street system based on Woonerf principles which have been successfully applied in the Netherlands since the 1970s.

The Access and Design Statement further states (p22) that

It is also thought that there is a need to improve the stairs that link Goldstone Villas to Ethel Street. This could be in the form of resurfacing the steps and replacing the handrails, providing cycle/buggy ramps, improved lighting and art installations on the flank walls.

In contrast, the Forum is certain this improvement to the heritage assets of the NP area is absolutely essential both in terms of heritage benefit and for the economic success of the scheme.

The visual images which accompany these statements effectively communicate this range of improvements which the Forum suggested to Matsim in 2015 for pedestrian/cyclist priority Conway Street, Ethel Street and the steps up from Ethel Street to Goldstone Villas .

There is also an arresting image of a proposed new pedestrian route from Conway Street to Hove Station which the Forum proposed. This major initiative to provide access to the station from the Conway Street area for people with disabilities cannot be implemented until the bus station is re-located in a second phase of redevelopment.

However, the image also illustrates the opening up of the adjacent disused basement (formerly a bar) of the locally listed Station pub, next to the steps. This could be implemented as part of the first phase of redevelopment, if the owner was incentivized to do so by the increased trade which would be generated by implementation of the Matsim scheme. This would be an example of the further investment in heritage assets along Ethel Street which could be triggered by the Matsim scheme.

***The Access and Design Statement states (p22) that
‘It is important for the scheme that there are improvements to the public realm in this initial phase of the development. This can be dealt with through a requirement within a S106 agreement and by means of S278 to secure off site highway improvements’***

Despite this statement the Heritage Team appear dismiss these public realm proposals as ‘aspirational ‘ with limited weight in terms of public benefits.

Similarly, the Highway Authority recommends refusal, stating that in the absence of '....detailed survey information the applicant has failed to fully assess the implications of the proposed public realm improvements '. Furthermore the lack of detailed survey information and detailed layout drawings means that the applicant has also failed demonstrate that the proposed changes will not have negative knock-on consequences for the wider area .The proposed changes giving rise to this concern include the one way proposal for Conway Street, the practicality of providing an appropriate level of on-street parking with all the other necessary on-street infrastructure.

However, the Highway Authority states very clearly that the proposed public realm works are welcome but that more detailed work is needed to ensure that they can be delivered . Moreover, it argues that the proposals in the submitted Transport Assessment do not go far enough and specifies further works should be funded through the developer contribution, such as improving the area of Conway Street at the bottom of the stairs down from Goldstone Villas.

The issue for the Forum is the extent to which the public realm improvements discussed above (and apparently the subject of ongoing negotiations) will be delivered as part of this scheme, through S106 and S278 procedures.

Our position is that with the exception of the proposed new pedestrian route from Conway Street up to Hove Station, all the public realm improvements illustrated in the Design and Access Statement and those further specified by the Highway Authority, should be delivered as part of the scheme, as they will both provide offsetting heritage benefits, improve the townscape of the area immediately adjacent to the scheme boundary , and avoid adverse knock-on effects that would place a burden on further phases of the redevelopment of the Conway Street Strategic Allocation.

5. Housing provision.

The ECE Planning Statement claims that '... on the basis of the Council's failure to demonstrate a five year housing land supply the Local Development Plan is out of date in relation to those policies regarding residential development' and that the Council 'concedes ' they cannot demonstrate this supply. It thus contends that the scheme has to be assessed only in relation to the National Planning Policy Framework 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' which states that planning permission must be granted '...unless ...any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole'. But the Statement does not provide evidence of the 'failure'.

In sharp contrast, the Planning Policy comments assert that the Council is able to demonstrate a five year housing land supply, but likewise do not provide evidence. The Forum is aware that the City Plan has been up to date since March 2016 and has been informed that the necessary evidence of a 5 year supply is available in the annually up-dated Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA).

Notwithstanding this unsatisfactory contradiction, our comments are based on the view that the application should be assessed against the policies of the recently approved City Part 1 including the

policies for DA6, but also in the light of our emerging Neighbourhood Plan policies and community perspectives.

The question of who will live in the apartments is obviously very important for the Neighbourhood Forum. The Draft Neighbourhood Plan adopts the City Plan Policy target of 40% affordable housing, but the application information gives no clear indication of the scheme performance against this target in terms of the proportion of the proposed 188 residential units. However, we understand that this will be determined when the District Valuer viability assessment is available to the planning officers and the developers and the result will be incorporated in the case officer report to Planning Committee. The Forum has been excluded from these negotiations and also from the related discussion about the extent of and priorities for developer contributions to mitigate the impact of the development. This is very unsatisfactory and contrasts with another current application in the Neighbourhood Area at School Road where the planning application includes the outcome of viability assessment and S106 negotiations.

The policy of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan for DA6 South of the Railway (which is dominated by the Conway Street Strategic Allocation) is to provide for 40% affordable homes overall. Should there be a shortfall against this target, as seems likely, the further development of the Neighbourhood Plan proposals will take this into account. For example, it may be possible for the council, as landowner, to redevelop Industrial House to deliver a combination of modern commercial space and 60%- 80% affordable housing.

6. Developing a stand-alone site in a proposed comprehensive development area.

DA6 planning policy, basically written in 2012, states that the first local priority to achieve the comprehensive mixed use development strategy is

‘the preparation of guidance to promote and co-ordinate employment focused mixed use regeneration of under-used land and buildings

But over the past four years the Council has been unable to do this in advance of the move to work on City Plan Part 2, only now underway since the approval of the City Plan Part 1 in March 2016. However, in the aftermath of the collapse of the first Matsim scheme in December 2012, BHCC agreed to support Hove Station Forum to develop the necessary planning guidance via the preparation of a statutory Neighbourhood Plan – a process which has made substantial progress and is ongoing – see next section.

The Planning Policy comments state that in the absence of approved guidance for comprehensive redevelopment, individual ‘stand-alone’ sites can be developed as long as the priorities of DA6 strategic policy can be largely met and the schemes do not prejudice comprehensive redevelopment. It concludes that the proposed scheme ‘...fails to deliver a number of important priorities and improvements sought by the policy for DA6 and city-wide planning policies’, to the extent that ‘...this will place a significant burden on later ‘phases’ of redevelopment to deliver these policy requirements, which as a consequence would be unlikely to be met’ .

Other than affordable housing, the important priorities and improvements which the stand-alone scheme allegedly will fail to deliver are listed as ‘improved public realm, public open space and essential community services; and environmental, biodiversity, pedestrian and public safety improvements and sustainable neighbourhoods.

- As outlined in section 4 above, the concerns about *public realm* can be substantially met through the ongoing negotiations to deliver appropriate S106 and S278 agreements complemented by planning conditions;
- unsurprisingly on such a small site, there is no provision of *public open space*, but the needs generated can be met, at least partly, elsewhere in DA6 South funded by the Council securing the relevant £ 480,000 developer contribution; moreover, there is generous provision of private open space and associated exceptionally high quality green elements which fully meet DA6 requirements
- the failures in essential *community services* are not clear, but could also be dealt with at least in part, through developer contributions;
- the failures to deliver *environmental and biodiversity improvement* are also not made clear, but in any event the high ecological design standards, including roof and balcony planting must substantially offset any perceived limitations;
- the failures to improve *pedestrian and public safety* can and should be remedied by an effective response to the Highway Authority requirements discussed in Section 3 above

Finally, in simply repeating criticism set out elsewhere in the report, the Planning Policy comments on *Sustainable Neighbourhoods* fail to acknowledge that

- notwithstanding some inevitable disruption during the construction period (which planning conditions can and should ensure will be minimized), the scheme will radically improve the immediate environment of the 300 households living in the adjacent 10 story tower blocks, the majority of who are council tenants; and
- the scheme will improve the quality of life of the many local residents who currently have to walk through the area to access the station, bus stops and shops. This is especially the case for residents north of the railway who are unable to use the station footbridge and have to use the decidedly Conway Street and steps on their route to local services.

In sum, and subject to a positive outcome of the ongoing negotiations about developer contributions, the Forum takes the view that the scheme will substantially meet the strategic priorities of DA6 policy

7. Neighbourhood planning progress towards ‘Master Plan’ guidance

In the determination of the application it is essential that any ‘failures’ are set against the huge benefits which derive from the particular characteristics of this stand-alone site as the logical place to kick-start the process of comprehensive redevelopment

- it is at the eastern edge the Conway Street Strategic Allocation (rather than, say, in the middle), adjacent to the existing sustainable transport provision, shops and community facilities
- it is small site – only 0.4 hectare within the 3.44 hectare Conway Street Strategic Allocation – about 12% of the total key site
- unlike most of the rest of the strategic allocation it is deliverable now, whereas most of the rest of the allocation cannot deliver development for some time

Thus the Forum’s view is that the scheme will fit into the area and will not substantially prejudice comprehensive redevelopment of the wider area. . On the contrary it will provide the stimulus for both private and public sector to invest the resources to deliver comprehensive redevelopment.

Thus the Forum believes that this application should be treated as a ‘special case’ .

But a crucial investment which is needed extremely urgently is in the resources required to establish a process which will deliver a ‘master plan’ - a framework within which individual landowners can bring forward development further proposals over time.

The Forum has made significant progress towards such a comprehensive development framework.

Since our first Forum meeting in January 2013, through a process governed by monthly meetings of an elected Management Committee we have delivered

- statutory designation by BHCC of the first Neighbourhood Forum and Neighbourhood Area in the city at the end of 2014
- substantial community engagement in the development of a vision and strategic policies for the comprehensive and integrated redevelopment of DA6 both north and south of the railway – thus establishing an emerging Neighbourhood Plan in July 2016 to deliver a new mixed use Hove Station Quarter
- significant community-led inputs to the pre-application phase of the second Matsim scheme
- and collaborative preliminary work, with Matsim as major landowner, on the development of an outline Concept Plan /Master Plan for the phased redevelopment of DA6 south of the railway - as illustrated in the Hove Garden Design and Accesss Statement
- independent urban design consultancy resources from AECOM, funded by the DCLG Supporting Communities in Neighbourhood Planning regime, to integrate and extend all this work and deliver the October 2016 *Hove Station Quarter Concept Plan and Options Study*
- a dialogue with the Bus Company to
 - assess the feasibility of the re-location of the garage facility to the western end of the Conway Street Strategic Allocation
 - enable pre-application discussion of the proposal to develop the bus park immediately adjoining the Matsim application Furniture Village site for company offices
- an initial dialogue with the City Architect about the redevelopment of Industrial House immediately opposite the proposed bus company office site, possibly in collaboration with Matsim redevelopment of the Agora

With regard to the wider DA6 area we have delivered

- a collaborative working relationship with Mountpark Properties, (acting for the major land owner north of the railway) to achieve
 - the imminent withdrawal of the Coal Yard waste management allocation and
 - a pre-application dialogue on an upcoming major mixed use Sackville regeneration project north of the railway
- an initial dialogue with La Salle/Mountpark about the long term future of the Clarks Industrial Estate north of the railway and
- successful lobbying for the first stakeholders meeting, chaired by Nick Hibberd on September 20th, to identify a process for collaborative working, initially in DA6 south of the railway, but also in the acknowledged context of the NP vision of a holistic and integrated redevelopment of DA6 to establish Hove Station Quarter

The current Matsim application highlights the **urgent need** to build on this work to establish the ‘master plan’ guidance necessary to enable a range of private and public landowners to bring forward further parcels of development which can be delivered in ways which secure the obvious advantages of comprehensive redevelopment, and thus be compliant with the recently approved City Plan part 1 and the be built into the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.

Given the need to respond to complex but very pressing development pressures and thus avoid missing the current window of opportunity, this guidance needs to be developed within a very few months, through an accelerated development of the recently established stakeholder working.

At the first stakeholder meeting a month ago, it was made clear that the council lacked the resources to do anything more than facilitate stakeholder collaboration and continue limited support for the development of the Neighbourhood Plan. However, on October 11th, the council was notified that its £280,500 bid to the One Public Estate Programme has been successful. This presents a **new opportunity** for the council to allocate the modest resources necessary to supplement those of private and public landowners and the Forum and create a process for developing the necessary guidance by the early New Year.

7. RECOMMENDATION

The Forum strongly recommends that

- subject to the delivery of public realm and other improvements this application is **approved** as an exceptional case, given its capacity to kickstart the regeneration of Hove Station Quarter; and
- the Council draws on the One Public Estate Programme for the resources needed to establish joint stakeholder working which will provide appropriate planning guidance for the Conway Street Strategic allocation, as a component of the Hove Station Neighbourhood Plan.

APPENDIX

Hove Station Neighbourhood Forum

STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT – HOVE GARDENS DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS.

During the summer and Autumn of 2015 the Forum's Technical Team (see Appendix) together with Robert Glick, the Convenor of the Community Engagement Working Group, had three informal meetings with the Matsim team on July 22nd, August 19th and September 16th. This dialogue enabled us to comment on and influence the evolving proposals and to subsequently include a public exhibition of the draft proposals at our fourth Have Your Day on November 21st which had over 130 participants.

The dialogue focused exclusively on the physical design aspects of the scheme and did not specifically address housing tenure and price. The issue of the proportion of affordable housing will be a key concern of the council and it is a major issue for the ongoing development of the Neighbourhood Plan which will be addressed at our next Have Your Say Day in May.

This note draws on notes of the meetings prepared by Matsim to summarise the points which were discussed, with particular reference to the issues raised by the Forum from the perspective of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. The Forum strongly supports Matsim's strategy of developing the Hove Gardens project as the initial phase of the eventual comprehensive redevelopment City Plan DA6 which is south of the railway.

Thus the specific design principles the Forum supports include

- The importance of scheme as an exemplar of high design standards which would be maintained in subsequent phases
- A high density mixed use development which is consistent with the emerging Neighbourhood Plan vision of DA6 as a new Hove Station Quarter, focused on a sustainable transport hub
 - A variety of medium to high rise blocks with a variety of materials used to provide visual diversity
 - A 'signature' high rise building including exceptionally well designed top storeys which could be seen from the surrounding area and approaches and would contribute to the sense of place of the ne Hove Statio Quarter
- Keeping the existing street pattern, with pedestrian priority for Ethel Steet and Conway Street and providing a courtyard in the centre of the development
- The building line generally at the back of pavement

- Ground level commercial/retail frontages along Ethel Street and Conway Street
- The importance of ‘greening’ the area including a high level of public realm landscaping and roof top gardens and the highest possible standards of energy efficiency
- A reduction in car parking provision and the inclusion of a car club

The Forum emphasised, and Matsim agreed, the importance of the relationship of the site to the Hove Station Conservation Area, including:

- The need and opportunity to improve the east side of Ethel Street and thus the view of the rear of the Hove Station Conservation Area from the proposed development
- An upgrade of the stairs from Ethel Street which provides the existing pedestrian access to the Conservation Area
- The location of the tallest blocks to the west of the site furthest away from the Conservation Area to minimise the impact of the changes to the setting of the Conservation Area

Similarly the Forum emphasised, and Matsim agreed,

- the importance of the relationship of the site to the Clarendon Road estate, which is currently being improved by the Council:
- the design should allow for the possibility of the demolition and replacement of the low rise dwellings and garages between the 10 story towers, as part of the overall comprehensive redevelopment of the area Matsim agreed that it may well be possible to facilitate such a scheme by offering rehousing opportunities in the affordable dwellings within the Hove Gardens project.

Overall the Forum had a productive dialogue with Matsim which enabled us to draw on our understanding of the views of the local community as they have emerged in our community engagement work since Spring 2013.

At the Have Your Say Day in November 2014 we provided a questionnaire which was designed to elicit views about the emerging Neighbourhood Plan Vision, the issues the NP needs to address and initial planning principles and policies which we would seek to apply to guide the development of DA6.

A total of 19 participants (a 15% response) completed the questionnaire and many included comments on the Hove Garden proposals and others voiced their views to members of the Forum Management Committee. The concerns expressed about Hove Gardens focused on the following issues:

- The level of affordable housing which would enable some local people rather than additional commuters to benefit from the scheme – the need for social rented housing especially for key workers
- The lack of public green space
- The apartment blocks would be too high – 9 storeys maximum
- The retail provision would adversely affect ‘struggling’ George Street

- The apparent lack of car sufficient car parking and the impact of cars getting in and out of the site on the existing roads and the impact on traffic down Sackville Road and at the Fonthill Road – Newtown Road junction
- The absence of community facilities

Professor Mike Gibson

HSNF Neighbourhood Plan Co-ordinator March 29th 2016

Hove Station Neighbourhood Forum Technical Team

Professor Mike Gibson BA DipTP MSc MRTPI AoU

Mike lives in Fonthill Road and is the Hove Station Neighbourhood Plan Co-ordinator. He is Emeritus Professor of Urban Planning, London South Bank University, where he was responsible for planning education and research from 1986 to 1996 and then Director of the Local Economy Policy Unit. He has been self-employed since 2001. During the 1980s he was a nationally elected member of the Royal Town Planning Council. For over forty years he has specialised in planning for neighbourhood regeneration. He has authored many major consultancy reports for government and voluntary sector agencies and published extensively in books and academic/professional journals. Since 2012 he has focused on neighbourhood planning, including providing consultancy support for the development of four Neighbourhood Plans.

Dipl.Ing. Helmut Lusser, Dip TP, MRTPI (Ret), MIEnvSc; Management committee member dealing primarily with planning policy and the relationship between the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and the City Plan.

Helmut is a local resident of Hove Park Villas. He chairs Hove Civic Society and sustainability consultancy Global to Local Ltd and was elected to sit on the policy council of the Town and Country Planning Association from 2011-2015. He has worked extensively on planning and environmental issues within local government in London and as a consultant UK and Europe wide. His committee appointments included advising the Secretary of the State for the Environment on Environmental Management and Audit for Local Government. He gained a reputation for being able to green up local government through his work for the London Borough of Sutton.

Stuart Croucher

Stuart lives in Fonthill Road. He is an Urban Designer and Transport Planner with over twenty years' experience and an extensive track record of developing, designing and delivering award-winning cutting-edge, streetscape improvement projects, with particular focus on the development, design and delivery of gateways and interchanges outside rail stations. His areas of expertise include urban realm improvements, policy writing, public consultation and town planning, as well as traffic management, bus priority, cycling and pedestrian projects. He is a design review panellist for Urban Design London, has provided training for Urban Design London and the PTRC, has published articles in the trade press and is a regular public speaker at national conferences.

Nigel Richardson Chair, Hove Station Neighbourhood Forum Management Committee .CEO of Custom Pharmaceuticals, Conway Street.

Jon Turner Vice-chair, Hove Station Neighbourhood Forum Management Committee. Architect and developer Wilbury Road

David Kemp Architect Hove Park Villas. Member, Hove Station Forum Management Committee