

<u>No:</u>	BH2025/03063	<u>Ward:</u>	Wish Ward
<u>App Type:</u>	Householder Planning Consent		
<u>Address:</u>	77 Braemore Road Hove BN3 4HA		
<u>Proposal:</u>	Demolition of existing garage and erection of replacement side extension, ground and first floor rear extension and hip-to-gable loft conversion, with associated roof alterations and extensions and revised fenestration.		
<u>Officer:</u>	Oliver Spratley, tel: 01273 290390	<u>Valid Date:</u>	18.12.2025
<u>Con Area:</u>	N/A	<u>Expiry Date:</u>	12.02.2026
		<u>EOT:</u>	04.03.2026
<u>Agent:</u>	Vesta Architects Ltd Heath West Sussex RH16 1UA	Delta House 16 Bridge Road	Haywards
<u>Applicant:</u>	Miss Smith 77 Braemore Road Hove BN3 4HA		

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
Location Plan			18-Dec-25
Block Plan			18-Dec-25
Proposed Drawing	25-5042-P-04A	Amended	03-Feb-26
Proposed Drawing	25-5042-P-05A	Amended	03-Feb-26
Proposed Drawing	25-5042-P-06A	Amended	03-Feb-26
Proposed Drawing	25-5042-P-07		11-Feb-26

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. Unless otherwise shown on the drawings hereby approved, the external finishes of the development hereby permitted shall match in material, colour, style, bonding and texture those of the existing building.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development in the interests of the visual amenities of the area and to comply with policies DM18 and DM21 of City Plan Part Two and CP12 of City Plan Part One.

4. 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 CP10 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One and Supplementary Planning Document SPD11 Nature Conservation and Development.

5. The development hereby permitted shall incorporate at least 3 swift bricks/boxes 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.

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.
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 above 5m height, 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.

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 commenced 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 site in Wish Ward is a residential plot accommodating a (linked attached) detached dwelling house set on the east side of Breamore Road. The existing property is a two storey dwelling with a pitched side hipped roof finished in a mix of brick and render.
- 2.2. The site is not in a conservation area and there are no other heritage assets or listed buildings nearby that would be affected by the proposed development.

3. APPLICATION DESCRIPTION

- 3.1. The application proposes to alter the property from a three to four-bedroom dwellinghouse facilitated by side, rear and roof extensions.
- 3.2. The proposal is for the demolition of the existing garage which is currently attached to the neighbour's garage (94 New Church Road), the erection of a smaller replacement ground floor side extension with a pitched roof on the northern side; a flat roof ground floor extension is proposed which would extend 3m from the original rear wall and would be approximately 3.3m in height. A first floor rear extension is proposed on the northern side and a hip-to-gable loft conversion is proposed which would create a larger crown roof, pitched roof front dormer with associated changes to fenestration.
- 3.3. During the application process, the plans have been amended to amend the design. The scheme has been amended by removing an originally proposed rear box dormer and replace it with the extended hip to gable roofline.

4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1. **BH2020/01731** Erection of single storey rear extension and first floor extension to rear. Approved 2020
- 4.2. **BH2017/01556** Roof alterations to include hip to gable roof extension with rooflights and creation of rear dormer. First floor rear extension over existing ground floor extension and associated works. Approved 2017.

5. RELEVANT HISTORY AT OTHER SITES

- 5.1. **BH2023/01182** 80 Braemore Road, Hove, BN3 4HB. Erection of two-storey rear extension with associated roof extension; creation of crown rooftop with side-facing Sussex hips, installation of 2no front and 2no rear Cabrio rooflights and removal of chimney; revised fenestration, and associated alterations. Approved 2023

6. REPRESENTATIONS

- 6.1. Ten **10** representations have been received objecting to the application for the following reasons:
- Detrimental effect on property value
 - Inappropriate Height of Development
 - Overdevelopment
 - Overshadowing
 - Poor design
 - Restriction of view
 - Too close to the boundary
 - Traffic or highways
 - Access to property
 - Damaging to trees
 - Noise including during construction

7. CONSULTATIONS

- 7.1. **Local Highway Authority:** No objection subject to condition and informative:

Parking Standards SPD14 states a maximum of 1 car parking space for this property. The conversion of the garage to habitable space would result in the loss of 1 car parking space, but there would still be space for 1 car on the driveway, which does not exceed the maximum and is an acceptable arrangement. The loss of 1 potential on-site car parking space may result in additional parking demand, but this is unlikely to have a significant effect on the public highway. The site is in Controlled Parking Zone W.

- 7.2. If the LPA is minded to grant consent, we request the inclusion of a Cycle Parking Scheme condition and informative, as below.
- 7.3. Full details of representations and consultee responses received can be found online on the planning register.

8. MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

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.

- 8.1. The development plan is:
- Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One (adopted March 2016);
 - Brighton & Hove City Plan Part 2 (adopted October 2022);
 - East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Plan (adopted February 2013, revised Oct 24);

- East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Sites Plan (adopted February 2017);
- Shoreham Harbour Joint Area Action Plan (JAAP) 2019.

9. RELEVANT POLICIES & GUIDANCE

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One:

SS1	Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
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
DM37	Green Infrastructure and Nature Conservation

Supplementary Planning Document:

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

10. CONSIDERATIONS & ASSESSMENT

- 10.1. The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to the design and appearance of the proposals and whether they would have a detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity. Biodiversity, trees and transport are also considerations.

Design and Appearance

- 10.2. The resultant mass and volume of the building as proposed would be consistent with detached dwelling houses in the area and is not considered to be excessive in terms of depth and relative to the size of the plot.
- 10.3. The demolition of the side garage with erection of the side extension would visually improve the front elevation.
- 10.4. The streetscene is varied with some examples of gabled roofs, roof alterations and rooflights. Whilst there are limited examples of front dormers, the proposal is modest and sympathetically designed and would not cause harm to the property or the streetscene. The overall scale of the roof additions are considered to cause no harm to the character and appearance of the area.
- 10.5. The plans show that the main property's ridgeline roof height would not be increased and the roof would incorporate two gable features at the rear which

are considered to be acceptable and the overall remodelled roof including front dormer is considered acceptable in design terms.

- 10.6. The rear extension would be of an appropriate scale and would not be visible from the public realm.
- 10.7. Materials will be secured by condition to match existing except where explicitly shown and annotated in plan.
- 10.8. The proposals would result in an appropriate and acceptable appearance to the dwelling and would cause no harm to the character and appearance of the area in accordance with policies CP12 of the Brighton and Hove City Plan Part One and DM18 and DM21 of the Brighton and Hove City Plan Part Two.

Neighbouring Amenity

- 10.9. Internal remodelling and enlargement of the first-floor bathroom would result in a window being removed from the (side) south facing first floor elevation which reduces outlook from this point. An existing small window is retained to provide daylight to the bathroom.
- 10.10. A new rooflight would feature within the lean to pitched roof set above the side extension which would have minimal impact on privacy given it affords views mainly skywards.
- 10.11. The extended hip roof line to the rear would have a new pitch and the proposal would include three roof lights set into the crown roof which would also have minimal impact on privacy given they would afford views skywards also.
- 10.12. A new bay window to the rear would be created at first floor level set on the same plane as the existing bay gable end window and any additional overlooking to the rear would be very similar to the existing situation.
- 10.13. The new front dormer is not considered to give rise to impactful overlooking to neighbouring properties as it fronts the street.
- 10.14. No other new side windows are proposed.
- 10.15. The extents of the extensions are typical of detached dwelling houses in the area and the garden areas and side elevations of properties are already mutually overlooked to an extent, and no excessive additional overlooking would not occur from the proposal.
- 10.16. Representations received have raised concern with overshadowing, and impacts on residential amenity. However, given that the property is detached and is separated and is offset from its neighbours' directly to the north and east, any amenity impacts would not be excessively above the existing situation and would not warrant refusal of the application.
- 10.17. Representations received have expressed concern that the development would be too close to the boundary on the northern side. The plans show that once

the side extension is erected there would be some physical separation from the neighbouring standalone garage.

- 10.18. The rear first floor and hip to gable roof extension would add volume to the building, however, the property is and would remain detached from its neighbouring properties above ground floor and would not be increased in height. The additional mass would be relatively limited. The two-storey element and roof conversion extensions and projections do not overreach the main footprint of the dwelling house and would not cause any harmful impacts in terms of overbearing, outlook or loss of privacy.
- 10.19. The separation distances between neighbours dwelling houses would be unchanged and the dwellinghouse footprint at 77 Braemore Road position is offset in relation to the neighbouring properties on New Church Road located directly to the north, and so there would only be minimal impact on daylight and sunlight access caused by the proposed extensions to the first floor and rooflines. Neighbouring rear and side gardens to the north are south facing and so would also continue to have relatively good solar access (sunlight and daylight).
- 10.20. A desktop review indicates that there would be no unduly adverse impacts on solar panel installations.
- 10.21. It is therefore, considered that the scale, position, projection of the extensions would not be excessive and that there would not be a significant loss of privacy, outlook, loss of light or overbearing impact towards neighbours - and the proposal would, therefore, comply with policies DM20 and DM21 of the Brighton and Hove City Plan Part Two.

Standard of Accommodation

- 10.22. The proposed development would extend and improve the existing property and the works would comply with policy DM1 of the Brighton and Hove City Plan Part Two and no conflict with the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) has been identified.

Biodiversity and Trees

- 10.23. There are no protected trees (TPOs) on or adjacent to the site which would be affected by the development.
- 10.24. A representation raised concern regarding potential damage to a neighbouring garden tree. The replacement side extension is set away from the property boundary from the most part and no tree has been identified as being of significant concern to warrant any further actions as part of the planning application, although any ownership issues would be a civil matter to be resolved privately.
- 10.25. Conditions recommending insertion of bee and swift bricks/boxes are recommended, to enhance biodiversity outcomes, as per policies CP10 of the Brighton and Hove City Plan Part One and DM37 of the Brighton and Hove City Plan Part Two.

- 10.26. Biodiversity Net Gain - 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

Transport and Highways

- 10.27. Whilst the demolition of the side garage is proposed the building line of the replacement side extension would be setback from the front elevation which continues to allow ample space for on plot car parking. There would be no change to the property access from the public highway.
- 10.28. The comments of the Local Highway Authority regarding the loss of the garage (and thus potential for cycle parking) are noted, however, it is not justified or necessary to impose a condition requiring a cycle store on a householder application, and there is ample space within the property to provide this should the occupiers require this.

Other matters

- 10.29. Representations raised concern with effect on property value and loss of views, however, these are not material planning considerations for the determination of applications. Concern has been raised relating to the works required to detach the adjoining garages, however, this is not a material planning consideration and is covered by separate civil legislation such as the Party Wall Act.
- 10.30. Representations also raised concern with noise related to construction activities which would be temporary. This is a small-scale minor householder planning application for which CEMPs (construction and environment management plans) are not usually required, and there are not considered to be any exceptional site circumstances to warrant a CEMP here.

11. CONCLUSION

- 11.1. As set out above, the proposal is considered to comprise a relatively modest set of extensions to a domestic property that would be in keeping with the dwelling and its surroundings and would not unduly impact neighbouring amenity. The proposal would comply with relevant policies of the Brighton and Hove City Plan Part One and Part Two.

12. EQUALITIES

- 12.1. 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.

12.2. 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.

