

<b><u>No:</u></b>	<b>BH2020/03667</b>	<b><u>Ward:</u></b>	<b>Rottingdean Coastal Ward</b>
<b><u>App Type:</u></b>	<b>Householder Planning Consent</b>		
<b><u>Address:</u></b>	<b>48 Arundel Drive East, Saltdean, Brighton BN2 8SL</b>		
<b><u>Proposal:</u></b>	<b>Two storey extensions to front and rear with new steps up to front porch. Revised fenestration, incorporating 2no front balconies. Roof extensions incorporating raising the ridge height and new front and rear dormers to form additional storey and associated works.</b>		
<b><u>Officer:</u></b>	Steven Dover, tel:	<b><u>Valid Date:</u></b>	14.12.2020
<b><u>Con Area:</u></b>		<b><u>Expiry Date:</u></b>	08.02.2021
<b><u>Listed Building Grade:</u></b>		<b><u>EOT:</u></b>	05.03.2021
<b><u>Agent:</u></b>	Downland Design Ltd Marshals Wick B2146 Compton Square To The Green Compton PO18 9HD		
<b><u>Applicant:</u></b>	Mr S Hipwell 48 Arundel Drive East Saltdean Brighton BN2 8SL		

## 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	2031-03.1		17 February 2021
Proposed Drawing	2031-02.2		17 February 2021
Proposed Drawing	2031 - 02.3		21 January 2021
Proposed Drawing	2031-02.4		17 February 2021
Proposed Drawing	2031-02.1		17 February 2021
Location and block plan	2031-01.1		14 December 2020

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. 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. 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 relates to a detached bungalow located on the north eastern side of Arundel Drive East. The area has an eclectic mix of design and forms, with no defining character or form. The ground levels in the area slope downwards to the west, from the rear of the site to its lower street frontage. Therefore, the properties in the surrounding streetscene step down to follow the sloping ground and many, including the application property, have areas of under-build or lower ground floor garaging.

**3. RELEVANT HISTORY**

None

**4. APPLICATION DESCRIPTION**

- 4.1. Planning permission is sought for the erection of two storey extensions to the front and rear, with new steps up to the front porch. Revised fenestration is also proposed, incorporating 2no. front balconies. Roof extensions are sought, incorporating raising the ridge height and new front and rear dormers to form an additional storey, and associated works.
- 4.2. Following officer concerns being raised, amendments have been made which have reduced the ridge heights, altered the roof form, and removed front balcony extensions, as well as removing a proposed rear ground floor balcony from the proposal.

**5. REPRESENTATIONS**

- 5.1. Nineteen (19) total letters have been received, though two (2) of these are duplicates.

Original scheme:

- 5.2. Eight (8) unique letters and one (1) repeat letter have been received objecting to the proposed development on the following grounds:

- Height
- Amenity harm
- Overshadowing
- Overdevelopment
- Effect on property values
- Would affect views
- Poor design
- Out of keeping with area

Amended Scheme:

- 5.3. Nine (9) unique letters and one (1) repeat letter have been received objecting to the amended proposed development on the following grounds:
- Height
  - Amenity harm
  - Overshadowing
  - Overdevelopment
  - Effect on property values
  - Would affect views
  - Poor design
  - Out of keeping with area
- 5.4. **Councillor Mears** has objected to the application. A copy of this correspondence is attached to this report.

**6. CONSULTATIONS**

None

**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 Joint Area Action Plan (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. RELEVANT POLICIES

### The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

#### Brighton & Hove City Plan Part Two

Policies in the Proposed Submission City Plan Part 2 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 April 2020, when the Plan was agreed for submission to the Secretary of State, it has gained weight for the determination of planning applications. The weight given to the key CPP2 policies considered in determining this application is set out below where applicable.

DM20	Protection of Amenity - Significant weight
DM21	Extensions and alterations - Significant weight

#### Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One

SS1	Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
-----	--

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

QD14	Extensions and alterations
QD27	Protection of Amenity
CP10	Biodiversity

#### Supplementary Planning Documents:

SPD12	Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations
SPD11	Nature Conservation & Development

## 9. CONSIDERATIONS & ASSESSMENT

- 9.1. The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to the impact of the proposed development on the appearance and character of the building and the wider area; and its impact on the amenities of adjacent occupiers.

#### Design and Appearance

- 9.2. The proposed works would be constructed in brick with white painted render to elevations. The new roof would be part hipped and part gable, finished with natural slate tiles. The new fenestration (windows/doors) would be constructed in aluminium, finished in a grey colour. It is noted that many representations have been made in respect of the appearance and its proposed finish.
- 9.3. The complete remodelling of the existing bungalow would see a change in form, creating a larger building that is extended in depth and height, with a very different appearance. The building would clearly present as a two storey dwelling (ground and first floor) with an integral garage at lower ground floor level.

- 9.4. However, to achieve this, the roof ridge would only be raised by just under one metre. Due to the relatively small increase in height and the natural stepping down of roof heights in the street scene, the roof would not look out of place. The new roof form with hipped ends and gables, although substantially different from the existing, would take design cues from the properties in close proximity and is considered to complement and reflect existing development. Similarly, the new elevations, although very different from the existing, are also taking cues from forms of development in the area, mixing established with modern design and are considered to improve the streetscene.
- 9.5. The depth of the remodelled property would increase, but not substantially, and would still leave an appropriate rear garden amenity area.
- 9.6. In comparison to many of the neighbouring properties which present as split level or one and a half storey buildings, this would be a more obvious two storey dwelling. However, the remodelled property would not appear incongruous or disruptive to the streetscene through its design, scale or form.
- 9.7. Therefore, the proposed extensions and works are considered to be a suitable addition to the building that would not harm its appearance or that of the wider area, in accordance with policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan, Policy DM21 of CPP2, and supplementary planning guidance for residential extensions.

#### Impact on Amenity

- 9.8. Policy QD27 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan states that planning permission for any development 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.
- 9.9. The position of the extensions and new roof design, although increasing the amount of fenestration, would not lead to substantially increased overlooking or harm to the privacy of neighbouring properties. The new front facing fenestration would only overlook front gardens and open space, limiting any harm to private amenity. The new side windows on the west elevation would be located at lower ground level and provide no substantial views. The new rear lower ground and ground floor windows, although increasing the amount of glazing in this area substantially, would not provide opportunities for overlooking in excess of what would normally be expected from residential gardens in this area. The new rear first floor windows would allow elevated overlooking of neighbouring properties; however the windows would be relatively small and serve only bedrooms and bathrooms, so no substantial harm to privacy is expected.
- 9.10. The original extended balconies/terraces proposed at the front and rear of the property have been removed due to concerns regarding appearance and perceived overlooking. Juliette balcony forms remain; however, these are not considered to cause substantial harm to amenity as the perceived overlooking and visual disturbance is substantially reduced.

- 9.11. The form of the extension and new roof would increase the size of the property, but the revised design is considered to overcome concerns regarding an excessive and overbearing impact on or loss of light to No.50 Arundel Drive East. The raising of the roof height and the new roof form would lead to a change in views from properties in Chichester Drive East to the rear and it is noted that objections have been received in relation to this aspect of the development. However, there is no right to a view and given the distances involved and the elevated position of these neighbouring properties in comparison to No.48, the proposed works are not considered to have any overbearing or overshadowing effects on these neighbours, and certainly not to a degree sufficient to warrant refusal. Accordingly, neighbouring amenity is considered to be sufficiently protected.
- 9.12. The increase in noise through the use of the remodelled property has also been raised in objections, but as no change of use is proposed, and it would continue use as a single residential property.
- 9.13. The new steps to the front elevation would replace the existing and, although different in style and size, would cause no amenity harm.
- 9.14. Therefore, it is not considered that the proposed extension and works would cause any significant harm to amenity, in accordance with Policy QD27 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and Policy DM20 of CPP2.

#### Other Matters

- 9.15. 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.
- 9.16. In view of the ongoing COVID-19 travel restrictions and in lieu of a site visit, photos of the site have been obtained from the applicant, which, along with aerial photographs and other material, is considered sufficient for a robust recommendation to be made by officers.

#### **Conclusion:**

- 9.17. The proposed development is considered to enhance the host property and bring improvements to the streetscene. No significant harm to neighbouring amenity is identified. Approval is therefore recommended.

## **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 £0, due to the residential extension exemption. The exact calculation 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**  
None identified.

