

<b><u>No:</u></b>	<b>BH2024/00243</b>	<b><u>Ward:</u></b>	<b>Rottingdean &amp; West Saltdean Ward</b>
<b><u>App Type:</u></b>	<b>Householder Planning Consent</b>		
<b><u>Address:</u></b>	<b>10 Tumulus Road Saltdean Brighton BN2 8FS</b>		
<b><u>Proposal:</u></b>	<b>Erection of front porch, installation of first floor Juliet balcony to rear, and alterations to fenestration. Roof alterations incorporating raising of ridge height, installation of rear dormer and retiling of roof.</b>		
<b><u>Officer:</u></b>	Charlie Partridge, 292193	tel:	<b><u>Valid Date:</u></b> 06.02.2024
<b><u>Con Area:</u></b>		<b><u>Expiry Date:</u></b>	02.04.2024
<b><u>Listed Building Grade:</u></b>		<b><u>EOT:</u></b>	14.04.2024
<b><u>Agent:</u></b>	Plans Prepared 8 Greenbank Avenue 8QS	Saltdean Brighton BN2	
<b><u>Applicant:</u></b>	Mr David Collins 10 Tumulus Road Saltdean Brighton BN2 8FS		

## 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>
Location Plan			26 January 2024
Proposed Drawing	TR-003	B	11 April 2024
Proposed Drawing	TR-004	B	11 April 2024
Proposed Drawing	TR-005	B	9 April 2024

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. Notwithstanding any details shown on the approved plans, no development hereby permitted shall take place until details 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

**Reason:** To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to comply with policies DM18 and DM21 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part 2 and CP12 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One.

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. SITE LOCATION**

- 2.1. The application site comprises a two-storey detached dwellinghouse of mainly brick and tile construction on the south side of Tumulus Road. Due to the gradient of the site, which slopes downwards from north (front) to south (rear), the front of the property is single storey and the rear is two storey. The property currently features a rear balcony at first floor level.

**3. RELEVANT HISTORY**

None

**4. APPLICATION DESCRIPTION**

- 4.1. Permission is sought for the erection of a front porch, the installation of a first floor Juliet balcony to the rear replacing the existing first floor rear window, and a replacement first floor balcony with a new obscurely glazed glass balustrade. Permission is also sought for roof alterations incorporating the raising of the ridge height by 800mm and the installation of a flat-roofed dormer.
- 4.2. The proposed alterations to fenestration would involve replacing the first floor balcony access doors and side windows with four full-height double glazed doors, the replacement of the ground floor rear garden doors with a glazed box window, the replacement of the ground floor rear window with a set of five double glazed bifold doors, the relocation of the ground floor side door and the removal of the ground floor window to the western side elevation. An obscurely glazed side window is also proposed either side of the house at first floor level beneath the gable ends to serve the two ensuite bathrooms. The existing ground floor bedroom would be changed to a lounge and two new bedrooms would be created within the converted loft space, resulting in one additional bedroom to the property.
- 4.3. During the course of determining the application, the drawings were amended. The amended proposal reduced the scale of the proposed dormer. The amended design would also increase the ridge height further than the original proposal did to allow for a greater head height and for a larger proportion of rear roofslope to remain following the construction of the proposed dormer.

## **5. REPRESENTATIONS**

- 5.1. Six (6) letters have been received from neighbours objecting to the proposed development. The following concerns have been raised in objections:
- Inappropriate height of development
  - Overshadowing
  - Out of keeping
  - Privacy concerns/overlooking
  - Restriction of view
  - Detrimental effect on property value
  - Poor design
  - Overbearing
  - Impact on residential amenity
  - Poor thermal management
- 5.2. Concerns regarding property value are not a material planning consideration.
- 5.3. Following the aforementioned amendments to the proposal, neighbours have been renotified and the consultation expires on 6 May 2024. Any additional representations received will be summarised in the late list and/or updated verbally at the Planning Committee meeting.

## **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 City Plan Part Two (adopted October 2022)
  - 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).

## **8. RELEVANT POLICIES & GUIDANCE**

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One:

SS1	Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
CP12	Urban Design

Brighton & Hove City Plan Part Two:

DM18	High quality design and places
DM20	Protection of Amenity
DM21	Extensions and alterations

Supplementary Planning Document:

SPD12	Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations
SPD17	Urban Design Framework

**9. CONSIDERATIONS & ASSESSMENT**

- 9.1. The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to the design and appearance of the proposed alterations and whether they would have a detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity.

Impact on Character and Appearance:

- 9.2. The original design of the proposed rear dormer would have occupied almost the entire rear roof slope. The scale of this dormer was therefore considered to be disproportionate to the host property and would have been harmful to its appearance.
- 9.3. During the course of determining the application, the drawings were amended to reduce its scale of the dormer. The dormer was reduced in width by 750mm and the depth was reduced so that it would be set back 1.1m from the soffit. It is considered that these amendments have brought the dormer into line with SPD12 guidance which, in relation to rear dormer extensions, states that *"As a rule rear dormers should be appropriately set in from the side, set down from the ridge and set up from the eaves so as not to appear as an additional storey or appear "top heavy"*".
- 9.4. Although the proposed dormer has been reduced in scale, it would still represent a relatively large addition to the rear roof slope. However it would be in proportion to the host dwelling and the size of it is considered acceptable. Further, it would be located to the rear of the dwelling and would therefore not be clearly visible from the public realm. As such, its impact on the character and appearance of the area would be limited.
- 9.5. It is proposed that the dormer would be finished in composite cladding. In order to ensure that it does not appear overly prominent within the roof, a condition would be attached to any planning permission to ensure that details of the cladding to be used are agreed prior to the commencement of the development as it is not considered that white cladding to match the existing cladding on the gable ends of the property would be appropriate or sympathetic.

- 9.6. The proposed increase in the ridge height of the property by 800mm is considered to be acceptable. There is some variety in ridge heights along Tumulus Road. When viewed in conjunction with the two adjacent neighbouring properties either side of the application site, there is variation in the land levels and thus the heights of the roofs which form a stepping down appearance following the gradient of the road. No.8 to the west is on a higher level and No.12 to the east is on a lower level, a formation that would be maintained despite the raised roofline. While it is accepted that this would represent a notable increase in ridge height, the total height would still be below the ridge height of No.8, maintaining the stepped down appearance of the group. This has been illustrated on the amended elevational drawings.
- 9.7. A front porch is proposed. This porch has been kept to an appropriate scale and would have the same eaves height as the main dwelling. It would feature a dual pitched roof to match the roof form of the garage. It would be slightly set back from the garage and the roof would measure approximately half the height of the garage, ensuring it remains subordinate to the host building. The roof would be tiled, and the walls would be finished in composite cladding to match the existing cladding throughout the property. For these reasons, the porch is considered to be a suitable and sympathetic addition to the host property that would have a minimal impact on its appearance or that of the wider streetscene. It would be somewhat in keeping with its surrounding context as several front porches of varying design exist within the locality.
- 9.8. The proposal would also involve the replacement of the first-floor rear window with doors and a Juliet balcony and the rebuilding and widening of the existing rear balcony at first floor level with a new set of doors and replacement glass balustrading. These alterations would not result in harm to the appearance of the dwellinghouse and, given they would be located at the rear of the property, they would not be detrimental to the character or appearance of the wider area. Furthermore, a structural engineer has deemed that the existing balcony is no longer structurally sound and is hazardous, reconstructing the balcony would therefore improve the safety of the property.
- 9.9. The proposal would therefore be in general accordance with Brighton & Hove City Plan Part Two policy DM21.

Impact on Residential Amenity:

- 9.10. Policy DM20 of City Plan Part 2 states that planning permission for development will be granted where it would not cause unacceptable loss of amenity to the proposed, existing and / or adjacent users, residents, occupiers or where it is not liable to be detrimental to human health.
- 9.11. The impact on the adjacent properties has been fully considered in terms of daylight, sunlight, outlook and privacy following a site visit and no significant harm has been identified. Six representations have been received objecting to the proposal and raising concerns including the potential for increased overlooking from the proposed dormer and Juliet balcony. However, the property already has some views into neighbouring gardens via the first-floor rear

windows and existing balcony and due to the difference in land levels, a degree of overlooking already exists between the properties along Tumulus Road and those on Bishopstone Drive. It is not considered that a rear dormer or first floor Juliet balcony would afford significantly more compromising views into neighbouring properties when compared to the existing views provided by the first floor rear balcony and windows. Additionally, the increase in the size of the proposed first floor balcony is relatively modest and would not result in any significant increased impact on neighbouring properties in respect of privacy and noise and disturbance.

- 9.12. In addition, there is a significant distance separating the rear elevation of 10 Tumulus Road and the rear elevations of the properties on Bishopstone Drive. The nearest property on Bishopstone Drive is approximately 25m away and the other nearby properties are between 27-32m away. In urban settings such as these, it is acknowledged that some mutual overlooking is to be expected. A 25m gap is considered adequate separation distance between these properties so that any overlooking would not be significantly harmful as to warrant a refusal of the application. The proposed replacement balustrading to the rear balcony would be obscurely glazed which would be likely to slightly improve privacy when compared with the current wooden slats.
- 9.13. Concerns have been raised regarding the potential for the proposed roof alterations to cause overshadowing, to have an overbearing effect or to impact on outlook/view. As mentioned previously, the application site is located a significant distance from the properties along Bishopstone Drive and the roof works would also be set away a large enough distance from both adjacent neighbours as to not have an overbearing impact. The ground floor side windows at No.8 serve a garage and there are no windows on the western side elevation of No.12. The proposal is therefore not expected to be overbearing nor is it expected to result in any overshadowing or loss of outlook.
- 9.14. It is considered that for the reasons set out above, the proposed development would not cause significant harm to the amenity of neighbours and would therefore not conflict with policy DM20 of the Brighton and Hove City Plan Part 2.

#### **Standard of accommodation**

- 9.15. The proposal facilitates the provision of two new bedrooms to this property. They would be at roof level and would benefit from sufficient outlook and natural light via the proposed dormer windows. Both bedrooms would have an internal floor space which would exceed the standard for double bedrooms of 11.5m<sup>2</sup> set out within the Nationally Described Space Standards. The space created would therefore be in conformity with CPP2 Policy DM1.

#### **Biodiversity**

- 9.16. None identified. A condition would usually be recommended requiring a bee brick to enhance nature conservation of the site. However, as the front porch extension would be composite clad it would not be reasonable to attach this condition.

Conclusion

- 9.17. The scheme is considered to be acceptable in terms of appearance and the impacts it is anticipated to have on the amenities of local residents.

**10. EQUALITIES**

- 10.1. During the determination of this application due regard has been given to the impact of this scheme in relation to the Equality Act 2010 in terms of the implications for those with protected characteristics namely age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation. There is no indication that those with any of these protected characteristics would be disadvantaged by this development.

