

Planning Committee 6 May 2020 – Member Questions

<p>Item A: BH2020/00470 Carden Avenue, Opposite 3 And 4 Dale Drive Brighton</p>		
1	<p>Can you please tell me what alternative sites were being looked at?</p>	<p>No alternative sites were considered. This is because it was considered preferable to minimise the number of masts in the area by upgrading an existing site rather than creating an additional site.</p> <p>This approach is encouraged by the NPPF para 113 and The Code of Best Practice for Mobile Phone Network Development (England) 2016.</p> <p>The applicant has confirmed that the current site was selected using the following sequential approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upgrading their own existing base stations; • Using existing telecommunications structures belonging to another communications operator. i.e. Mast and/ or site sharing, co-location; • Installations on existing high buildings or structures including National Grid pylons; • Using small scale equipment; and finally • Erecting a new ground-based mast site – (1st) Camouflaging or disguising equipment. (2nd) A conventional installation e.g. a lattice mast and compound.
2	<p>Is there a better picture of the proposed mast in the surrounding area?</p>	<p>There are no other proposed drawings or visualisations included with the application.</p>
3	<p>Could the applicant be asked to plant more trees</p>	<p>Yes – Members could attach a condition requiring the applicant to submit and implement a landscaping scheme if the application is to</p>

	on site.	be approved. The applicant would be agreeable to this.
<p>Item B: BH2020/00325 Avon Court, 12 Dallington Road, Hove</p>		
1	Are there any visuals of the proposals beyond just the schematics that are in the presentation?	No visuals were submitted with the application. For a scheme of this scale it would be unusual to receive visuals.
2	Councillor Nemeth's submission is missing in the report.	Circulated to Members on the 29 th April
3	Were Residents consulted on this?	Consultation took place during the application consistent with the Council's requirements.
4	Are there any other roof alterations, front dormers, or rear extensions in this Road?	Of the 18 properties on the road, there are full-width box dormers to the rear of nos. 6, 7, 11 and 15 and a slightly smaller extension at no. 9. It is also worth noting that there is a full-width box dormer at 61 Grange Road visible at the west end of the road.
<p>Item C: BH2019/02055 10 Gladstone Terrace, Brighton</p>		
1	Does the room on the third floor exist already? There's no dormer, or proposal for one?	The bedroom on the third floor does exist. There is a rooflight as shown on the plans. There is no proposal for a dormer window. The existing plans show the pre-existing arrangement as a 3no bedroom flat (C3) and the proposed plans show the existing arrangement as a 6no bedroom HMO (C4). This is because the application is retrospective.
2	How much weight has the Article Four direction restricting the conversion of single dwelling houses to HMO's?	Planning permission is not normally required to convert a family house into a shared house or HMO for up to six people. However in five wards of the city, the council introduced an 'Article 4 Direction' in

		<p>April 2013 which removes permitted development rights. The property is located in one of the five wards (Hanover and Elm Grove) which means that planning permission is required to change the use from a single dwelling house (C3 use class) to a 6no bedroom small house in multiple occupation (C4 use class).</p> <p>The Article 4 does not influence the consideration of the application but the requirement to submit an application. The planning application has assessed the main considerations as outlined within the report and has recommended approval of the application.</p>
<p>Item D: BH2020/00240 2C Lansdowne Place</p>		
1	<p>Councillor Clare refers to the upcoming expansion of the Article 4 direction but my understanding is that that isn't relevant here, because the application is for a 7-bed sui generis HMO which would require planning permission anyway. Could this be confirmed?</p>	<p>This is correct. The Article 4 direction applies only to changes of use that would otherwise be permitted development. There are no permitted development rights for changing from C3 to Sui Generis large HMO.</p>
2	<p>Resident feedback suggests this property has been used as a short term/holiday/party let. If this property were to be used consistently as a holiday let for 7 people, would this be considered a change of use from sui generis HMO?</p>	<p>Holiday lets can fall under the use class C3, which is the current use class. If 'Change of Use to Sui Generis HMO for 7 people' is approved by the committee and implemented the C3 use would no longer be authorised. Any other use would require planning permission.</p>
3	<p>Is this property listed?</p>	<p>No. The building was constructed following permission being granted in 2004. It is however located in a Conservation Area</p>

4	Is 23 sq. m of communal enough for up to 14 occupants as rooms all shown as double?	This is addressed in the report. In addition, recommended condition 4 restricts the number of occupiers to 7.
5	Is there any outdoor amenity space for such a large, intensively used house?	The property, being located in the city centre, in common with many other properties in the area, does not have a garden. However there is a small area of forecourt at basement level although this is not directly accessible from the basement level accommodation.
6	Can the HMO map be included in the presentation?	This has been added to the presentation.
<p>Item E: BH2020/00215 23 Trafalgar Street</p>		
1	Could we have clearer slides with some narration or commentary on them?	Changes made to the presentation.
2	What is the difference to the shop front as not clear on the photo?	The shopfront would be replaced with one that features a recessed doorway, a painted timber fascia board, panelled stallriser, large 'glass plate' window, a ramp and shop shutters (a thin-framed roller grille over the shopfront window and a demountable security grille over the entrance door). Separate access to the existing maisonette and proposed A1/A4 unit would also be provided.
3	It is not clear where the external area mentioned is or how it will be used, is it only accessed from inside?	The external patio to the rear is a significant part of the application and therefore cannot be considered in isolation. Undoubtedly there would be a noise impact from the use of the rear area, however, officers feel submit to the suggested conditions, the level of harm is not sufficient to warrant refusal of the application particularly as the requirement to cease use at 18.00 means it would not be in use during anti-social hours or when nearby residents would be expected to be sleeping.

4	What about concerns raised about the garden space during weekends and sunny days too.	Environmental Health commented, as a consultee, on this application, have raised no objection to the application.
5	Can the application be granted without the external use? Probably not in which case I don't see how noise etc wont impact on other residents	The external area is to the rear of the building and is solely accessed from inside at lower ground floor level. It will be used exclusively by patrons of the proposed A1/A4 premises.

