

<u>No:</u>	BH2025/03024	<u>Ward:</u>	Round Hill Ward
<u>App Type:</u>	Householder Planning Consent		
<u>Address:</u>	2 Richmond Road Brighton BN2 3RN		
<u>Proposal:</u>	Replacement of existing fenestration and fitment of a new entrance door to basement, and first floor window to the front elevation, erection of a single storey rear extension, loft conversion with 2no. rear dormers and 1no. front conservation rooflight (amended).		
<u>Officer:</u>	Charlotte Tovey, tel: 01273 202138	<u>Valid Date:</u>	12.12.2025
<u>Con Area:</u>	Round Hill	<u>Expiry Date:</u>	06.02.2026
		<u>EOT:</u>	20.01.2026
<u>Agent:</u>	Lewis McMillan Architects Ltd. 108 Barnett Road, Brighton, BN1 7GH		
<u>Applicant:</u>	Yuval Veeder, 2 Richmond Road, Brighton, BN2 3RN		

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 and block plan	25-120-20		12-Dec-25
Proposed Drawing	25-120-03	E	20-Jan-26
Proposed Drawing	25-120-04	D	20-Jan-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. All new render finishes of the ground floor rear extension shall be smooth, lime based, wet render without external beads, stops, bell drips or expansion joints.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to comply with DM26 of Brighton & Hove City Plan Part 2 and CP15 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One

4. The windows hereby approved to the front elevation of the building shall be slimline double glazed painted timber double hung vertical sliding sashes with

no trickle vents and shall match exactly the original sash windows to the building, including their architrave, frame and glazing bar dimensions and mouldings, and subcill, masonry cill and reveal details, and shall have concealed sash boxes recessed within the reveals and set back from the outer face of the building to match the original sash windows to the building, and the windows shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to comply with policy DM26 of Brighton & Hove City Plan Part 2, and CP15 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One.

5. The rooflight(s) hereby approved shall have steel or cast metal frames colour-finished black or dark grey, fitted flush with the adjoining roof surface and shall not project above the plane of the roof.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to comply with policies DM26 of Brighton & Hove City Plan Part 2, and CP15 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One.

6. All historic decorative moulding above the front entrance door and windows to the front elevation of the building shall be retained and are not to be removed during the construction of the development.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory preservation of the building and to comply with policies DM26 of Brighton & Hove City Plan Part 2, and CP15 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One

7. 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.

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. 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

4. The applicant is advised that under Part 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 disturbance to nesting wild birds, their nests and eggs is a criminal offence. The nesting season is normally taken as being from 1st March - 30th September so trees and scrub on the site should be assumed to contain nesting birds between these dates, unless a recent survey has been undertaken by a competent ecologist to show that it is absolutely certain that nesting birds are not present. The developer should take appropriate steps to ensure nesting birds, their nests and eggs are not disturbed and are protected until such time as they have left the nest. Planning permission for a development does not provide a defence against prosecution under this Act.

2. SITE LOCATION

- 2.1. The application site relates to a three storey end of terrace dwellinghouse located on the east side of Richmond Road within the Roundhill Conservation Area. The building is constructed in white painted render and the existing glazing to the front elevation is with timber framed sash windows. The existing pitched roof is unaltered and constructed in concrete red tiles. At the rear, the building has a patio and rear garden where the land slopes to the east with views to Roundhill Crescent and Bear Road.
- 2.2. The southern elevation of the building lies immediately adjacent to a stepped pathway known locally as "catscreeper" that connects Richmond Road to Roundhill Crescent.
- 2.3. The site is located in the Round Hill Conservation Area and alterations to the dwellinghouse are restricted by an Article 4 Directive restricting permitted development rights in order to preserve the appearance and architectural features of the buildings.

3. RELEVANT HISTORY

- 3.1. **BH2003/03562/FP** Loft conversion with 1 front rooflight and 2 rear rooflights. Approved (not implemented)

4. RELEVANT HISTORY AT OTHER SITES

- 4.1. **BH1998/01870/FP** 10 Richmond Road - Installation of 2no. rear dormers and balustrading to existing terrace at rear. Approved

- 4.2. **BH2025/00846** 5 Wakefield Road - Roof alterations incorporating rear dormer, with 1no. front and 1no. rear rooflight, and erection of single-storey rear conservatory extension. (amended). Approved
- 4.3. **BH2025/02216** 9c Richmond Road - Replacement of existing fenestration and fitment of a new entrance door to basement, and first floor window to the front elevation, erection of a single storey rear extension, loft conversion with 2no. rear dormers and 1no. front conservation rooflight (amended). Approved

5. APPLICATION DESCRIPTION

- 5.1. Planning permission is sought for replacement of the existing fenestration and fitment of a new entrance door to basement, a new first floor window to the front elevation, the erection of a single storey rear extension, loft conversion with 2no. rear dormers and 1no. front conservation rooflight.
- 5.2. During the course of the application amendments have been made to the proposal removing the 'rosewood' UPVC windows from the front elevation that are now proposed to be white painted timber framed slimline double glazed sashes. The second rooflight proposed to the front roof slope has also been removed, and the material finish of the roof has been upgraded to slate tiles. The materials of the rear dormers and rear extension are now confirmed to match the host building. Details have also been added to the proposed elevational drawings showing the detail retained on the front elevation below the blank window at first floor level.
- 5.3. Neighbours have not been reconsulted as the proposal is now considered to be less harmful to the appearance of the building and Conservation Area and the amendments do not fall outside the scope of the original description of works.

6. REPRESENTATIONS

- 6.1. In response to publicity, responses were received from **11** individuals and the Round Hill Society, **objecting** to the application and raising the following issues:
- Cause visual harm to the appearance of the building and the terrace of 4 houses that it sits within (2-8 Richmond Road).
 - Adversely harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, Catscreeper and green corridor.
 - Inappropriate height of development.
 - Overdevelopment of the site.
 - Inadequate detailing has been included on the plans omitting the detail above the front door and windows on the front elevation and that amendments were sought by the case officer prior to consultation ending
 - The alterations would cause harm to the neighbouring amenity and result in overshadowing, overlooking and an overbearing form of development
 - Result in a detrimental loss of biodiversity.
 - Concerns on the use of the building

- 6.2. Councillor Raphael Hill has objected to the application and a copy of their representation is attached as an appendix to this report.
- 6.3. In addition, responses were received from 1 individual in **support** of the application, raising the following issues:
- Good Design
 - The development increases internal space efficiently while upgrading windows to modern performance standards with heritage aesthetics. This represents renovation that keeps historic buildings viable and well maintained for future generations.
 - Conservation areas are not museums - loft conversions with appropriately designed dormers allow properties to provide modern accommodation without increasing ground footprint. The rear extension is modest and subordinate to the main building.
- 6.4. Full details of representations received can be found online on the planning register.

7. CONSULTATIONS

Internal

- 7.1. **Heritage** No comment

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

External

- 7.2. **CAG:** Refuse

No objection to the slimline sash windows or 1no. conservation style rooflight
Concerns that the description and plans have inadequate detailing.
Development would cause harm to the terrace that it sits within and the Conservation Area

8. MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 8.1. 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.
- 8.2. 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).

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
CP15	Heritage

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
DM26	Conservation Areas
DM37	Green Infrastructure and Nature Conservation

Supplementary Planning Document:

SPD09	Architectural Features
SPD11	Nature Conservation & Development
SPD12	Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations
SPD17	Urban Design Framework

Other Documents

Round Hill Conservation Area character statement

10. CONSIDERATIONS & ASSESSMENT

- 10.1. The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to the design and appearance of the proposal, the impact of the development on the character of the Conservation Area and whether the development would have a detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity. Other considerations include the standard of accommodation provided for the existing and future occupiers and the impacts of the development on the Biodiversity of the site.
- 10.2. 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.
- 10.3. Case law has held that the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area should be given "considerable importance and weight".

- 10.4. A site visit has been carried out by the case officer to assess the proposal and to consider the points raised in the representations received.
- 10.5. At present, the front elevation of the building is in poor condition, the sash windows are rotten and the basement has visible damp and the front elevation is in need of refurbishment. The current condition is considered to detract from the character of the Conservation Area and visually from the neighbouring dwellings.

Design, appearance and heritage

Front Elevation

- 10.6. The proposal seeks to alter the front elevation of the building by replacing the existing timber framed single glazed sash windows that are in poor condition with timber framed slimline double glazed sashes. These amendments to the front elevation of the building are considered to be sympathetic to the existing glazing, matching their opening method and traditional frame finish. As the building is not listed, there is no objection to the replacement with slimline double glazed units. A condition is attached requiring that the sash windows are white painted timber framed and recessed within the frame and show no visible trickle vents subject to this condition this is considered acceptable.
- 10.7. A new sash window is proposed to the first floor 'blind' recessed window above the front door. Concerns have been raised that this alteration would detract from the uniformity of the four houses (2-8) within the terrace and cause harm to the Conservation Area. Whilst it is noted that these four dwellings do share this same blank window feature above the door, the buildings are not strictly identical and uniform in appearance. It was noted on the site visit that there are other examples of windows being fitted to the 'blank' window recess at this level at neighbouring dwellings within the vicinity of the site. As there is some variation to the front elevations of the neighbouring dwellings and within the streetscene, the fitment of a sympathetic traditional sash window in this blank recess is not considered to cause harm to the appearance of the building or terrace that would warrant refusal. The design would match the other new sash windows proposed to the front elevation and it is not considered that the window would result in an incongruous addition.
- 10.8. Concerns have been raised by local residents, CAG and the Round Hill Society that the existing and proposed drawings are inaccurate and do not show adequate detailing of the ornate features above the front door, its pillars or the windows cill and frames. There are no concerns on the information submitted and no loss of the historic moulding to the front elevation is proposed and this is recommended to be secured by condition.
- 10.9. A new door is proposed to the basement level that would not create new access to the street level but provide the occupiers with access to the basement area for repairs and bike storage. The drawings confirm that the new door will be four panelled and timber and is considered to be acceptable.
- 10.10. The amendments to the front roof slope include replacing the existing concrete tiles with slate tiles and fitment of 1no. conservation style rooflight that would

align with the window in the bay below. Taking into account the rooflights present at no. 4 and no. 6 Richmond Road, this part of the development is considered acceptable. The new slate tiles would improve the appearance of the building and is welcomed. A condition is recommended requiring that the rooflight is conservation style and fitted flush within the roof slope.

- 10.11. Taking into account the existing condition of the building and the context of the street scene, the alterations proposed to the front elevation of the building would result in an improvement to the appearance of the building from its current deteriorated condition and cause no harm to the Round Hill Conservation Area.

Rear Elevation

- 10.12. The application proposes a new rear ground floor extension and two new dormer windows within the rear roofslope.
- 10.13. The proposed ground floor rear extension is single storey and would extend 3m into the rear garden with a pitched roof approximately 3.3m in height with an eaves height of 2m. The proposed side elevational drawing detail the height of the development and what will be visible above the boundary wall from Catscreep. The drawings show 1.7m of the extension will be visible above the side/rear boundary. The extension would be adequately set away from the southern boundary and Catscreep by 1.3m with the majority of the development otherwise concealed from view. The extension is proposed to be finished in white painted render with a slate tiled pitched roof to match the principle roofslope. The new sliding doors to the rear elevation of the extension would be a modern design however due to their concealment below the boundary wall no concern is raised in this respect.
- 10.14. The design and material finish of the ground floor extension is not considered to cause harm to the appearance of the existing building. The original planform of the host building would remain clearly identifiable. The depth of the extension proposed is not considered to overdevelop the site. Adequate outdoor amenity space of over 5.7m would be retained to the eastern boundary and the extension is also set away from the shared boundary with no. 4 Richmond Road to the north.
- 10.15. There are other examples of a single storey rear extension to the rear elevation of Richmond Road such as no. 12 Richmond Road to the north and no. 29 Wakefield Road to the south. In the wider area to the north on Richmond Road this form of development is seen at most rear elevations from no. 28 upward. To the south of Catscreep there is a flat roof extension to the rear elevation of no. 29 Wakefield Road that has been constructed with a flat roof and is built up to the boundary wall.
- 10.16. Given the context of the rear elevation of the neighbouring dwellings and the overall size of the plot, the single storey rear extension is considered to result in a subordinate addition that would not cause harm to the appearance of the building or Round Hill Conservation area. The proposal would not interrupt any views of the green corridor between Richmond Road and Roundhill Crescent or views to the east to Bear Road. A condition is attached requiring the materials

to match the host building, where necessary, to ensure a sympathetic appearance.

- 10.17. Two new rear dormer windows are proposed to the rear roofslope. The dormers are aligned sufficiently with the existing first floor glazing, of traditional design and sufficiently small in scale. The new glazing will be 'rosewood' UPVC heritage style double glazed units which is acceptable given their positioning and limited visibility. The improvement of changing the principal roof material from concrete tiles to slate is considered to be an overall enhancement to the appearance of the building and the fitment of two modest, traditional dormer windows to the rear roof slope would not detract from the appearance of the building or conservation area.
- 10.18. When viewing the rear elevation of 2 Richmond Road and wider area, there are other examples of similar development at no. 10 Richmond Road to the north, dormer windows present to the east, visible from the rear garden of the site to the front roof slopes of Roundhill Crescent and to the south on Wakefield Road. Representations have commented that recent planning applications for similar development have been refused in the conservation area however searches have not found this is not the case. The rear elevation of the building is not highly visible from Catscreep due to the height of the boundary, fences and the green hedges. When viewed from Roundhill Crescent there are oblique and longer views of the rear elevation but this is interrupted by the existing trees and vegetation.
- 10.19. Concerns have been raised by local residents, CAG and the Round Hill Society that the proposed single storey rear extension and 2no. rear dormer windows would visually be intrusive causing harm when viewed from Catscreep and the surrounding Conservation Area however following the amendments received, due to the sympathetic design of the dormers, traditional materials proposed and the context of the rear roof slopes within the terrace, the alterations are not considered to cause harm to the appearance of the building or cause harm to the appearance and character of the Conservation Area that would warrant refusal.
- 10.20. Overall the alterations and extensions to the host building are considered acceptable and in accordance with policies DM18, DM21, DM26 of City Plan Part Two and CP12 and CP15 of City Plan Part One.

Impact on Amenity

- 10.21. Policy DM20 of City Plan Part 2 states that planning permission for any development or change of use will not be granted where it would cause unacceptable loss of amenity to the proposed, existing and/or adjacent users, residents, occupiers or where it is liable to be detrimental to human health.
- 10.22. Concerns have been raised that the new glazing to the front and rear of the building would result in a loss of privacy to the adjoining neighbours.
- 10.23. The new window proposed to the front elevation 'blank' window would create new views to the west however there is adequate separation between this

window and the dwellings on Princes Crescent by the highway and green space opposite that the new glazing would not result in a loss of privacy to the residents on Princes Crescent.

- 10.24. The new windows proposed in the rear dormers are small in scale and whilst new views will be created from the converted loft space, the views achievable would be similar to that already existing at first floor level from the existing windows.
- 10.25. Concerns have been raised that the ground floor rear extension would result in an overbearing extension at the rear resulting in a loss of light and privacy to the adjoining neighbours.
- 10.26. The neighbour most affected by the proposal would be no. 4 Richmond Road to the north adjoining the site. The height of the extension would not sit detrimentally taller than the existing boundary and the proposed pitched roof design and single storey ground floor nature would also mitigate any harmful overshadowing. The adjacent property no. 4 sits higher in land level than no. 2 which also mitigates any harmful overshadowing and the proposal would not result in a loss of light or outlook that would warrant refusal in this instance.
- 10.27. The view from the new sliding patio doors proposed to the rear elevation would be mitigated by the boundary treatment to no. 4 Richmond Road and there is considered to be adequate separation to the dwellings east on Roundhill Crescent to mitigate against any loss of privacy.
- 10.28. Therefore, after careful consideration, the development is not considered to result in an overbearing form of development, causing harmful loss of privacy or significant loss of light to the adjoining neighbours that would warrant refusal, in accordance with policy DM20 of City Plan Part Two.

Standard of Accommodation

- 10.29. The alterations proposed to the dwellinghouse will result in a 3 bedroom, 5 person accommodation over 4 storeys. There would be no increase in occupancy beyond the existing arrangement as the third bedroom on the first floor will be converted to a bathroom and a new double bedroom placed in the converted loft space.
- 10.30. Concerns were raised in neighbour consultation that the development would create a poor standard of accommodation. No change of use is proposed and the plans show a retained C3 residential dwelling.
- 10.31. The new layout proposed would meet the minimum floorspace standards of 99sqm for the number of occupants proposed. The two double bedrooms exceed the minimum requirement of 11.5msq and the single bedroom exceeding 7.5msq. The proposed floorplan includes adequate ventilation and light in each bedroom and adequate space within the rooms for placement of furniture.
- 10.32. The rear extension will mostly take place on hard standing and leave adequate outdoor amenity space for the use of future occupiers.

- 10.33. Overall the development is considered to offer an acceptable standard of accommodation for a C3 residential dwelling in accordance with policy DM1 of City Plan Part Two and the Nationally described space standards.

Biodiversity

- 10.34. Concerns were raised that the development would have a detrimental effect on the biodiversity of the site and local wildlife.
- 10.35. The wildlife assessment submitted with the application did not consider the development was in close proximity to woodland that the alterations would have an impact on local wildlife that required further consideration or consultation the county ecologist.
- 10.36. The ground floor extension will mostly take place on hard standing. There would be some trimming of the hedge on the northern boundary with no. 4 Richmond Road to facilitate the extension however as this hedging is of low quality, the impacts of this alterations to the biodiversity and wildlife of the site would not warrant refusal. A condition is attached requiring that a bee brick is fitted to the extension to improve the biodiversity of the site.
- 10.37. The 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.
- 10.38. The plans are considered to accord with policies DM37 of City Plan Part Two and CP11 of City Plan Part One.

Conclusion

- 10.39. Taking into account all the above, the proposed development is considered to have an acceptable impact on the host building that would not cause harm to its appearance or to the character of the Round Hill Conservation Area. No demonstrable harm to neighbouring amenity would result from the proposal and the impacts are otherwise considered acceptable.

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 would be confirmed in the CIL liability notice which would be issued as soon as it practicable after the issuing of planning permission, if granted.