

<b><u>No:</u></b>	<b>BH2025/02114</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>3 Ridgewood Avenue Saltdean Brighton BN2 8HH</b>		
<b><u>Proposal:</u></b>	<b>Erection of single storey rear extension, roof alterations/extensions including hip-to-gable extensions, raising the ridge height and front and rear dormers, and landscaping to the rear.</b>		
<b><u>Officer:</u></b>	Steven Dover,	<b><u>Valid Date:</u></b>	19.09.2025
<b><u>Con Area:</u></b>	N/A	<b><u>Expiry Date:</u></b>	14.11.2025
<b><u>Listed Building Grade:</u></b>	N/A	<b><u>EOT:</u></b>	14.01.2026
<b><u>Agent:</u></b>			
<b><u>Applicant:</u></b>	Mr Lloyd Baylis 3 Ridgewood Avenue Saltdean Brighton BN2 8HH		

## 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.

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received
Block Plan	RIDG_01(PR)-00/09		20-Nov-25
Proposed Drawing	RIDG_01(PR)-01/09	Rev 01	20-Nov-25
Proposed Drawing	RIDG_01(PR)-02/09		20-Nov-25
Proposed Drawing	RIDG_01(PR)-03/09		20-Nov-25
Proposed Drawing	RIDG_01(PR)-04/09		20-Nov-25
Proposed Drawing	RIDG_01(PR)-05/09		20-Nov-25
Proposed Drawing	RIDG_01(PR)-06/09		20-Nov-25
Proposed Drawing	RIDG_01(PR)-07/09		20-Nov-25
Proposed Drawing	RIDG_01(PR)-08/09		20-Nov-25

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. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved (including demolition and all preparatory work), a scheme for the protection of the

retained trees in accordance with BS 5837:2012, including a tree protection plan(s) (TPP) and an arboricultural method statement (AMS) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development thereafter shall be implemented in strict accordance with the approved details.

**Reason:** As this matter is fundamental to protecting the trees which are to be retained on the site during construction works in the interest of the visual amenities of the area and for biodiversity and sustainability reasons, to comply with policies DM22 and DM37 of Brighton & Hove City Plan Part 2, and CP8, CP10 and CP12 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One and SPD06:Trees and Development Sites.

4. The development hereby permitted shall incorporate at least 3 (three) swift bricks within the external walls of the development and shall be retained thereafter.

**Reason:** To enhance the biodiversity of the site and to comply with Policy DM37 of Brighton & Hove City Plan Part 2, Policy CP10 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One and Supplementary Planning Document SPD11 Nature Conservation and Development.

5. The ground floor rear extension hereby permitted shall not be first occupied until details of secure cycle parking facilities for the occupants of, and visitors to, the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved facilities shall be fully implemented and made available for use prior to the first occupation of the development and shall thereafter be retained for use 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 DM33 of Brighton & Hove City Plan Part 2, and SPD14: Parking Standards.

6. At least one 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 DM37 of Brighton & Hove City Plan Part 2, Policy CP10 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One and Supplementary Planning Document SPD11 Nature Conservation and Development

7. Access to the flat roof over the extension hereby approved shall be for maintenance or emergency purposes only and the flat roof shall not be used as a roof garden, terrace, patio or similar amenity area.

**Reason:** In order to protect adjoining properties from overlooking and noise disturbance and to comply with Policies DM20 and DM21 of Brighton & Hove City Plan Part 2.

8. No tree shown on the approved drawing RIDG\_01(PR)-00/09 that is shown as retained shall be cut down, uprooted, destroyed, pruned, cut or damaged in any manner during the development phase and thereafter within 5 years from the date of occupation of the building for its permitted use, other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars or as may be permitted

by prior approval in writing from the local planning authority. Any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

**Reason:** To enhance the appearance of the development in the interest of the visual amenities of the area, to provide ecological, environmental and biodiversity benefits and to maximise the quality and usability of open spaces within the development in compliance with policies DM22 and DM37 of Brighton & Hove City Plan Part 2, and CP8, CP10, CP12 and CP13 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. Where possible, bee bricks should be placed in a south facing wall in a sunny location at least 1 metre above ground level and preferably adjacent to pollinator friendly plants.
3. Swift bricks/boxes can be placed on any elevation, but ideally under shade-casting eaves. They should be installed in groups of at least three, at a height of approximately 5 metres above ground level, and preferably with a 5m clearance between the host building and other buildings or obstructions. Where possible avoid siting them above windows or doors. Swift bricks should be used unless these are not practical due to the nature of construction, in which case alternative designs of suitable swift boxes should be provided in their place where appropriate.
4. The applicant should be aware that the site may be in a radon affected area. If the probability of exceeding the Action level is 3% or more in England and Wales, basic preventative measures are required in new houses, extensions, conversions and refurbishments (BRE2011). Radon protection requirements should be agreed with Building Control. More information on radon levels is available at <https://www.ukradon.org/information/ukmaps>
5. Where asbestos is found/suspected on site, it will fall under the Control of Asbestos Regulations 2012, overseen by the Health and Safety Executive. Further information can be found here: HSE: Asbestos - health and safety in the workplace

**Biodiversity Net Gain**

Based on the information available, this permission is considered to be one which will not require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because one or more of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements are considered to apply. These can be found in the Environment Act 2021.

The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that, unless an exception or a transitional arrangement applies, the planning permission granted for the development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition (the biodiversity gain condition) that development may not begin unless:

- a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
- b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

## **2. SITE LOCATION**

- 2.1. The application relates to a detached bungalow located on the western side of Ridgewood Avenue in Saltdean. The property as existing, has a hipped roof, with a modest side pitched roof side extension. Off street parking is provided with a concrete front driveway. The property is finished in a brown pebble dash render and white timber casement fenestration, with red/brown tiles to the roof.
- 2.2. The southern end of Ridgewood Avenue, in which this building sits, is characterised by a lack of uniformity in the design, style, and scale of properties. Moving north from the site, there is more uniformity, with very similar plots and comparable hipped roof designed bungalows. Of note is that to the south is the recently constructed one bedroom bungalow 91A Lustrells Crescent. This has a small rear garden area and is sited with the rear elevation in close proximity facing towards the southern boundary of 3 Ridgewood Avenue and the side elevation. A circa 1.8m high close board fence separates the plots on the shared boundary.
- 2.3. The site is not located in a conservation area or subject to any article 4 directions regarding extensions or alterations.

## **3. RELEVANT HISTORY**

- 3.1. None identified for the application site.

## **4. APPLICATION DESCRIPTION**

- 4.1. The application seeks permission for the erection of single storey rear extension, roof alterations including hip-to-gable extensions, raising the ridge height and front and rear dormers, with landscaping changes to the rear. The works would alter the appearance with complete removal of the hipped roof, and new gables created to the sides, and extending the footprint significantly to the rear.
- 4.2. The plans have been amended during the course of the application to reduce the bulk and massing of the development, reduce the size of the front dormers to improve the appearance, and remove the side extension in order to

minimize adverse amenity impacts to neighbouring properties. Due to a reduction in the overall size, the application has not been readvertised.

## 5. REPRESENTATIONS

5.1. **Seven (7)** comments (including repeat comments) have been received from **five (5)** different interested parties objecting to the proposed development on the following grounds:

- Poor design
- Loss of vegetation and wildlife
- Overdevelopment
- Height
- Overshadowing
- Out of character with area
- Insufficient parking

## 6. CONSULTATIONS

6.1. **Arboriculture:** Verbal Comment No objection subject to condition. There should be sufficient distance to retain the tree at the rear. A fair amount of vegetation clearance has already taken place. Please condition a Tree Protection Plan prior to works.

6.2. Full details of consultation responses received can be found online on the planning register, with the exception of the verbal responses noted above.

## 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, revised October 2024);
- East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Sites Plan (adopted February 2017);
- Shoreham Harbour JAAP (adopted October 2019).
- West Saltdean Neighbourhood Plan

## 8. RELEVANT POLICIES & GUIDANCE

## The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

### Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One:

SS1	Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
CP8	Sustainable Buildings
CP10	Biodiversity
CP12	Urban Design

### Brighton & Hove City Plan Part Two:

DM1	Housing Quality, Choice, and Mix
DM18	High quality design and places
DM20	Protection of Amenity
DM21	Extensions and alterations
DM22	Landscape Design and Trees
DM33	Safe, Sustainable and Active Travel
DM37	Green Infrastructure and Nature Conservation

### Supplementary Planning Document:

SPD06	Trees and Development Sites
SPD11	Nature Conservation & Development
SPD12	Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations
SPD14	Parking Standards
SPD17	Urban Design Framework

### West Saltdean Neighbourhood Plan:

WS1	Achieving High Quality Design
WS8	Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Technology (LCT) Projects including Community Energy Scheme

## **9. CONSIDERATIONS & ASSESSMENT**

- 9.1. The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to the design and appearance of the proposal and the impact upon residential amenity.

### Design and Appearance:

- 9.2. This remodelling would require the complete removal of the existing hipped roof, and its replacement with a new dual gable ended roof scape. New twin dual pitched dormers would be provided to the front roofslope and a wide box dormer to the rear. An extensive single storey extension would be located to the rear and integrate with the existing floorspace and revised roof.
- 9.3. The current building is in poor condition and finished with brown pebble dash render to the elevations, with brown plain tiles to the roof areas. The current fenestration is white timber windows and timber doors. The proposed complete remodelling would see the use off-white render to the elevations, Cedar shingle tiles to the pitched roof areas, and anthracite powder coated

aluminium windows and doors are proposed (painted timber to front door). The dormer faces would have a clapboard off white finish to match the colour of the render but contrast with the cedar tiles of the pitched roof and dormers. This would overall create a contemporary appearance.

- 9.4. The proposed remodelling would raise the ridge height of the property, by circa 0.25m, and also the eaves. In the context of the existing building, which is already higher than the neighbours, and the proposed design this is considered in proportion and acceptable. A plan has been submitted showing the OS Datum height of the increased ridge and a comparison with the neighbouring properties to show the relationship is correct, reflecting the actual land levels.
- 9.5. SPD12 states that:  
*"Additional storeys or raised roofs may be permitted on detached properties where they respect the scale, continuity, roofline and general appearance of the streetscene, including its topography."*
- 9.6. The proposed works increase the size, bulk and massing over the existing property, and are designed to accommodate the desired design and internal space but also complement the host property. The additional depth and height would be visible in views along Ridgewood Avenue, due to the building siting forward of the adjoining properties. However, it is considered that the proposed remodelled building, when viewed from the street, would not visually overpower the adjoining properties and would bring interest to the host property and wider streetscene. It is recognised that it would substantially increase floorspace over the existing design, but it is not considered to create harm to the surrounding area, due the existing siting, depth of plot and the varied designs at this end of the avenue.
- 9.7. The principle of roof alterations is acceptable, and the current design does not bring any significant harm in the context of the streetscene, which has no overriding vernacular that must be adhered too at this end of the road, and is not within a conservation area. The rear dormer is large but mainly conforms to the guidance of SPD12 in that it would be set down, up and in form the roof edges, and as it would be located at the rear would not be highly visible in the public realm - the harm is therefore limited.
- 9.8. During the course of the application, amendments were received reducing the size of the front dormers and now considered to be positioned subserviently in the front roofslope. It is recognised that front dormers are not a feature of the other bungalows in the road, but as this property is currently different in design to the other dwellings they are considered acceptable in this exceptional case.
- 9.9. It is also noted that a similar form of gable roof design and rear dormer, albeit with no raising of the ridge or front dormers, could be achieved through the use of householder permitted development rights.

9.10. The proposed elevation materials are not considered harmful to the host property and wider area, although differing in style (windows finish and roof tiles) from that on the majority of properties in the road.

9.11. The extensions and alterations are considered to be suitable additions to the building that would improve its appearance and not bring significant harm to that of the wider area, in accordance with policies DM18 and DM21 of the Brighton and Hove City Plan Part 2 and SPD12 guidance.

Standard of accommodation:

9.12. The proposal would increase the ground floor area and create a large combined open plan living area, which would significantly increase floorspace over the current separate kitchen and lounge, with a new ground floor of circa 131sqm, over the existing circa 61sqm. The two existing ground floor bedrooms are retained which is acceptable. In the new roof space two new further bedrooms are created, with a separate shower room and W/C. Both of these bedrooms would be in excess of 11.5sqm and therefore meet the space standards required for a double bedroom under DM1 and the NDSS. Again, these are acceptable in size and layout, improving the flexibility of the property and making better use of the plot. The overall size of the remodelled property would be circa 180sqm of floorspace internally, and create a 4 bedroom, 7 person dwelling over two storeys, which according to DM1 would need achieve a minimum floorspace of 115sqm. The development would substantially exceed this criteria, with a standard of accommodation and layout that would benefit existing and future occupiers.

9.13. The proposal would overall improve the internal standard of accommodation and is in accordance with policy DM1 of the Brighton and Hove City Plan Part Two.

Impact on Residential Amenity:

9.14. A recent officer site visit has been conducted, which included internal and external access to the application property.

9.15. The form of the works extending to the side and rear would lead to some detrimental effects to the neighbouring properties. The impact of the increased height and bulk of the gable ends would increase the overbearing and overshadowing to No.5 Ridgewood Avenue to the north, but this would be mainly limited to the side access area and side elevation of the property. The rear single storey extensions would not extend past the rear of this neighbouring property. The setting back from the boundaries and shallow pitched roof forms of the proposed extension, with the majority of works being adjacent to side elevations of No.5, mean the level of harm is not considered so substantial that refusal on this element is warranted.

9.16. It is acknowledged that development would reduce the sky views from the southern side windows of No.5 with a loss of daylight, but the outlook would not be significantly diminished, and is currently only relatively open due to the lack of high boundary fence. The applicant could erect a close board fence under permitted development rights which would have comparable effects.



- 9.17. The impacts are not assessed as significantly harmful, and the degree of overshadowing and overbearing is limited. The windows on the southern elevation of the ground floor of No.5 will lose some views to the south, but the outlook that remains is considered acceptable.
- 9.18. The proposed development is not considered to cause any significant levels of overshadowing or overbearing effects to other surrounding properties, due the setting back from rear and southern boundaries (the side extension originally proposed is now removed).
- 9.19. The impact of overlooking from the rear first floor dormer, is considered acceptable, as a high degree of mutual overlooking already exists from the surrounding properties, especially as those to the rear are at a higher elevation, some with rear dormers. The other new proposed windows at the rear are located at ground level and are not considered to cause any significant harm. The front roofslope dormers would be looking over the front garden areas and the public highway towards opposing development and would cause little, if any harm, to neighbouring amenity due to the high levels of existing mutual overlooking at ground floor for properties on the Avenue, which would remain.
- 9.20. The rear alterations to the amenity space would create a new patio area extending to the side and rear of the extension. This would involve the regrading of the existing land which slopes upwards from the house, by removing soil and lowering to create a level surface. The remainder of the garden to the rear would retain the existing gradient, with a retaining wall, and accessed by new central steps from the patio. This design is considered acceptable as the existing land levels are largely comparable or lowered and therefore the amenity impacts any overlooking are not increased through use of the amenity space.
- 9.21. As stated earlier, an officer site visit has been undertaken and the impacts of the proposed development on the adjacent properties has been fully considered in terms of daylight, sunlight, outlook, and privacy and it is considered that the proposed extensions and works would not cause significant harm to amenity, in accordance with Policy DM20 of Brighton and Hove City Plan Part Two.

#### Arboriculture

- 9.22. The works would take place in proximity to a tree on the southern boundary, and existing trees and shrubs to the front are being removed as part of the proposal. The Arboriculture Officer has no objection to the removal of the front trees and shrubs, and in relation to the remaining trees on the boundary at side and rear, a condition would be attached to ensure they are protected prior to any works commencing.

#### Other Matters

- 9.23. It has been raised in objections that the proposed development has too little parking provision. The existing crossover and parking to the southern side

would remain and as no new dwelling is being created it is considered reasonable that this situation remains. Cycle parking would be secured by condition.

- 9.24. Representation has also been made that the development would in fact be used as two flats. The application is for extension of an existing dwelling and that is what would be approved planning permission. In the event that the applicant, or any future owner, wished to use the property as two separate dwellings (flats) they would need to apply for planning permission, and have it approved, for that use to be lawful.

Climate Change/Biodiversity

- 9.25. The proposed works would modernise and increase the flexibility of an existing property and its energy efficiency. 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 bumblebees and swifts. A suitably worded condition will be attached to secure an appropriate number of swift bricks and a bee brick within the proposal in order to help meet the requirements of policies CP10 of the CPP1 and DM37 of the CPP2 as well as SPD11.

Biodiversity Net Gain

- 9.26. This scheme was considered exempt from the need to secure mandatory biodiversity net gain under Schedule 7A of the TCPA because it is a householder application.

## **10. CONCLUSION**

- 10.1. The proposed development is considered to be of an acceptable design and appearance and would not cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, and would bring significant visual improvements to the host property. It is not considered to result in any significant harm to neighbouring amenity, transport or biodiversity and would provide a good standard of accommodation for existing and future occupants. Approval is therefore recommended subject to conditions as set out above.

## **11. EQUALITIES**

- 11.1. Section 149(1) of the Equality Act 2010 provides:
- 1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to—
    - (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
    - (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
    - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

- 11.2. Officers considered the information provided by the applicant, together with the responses from consultees (and any representations made by third parties) and determined that the proposal would not give rise to unacceptable material impact on individuals or identifiable groups with protected characteristics

## **12. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY**

- 12.1. 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. 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.

