

<b><u>No:</u></b>	<b>BH2021/01735</b>	<b><u>Ward:</u></b>	<b>Queen's Park Ward</b>
<b><u>App Type:</u></b>	<b>Full Planning</b>		
<b><u>Address:</u></b>	<b>1-3 Bedford Street Brighton BN2 1AN</b>		
<b><u>Proposal:</u></b>	<b>Conversion of existing garages to form 2no two bedroom houses incorporating first floor extensions with front balconies and associated works.</b>		
<b><u>Officer:</u></b>	Rebecca Smith, tel: 291075	<b><u>Valid Date:</u></b>	11.05.2021
<b><u>Con Area:</u></b>	East Cliff	<b><u>Expiry Date:</u></b>	06.07.2021
<b><u>Listed Building Grade:</u></b>	N/A	<b><u>EOT:</u></b>	
<b><u>Agent:</u></b>	Turner Associates 19A Wilbury Avenue Hove BN3 6HS		
<b><u>Applicant:</u></b>	Acctive Systems Ltd Unit 10 Redland Centre Redlands Coulsdon CR5 2HT		

## 1. RECOMMENDATION

- 1.1. That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out below and resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the following Conditions and Informatives:

Conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings listed below.

**Reason:** For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

<b>Plan Type</b>	<b>Reference</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Date Received</b>
Proposed Drawing	17		28 June 2021
Location and block plan	03		11 May 2021
Proposed Drawing	10	A	28 June 2021
Proposed Drawing	11	B	28 June 2021
Proposed Drawing	12	B	28 June 2021
Proposed Drawing	13	B	28 June 2021
Proposed Drawing	14		11 May 2021
Proposed Drawing	15		11 May 2021
Proposed Drawing	16		11 May 2021
Proposed Drawing	23		11 May 2021

2. The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

**Reason:** To ensure that the Local Planning Authority retains the right to review unimplemented permissions.

3. No development above ground floor slab level of any part of the development hereby permitted shall take place until samples of all materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development have been submitted

to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, including (where applicable):

- a) Details of all render and tiling (including details of the colour of render/paintwork to be used)
- b) Details of the proposed window, door and balcony treatments
- c) Details of all other materials to be used externally

Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

**Reason:** To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to comply with policies HE6 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and CP15 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One.

4. The window and door openings for the proposed dwellings shall not be constructed until detailed 1:20 scale elevations and sections of the windows, doors and balustrades have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall then be carried out and retained in accordance with the approved details.

**Reason:** In the interests of the character and appearance of the buildings and the visual amenities of the area and to comply with policies HE6 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and CP15 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One.

5. No cables, wires, aerials, pipework (except rainwater downpipes as shown on the approved plans), meter boxes or flues shall be fixed to any elevation facing a highway.

**Reason:** To safeguard the appearance of the building and the visual amenities of the locality and to comply with policy HE6 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and CP15 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One.

6. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the redundant vehicle crossover in front of the development site has been converted back to a footway by raising the existing kerb and footway.

**Reason:** In the interests of highway safety and to comply with policies TR7 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan and CP9 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One.

7. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the cycle parking facilities shown on the ground floor of the approved plans have been fully implemented and made available for use. The ground floor cycle parking facilities shall thereafter be retained for use by the occupants of, and visitors to, the development at all times.

**Reason:** To ensure that satisfactory facilities for the parking of cycles are provided and to encourage travel by means other than private motor vehicles and to comply with policy TR14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and SPD14: Parking Standards.

8. A bee brick shall be incorporated within the external wall of the development hereby approved and shall be retained thereafter.

**Reason:** To enhance the biodiversity of the site and to comply with Policy CP10 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One and Supplementary Planning Document SPD11 Nature Conservation and Development.

### Informatives:

1. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy SS1 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One the approach to making a decision on this planning application has been to apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Local Planning Authority seeks to approve planning applications which are for sustainable development where possible.
2. The applicant is advised to contact the Council's Streetworks Team (permit.admin@brighton-hove.gov.uk 01273 290729) for necessary highway approval from the Highway Authority prior to any works commencing on the adopted highway to satisfy the requirements of the condition.
3. Where possible, bee bricks should be placed in a south facing wall in a sunny location at least 1 metre above ground level.

## **2. SITE LOCATION**

- 2.1. The application site comprises of 4no garages to the western side of Bedford Street. The garages are located behind Grade II listed properties fronting Marine Parade and opposite Grade II listed properties on the western side of Bedford Street. The garages themselves are single storey over basement.
- 2.2. The site falls within the East Cliff conservation area. The site is not covered by any Article 4 Direction relevant to what is applied for in this application.

## **3. RELEVANT HISTORY**

- 3.1. No relevant history for application site, however it is noted that nos. 4 and 5 Bedford Street are on the site of former building that were demolished to make way for what is there now, application details below.

### 4-5a Bedford Street

- 3.2. **BH1998/00020/FP** - Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 2x2 storey dwelling houses. Approved 02.06.1998
- 3.3. **BH1998/00021/CA** - Demolition of existing buildings. Approved 02.06.1998

## **4. APPLICATION DESCRIPTION**

- 4.1. The application seeks planning permission to convert the existing garage block with the addition of a first-floor extension to create 2no two-bedroom town houses with retained basements.
- 4.2. The drawings have been amended to address consultee comments from transport and heritage and to provide contextual information regarding surrounding buildings.

## 5. REPRESENTATIONS

5.1. **Eleven (11)** letter has been received objecting to the proposed development for the following reasons:

- Detrimental effect on property value
- Inappropriate height of development
- Increased Noise
- Overshadowing and loss of daylight/sunlight
- Restriction of view
- Appears to have a terrace/balcony to the side elevation
- Loss of privacy
- Development should not be allowed to be used for Airbnb purposes
- Proposals are not in keeping with other properties within the street
- Too close to boundary
- Additional traffic and congestion
- Construction would be close to a Grade II listed building
- Adversely affects conservation area
- Loss of garages would increase demand for parking
- The development will generate an on-street vehicle parking demand.
- Does not complement existing heritage assets
- No communication from developer about plans
- Additional storey would be within 2 metres of neighbouring windows
- Neighbouring garden would be overshadowed
- Poor design
- Overdevelopment
- Creates a terrace of properties
- Removes access to roof/ rear of property for repairs

5.2. It is noted that one of the above objections has been received from outside of the Brighton and Hove area.

5.3. The **Conservation Advisory Group (CAG)** have reviewed the proposals and have recommended that the application is refused with the following comments:

- The design and style are harmful in relation to nearby listed buildings
- The contemporary design and style are harmful to the character of the area and the streetscene
- A similar style to numbers 4 and 5 would be preferred.

## 6. CONSULTATIONS

6.1. **Environmental Health:** No comment received

6.2. **Heritage:** No objection

First Comment - 3rd June 2021:

The existing garages are not of any integral significance, though they reflect the historic service scale and character of the west side of the street. The principle of 2 storeys houses on the west side has been established at numbers, 4, 5 and

6a and further 2 storey houses on this site would continue to be subservient to the original terrace on the east side, including the 4 storey listed buildings at 17 and 18, and would be subservient to the grand listed seafront buildings at 76a, 77 and 78 Marine Parade and there would remain an appropriate physical and visual gap between the new houses and the rear of number 78. The general character of the street scene would be preserved.

- 6.3. The height of the proposed houses in relation to number 4 suitably reflects the gently sloping topography. The contemporary design of the houses, but incorporating the pilaster and parapet detailing from the garages and garage style ground floor openings, is considered to be generally contextually appropriate. However, the relationship of solid to void is overly tilted towards void and does not sufficiently respect the traditional hierarchy of floors. It is suggested that this could be overcome by making the first-floor balcony doors into double door width only.

Second Comment - 23rd June 2021:

- 6.4. The amended plans satisfactorily address the previous comments, though it is noted that an amended East Elevation drawing has not been submitted. Subject to that approval is recommended subject to conditions regarding materials, details of doors and windows and that elevations facing a highway are free of clutter.

- 6.5. **Housing Strategy :** No comment received

- 6.6. **Private Sector Housing:** No comments to make

- 6.7. **Sustainable Transport:** Unable to recommend approval

First Comment - 2nd June 2021:

- 6.8. The applicant is proposing cycle parking to only be provided in the basement for both the proposed units, this is not accepted in accordance with SPD14. The cycle parking should be revised. No car parking is provided for the dwellings and the application site is within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). CPZ C is considered to be under stress with a parking permit uptake of 94% (averaged). The applicant should provide analysis to demonstrate that there is capacity for a parking demand generated by the development.

- 6.9. Pedestrian access to the site is level and acceptable. In the applicant's supportive letter it states that the existing garages were used for private parking but this has ceased recently, therefore their change of use is acceptable and unlikely to result in an increase in trips to the site, therefore no objection.

- 6.10. The loss of the garages would leave the existing vehicle crossover redundant and therefore this should be conditioned to be removed.

Second Comment - 25th June 2021:

- 6.11. The applicant is proposing one cycle parking space in a store on ground level of each dwelling. This is acceptable being in line with Parking Standards SPD14

and their implementation may be conditioned. However, the parking objection above remains.

## **7. MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

- 7.1. In accordance with Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, this decision has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the National Planning Policy Framework, the Development Plan, and all other material planning considerations identified in the "Considerations and Assessment" section of the report
- 7.2. The development plan is:
- Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One (adopted March 2016)
  - Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005 (retained policies March 2016);
  - East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Plan (adopted February 2013);
  - East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Sites Plan (adopted February 2017);
  - Shoreham Harbour JAAP (adopted October 2019).
- 7.3. Due weight has been given to the relevant retained policies in the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005 according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF.

## **8. POLICIES**

### The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

#### Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One

SS1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

CP1 Housing delivery

CP9 Sustainable transport

CP10 Biodiversity

CP12 Urban design

CP13 Public streets and spaces

CP14 Housing density

CP15 Heritage

CP19 Housing mix

#### Brighton and Hove Local Plan (retained policies March 2016):

TR7 Safe Development

TR14 Cycle access and parking

SU9 Pollution and nuisance control

SU10 Noise Nuisance

QD5 Design – street frontages

QD14 Extensions and alterations

QD27 Protection of amenity

HO5 Provision of private amenity space in residential development

HE3 Development affecting the setting of a listed building

HE6 Development within or affecting the setting of conservation areas

### Brighton & Hove City Plan Part Two

Policies in the Proposed Submission City Plan Part Two do not carry full statutory weight but are gathering weight as the Plan proceeds through its stages. They provide an indication of the direction of future policy. Since 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2020, when the Plan was agreed for submission to the Secretary of State, it has gained weight for the determination of planning applications.

DM1 Housing, Accommodation and Community

DM20 Protection of Amenity

DM21 Extensions and alterations

DM26 Conservation Areas

DM29 The Setting of Heritage Assets

DM33 Safe, Sustainable and Active Travel

DM40 Protection of the Environment and Health – Pollution and Nuisance

### Supplementary Planning Documents:

SPD11 Nature Conservation & Development

SPD12 Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations

SPD14 Parking Standards

## **9. CONSIDERATIONS & ASSESSMENT**

- 9.1. The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to the principle of development and the loss of the garages, the design and appearance of the proposals, the impacts of the proposals on the East Cliff conservation area and nearby listed buildings, the standards of accommodation for the proposed residential units, the impact on neighbouring amenity and transport matters.
- 9.2. A site visit has taken place for this application, with the application viewed from the public footway in Bedford Street. This has informed the assessment of the proposals alongside a desktop assessment using streetview and aerial photograph of the site in addition to the photographs provided in the submission. The agent has also provided updated plans to inform the context and neighbouring buildings.

### **Principle of Development:**

- 9.3. Policy CP1 sets out the housing targets for the plan period with a provision target of 13,200 new homes for the city up to 2030. The council's most recent housing land supply position against this minimum target was published in the SHLAA Update 2020 and shows a five-year housing supply shortfall of 342 (equivalent to 4.7 years of housing supply).
- 9.4. However, on 24 March 2021 the City Plan Part One reached five years since adoption. National planning policy states that where strategic policies are more than five years old, local housing need calculated using the Government's standard method should be used in place of the local plan housing requirement. In addition, following an amendment to the standard method set out in national planning practice guidance, from 16 June 2021 onwards Brighton & Hove is

required to apply an additional 35% uplift as one of the top 20 cities in the urban centres list.

- 9.5. The local housing need figure for Brighton & Hove using the standard method (including the 35% uplift) is 2,331 homes per year which gives a five-year housing supply shortfall of 6,604 (equivalent to 2.2 years of housing supply).
- 9.6. As the council is currently unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply, increased weight should be given to housing delivery when considering the planning balance in the determination of planning applications, in line with the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the NPPF (paragraph 11).
- 9.7. In terms of the overall change of use, the principle is supported as it would make a small contribution to the city's housing targets. The proposed units would have the same footprint as existing with an upward extension and would be accessed directly from the public footway.
- 9.8. The LPA is not aware of any commercial use of these garages and the photographs submitted do not suggest that there has been any recent commercial activity. Furthermore, it does not appear that the Council has collected any business rates from the garages. These garages seem to have been for private storage or parking purposes.
- 9.9. Accordingly, subject to all other matters being acceptable the principle of development is supportable.

**Design and Appearance:**

- 9.10. The proposed redevelopment of the garages into dwellings involves the retention of some of the garage styling and this has been used to inform the design of the proposals.
- 9.11. As stated in the Planning Statement, the contemporary design of the proposed dwellings has been presented to reflect the historic commercial use of the garages further confirmed by the Heritage Officer. Although the Heritage Officer was largely content with the contemporary design of the properties an amendment to the width of the glazing serving the balconies on the east elevation was requested and made to the proposals. Therefore, contemporary design of the houses, but incorporating the pilaster and parapet detailing from the garages and garage style ground floor openings, is considered to be generally contextually appropriate.
- 9.12. Furthermore, the deviation in style from that of numbers 4 and 5 is not considered significantly harmful to the area or the street. The buildings that existed on the neighbouring site prior to conversion were not garages as they are here. By retaining the garage proportions at ground floor and detailing, the overall design, although counterparty helps to tell the history of the area with a slightly more 'commercial' appearance to the proposed dwellings.



- 9.13. Turing attention to the rear of the proposals and the overall height, it is noted that the proposal has a roof form which is influenced by that of numbers 4 and 5 Bedford street with a 45-degree slop at the rear. It is further noted that the proposal is stepped down in height from that of number 4 and 5. The step down together with the sloping roof lessen the overbearing and overshadowing impacts of the proposed upward extension. In terms of overbearing it is further noted that the only windows within the development are to the east elevation (facing the street).
- 9.14. It is noted that a number of the objection comments refer to a balcony and windows shown in drawings of the southern elevation (both proposed and existing). This is an existing feature of the urban landscape (of another property - 6A Bedford Street) and does not form part of the development site.
- 9.15. In terms of the materials to be used in the design, the walls are proposed to be painted rendered masonry and the roof is proposed to be comprised of natural slate for the rear pitched roof and mastic asphalt for the flat roof. The doors and windows would be painted timber windows. These materials are considered suitable materials that would not cause harm to the wider area. It is noted that the heritage team have requested door and window details and details of the materials to be agreed by condition.

Impact on heritage assets:

- 9.16. In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the Council has a statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Moreover, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development in a conservation area the Council has a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area.
- 9.17. Case law has held that the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses, and the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation should be given "considerable importance and weight".
- 9.18. Although the development site is not listed it is noted that the proposed dwellings would be sited close to the Grade II listed building on Marine Parade, however as noted in the Heritage Officer comments the development would retain an important physical and visual gap between the proposed dwellings and the listed buildings of Marine Parade. It further noted that the addition of a first floor would obscure views of the rear of these properties, but it is not considered to cause significantly harm to their appearance or setting. The important and more grand front elevation of the listed buildings would be unaffected by the proposals.
- 9.19. Accordingly, the proposed design would be appropriate for the site and not have a significantly harmful impact on the street scene, neighbouring buildings or the East Cliff conservation area in accordance with policies HE6 and QD14 of the Local Plan and CP12 and CP15 of the City Plan Part One (and emerging policies DM26, DM29

**Standard of Accommodation:**

- 9.20. It is noted that the proposals have a similar layout to the neighbouring development approved in 1998 which has been built out, but that this would provide the living space at first floor level and bedrooms at ground floor with ancillary basement space.
- 9.21. The 'Nationally Described Space Standards' (NDSS) were introduced by the Department for Communities and Local Government in 2015 to establish acceptable minimum floor space for new build developments. Although these space standards have not been formally adopted into the Brighton & Hove City Plan, policy DM1 of CPP2 proposes to adopt them and can now be given significant weight.
- 9.22. The new residential units would provide a gross internal area (GIA) of approximately 87m<sup>2</sup> and 107m<sup>2</sup> respectively. Both properties would be laid out to provide 2-bedroom, 3 person dwellings and would exceed the minimum for this level of occupation. This GIA is measured in conjunction with a qualitative assessment of the usability of the total space in terms of layout and circulation (including when furnished with standard furniture), and the provision of natural light and outlook to determine if a good standard of accommodation would be enjoyed by future residents.
- 9.23. Unit 1 (southern dwelling, shown in red on the plans) would have the smaller basement footprint and allow for a utility area and storage or refuse & recycling and a secondary bicycle area is desired.
- 9.24. At ground and first floor levels the habitable rooms are provided with the bedrooms and bathrooms on the ground floor and the kitchen/living and dining space on the first floor. There would be a principal bedroom with an ensuite this would have a combined GIA of 15.5sqm and the second bedroom would be 7.8sqm in size. The living space on the first floor would be just over 30sqm in size not including the external balcony footprint. It is noted that the sloping roof would impact on the usability of the space but the indicative layout with the kitchen to the rear of the space and the living/dining areas toward the front is beneficial in term of the partial reduced head height and availability of natural light from the proposed windows.
- 9.25. Unit 2 (northern dwelling, shown in green on the plans) would have the larger basement area and as with Unit 1 this would provide a utility space, refuse and recycling storage and secondary bicycle storage but as this is larger it would also be capable of being used as storage and as a gym or other ancillary space not dependant on natural light.
- 9.26. Similarly, as with Unit 1 the habitable rooms are at ground and first floor. The layout is identical with slightly different room sizes. Again, the principal bedroom would be ensuite and have a combined GIA of 14sqm and the second bedroom would be 7.5sqm. The living space on the first floor would be just under 28sqm in size not including the external balcony footprint. Again, it is noted that the sloping roof would impact on the usability of the space but the indicative layout

with the kitchen to the rear of the space and the living/dining areas toward the front is beneficial in term of the partial reduced head height and availability of natural light from the proposed windows.

- 9.27. Both new dwellings would have good outlook and access to natural light and ventilation from the proposed windows and that the basement level would benefit from some natural light from sunlight tunnels. Although the dwellings are single (east) aspect this is not considered to be detrimental as the windows are large and have been designed to serve the living and bedroom areas. Although it is not ideal to have a bathroom without windows this would not be a reason for refusal that could be sustained in the overall proposal. It is noted that none of the flats created under this permission would have access to gardens but that balconies overlooking the street are part of the design. While the balconies would not provide any private outdoor space for future residents it is accepted that the proposals make the best use of the available space. It is noted that the development is not far from the seafront.
- 9.28. Accordingly, the development is considered to provide a good standard of accommodation for future residents and is acceptable in terms of polices QD27 and HO5 of the Local Plan and emerging polices DM1 and DM27 of the City Plan Part Two.

**Impact on Amenity:**

- 9.29. Policy QD27 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and emerging Policy DM20 of City Plan Part 2 (which can be given significant weight) state that planning permission for any development or change of use will not be granted where it would cause material nuisance and loss of amenity to the proposed, existing and/or adjacent users, residents, occupiers or where it is liable to be detrimental to human health.
- 9.30. The application has received a number of objections from adjoining residents. In terms of amenity impact these can be loosely grouped into three main concerns; loss of daylight/sunlight, overlooking/loss of privacy and the structure being overbearing and reducing outlook.
- 9.31. In terms of the loss of daylight and sunlight it is acknowledged that there would be some change in natural light to the rear windows at no. 78 Marine Parade, however this would not mean that habitable rooms are significantly affected. The revised floorplan, including the layout of 78 Marine Parade demonstrate that although northern windows of the rear projection of the building would be affected over ground and first floor levels, the rooms do have other windows that are not in the north elevation. The basement may also be slightly affected but given that there is already a high wall between the application site and no. 78 this together with the roof form is unlikely to result in significant harm in terms of daylight or sunlight.
- 9.32. The proposal would involve some loss of outlook, particularly to the first floor of no 78 Marine Parade, but again although the rear outrigger is affected by this development it has other windows which can provide outlook. There would also

be some impact on outlook, but it is not considered significantly harmful to warrant refusal of the application.

- 9.33. In terms of the impact on the garden area behind the development site, it is not considered that there would be a significant negative impact on this outdoor space to 77 Marine Parade. The design of the roof slopes away from this garden space so it would not be overbearing or cause significant overshadowing. Furthermore, unlike number 4 and 5 Bedford Street there would be no windows in the sloping roof to overlook the garden. The sloping nature of the new first floor roof may make the space feel more hemmed in but this is part of the urban landscape the site and neighbouring buildings are in and would not be so harmful or out of character for the pattern of development as to warrant refusal of the application.
- 9.34. Finally, as noted above there are objections which refer to a 'balcony' and 'windows' to the southern elevation, however this is not a feature of the development site. This is an existing feature of the urban landscape of a property further north (6A Bedford Street) and not part of the development site.
- 9.35. The proposed development would have balconies on the east elevation, these would overlook the street. It is not considered that these small areas of outdoor amenity space would cause not significant harm to neighbouring amenity and would not increase overlooking demonstrably above that which could be achieved from windows. It is also noted that the development site is on the other side of the road from the closest residential properties that would be opposite the new dwellings.
- 9.36. Accordingly, although the development would represent a change to the outlook and surroundings for neighbouring residents, it has been designed to minimise impact in terms of overbearing, overshadowing, loss of natural light/sunlight or harm to outlook. Consequently, no significant harm has been identified and it is therefore considered that the application accords with policy QD27 of the Local Plan and DM20 of the emerging City Plan Part Two.

**Sustainable Transport:**

- 9.37. The proposed redevelopment of the garages, which have been in use privately for the parking of vehicles recently is not something the Local Highway Authority (LHA) have objected to. Therefore, the loss of the garages is acceptable. As a result of the loss of the garages, the existing vehicle crossover would become redundant and the LHA have requested that a condition is applied to any recommendation to grant approval to ensure the crossover is removed. This has been attached to this recommendation.
- 9.38. In terms of the new residential use this would generate some additional activity at the site in terms of trips to and from the site, however this is not considered to be harmful to the highway network.
- 9.39. The LHA did raise concerns in relation to the sole provision of cycle parking being at basement level in both proposed units with no direct access to this space from the street. It was considered that having to navigate a twisty internal

staircase with a bicycle would not be convenient for future resident. Considering this the plans were amended to demonstrate that an internal cupboard at ground floor level was capable of store a bicycle (in each dwelling). This has been accepted by the LHA as being appropriate provision for the size of the dwellings and it has been requested that an implementation is attached. This has been attached to this recommendation. Furthermore, the agent has advised that the basement would then be capable of providing further cycle parking and/or alternative storage within the dwelling if desired.

- 9.40. Finally, it is noted that the LHA have highlighted concerns that the development could lead to increased demand for on-street parking as there is no off-street parking included in the proposals. The site is in Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) C. CPZ Z has an permit uptake of 94% (average of last 12 months of available data) which creates concern that the area is experiencing parking stress. However, it is not considered appropriate to impose the car-free condition requested by the LHA because parking in the local area and limiting the issue of parking permits is already covered through the management of the Controlled Parking Zone.
- 9.41. Accordingly, the development is considered acceptable in relation to transport matters with the above discussed conditions.

**Other Considerations:**

- 9.42. The Council has adopted the practice of securing minor design alterations to schemes with the aim of encouraging the biodiversity of a site, particularly with regards to protected species such as bees. A condition requiring a bee brick has been attached to improve ecology outcomes on the site in accordance with the Policy CP10 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One and Supplementary Planning Document SPD11 Nature Conservation and Development.
- 9.43. Furthermore, as identified in the planning statement the site falls within an area of the city which is served by communal bins. The closest communal bins to the application site are located at the end of Bedford Street on Marine Parade.
- 9.44. Finally, the proposal has been considered as a conversion with extensions rather than an application which provides a new dwelling. Therefore, it is not considered that conditions relating to sustainability or swift boxes are appropriate in this instance.

**10. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY**

- 10.1. Under the Regulations of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) 2010 (as amended), Brighton & Hove City Council adopted its CIL on 23 July 2020 and began charging on all CIL liable planning applications on and from the 5 October 2020. It is estimated that the amount of CIL liability for this application is £ 10,294.09. The exact amount will be confirmed in the CIL liability notice which will be issued as soon as it practicable after the issuing of planning permission.

**11. EQUALITIES**

- 11.1. It is noted that the access to the northern property would be level from the street but that there is a slight step up into the southern property from the pavement. Moreover, once inside the properties it would not be possible for daily living to take place on the ground floor as no kitchen/dining or living facilities on this level. As noted above this application is being treated as a conversion with extension so would not need to meet the policy requirements for HO13.