

<u>No:</u>	BH2026/00840	<u>Ward:</u>	Hollingdean & Fiveways Ward
<u>App Type:</u>	Householder Planning Consent		
<u>Address:</u>	14 Ashford Road Brighton BN1 6LJ		
<u>Proposal:</u>	Demolition of rear extension and erection of two storey rear extension along with proposed rear dormer along with no. 2 rooflights on the front roof elevation.		
<u>Officer:</u>	Malila Totene, tel:	<u>Valid Date:</u>	07.04.2026
<u>Con Area:</u>		<u>Expiry Date:</u>	02.06.2026
<u>Listed Building Grade:</u>		<u>EOT:</u>	
<u>Agent:</u>	PMR Architecture Suite 4 Sheridan House 112-116 Western Road Hove BN31DD United Kingdom		
<u>Applicant:</u>	Vicki Wickens 14 Ashford Road Brighton Brighton & Hove BN1 6LJ		

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
Proposed Site Plan	25.96_PL_102	B	12-Jun-26
Location Plan	25.96_PL_001		07-Apr-26
Proposed Drawing	25.96_PL_101	B	12-Jun-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. 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.

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 site comprises a two-storey terraced house of brick and tile construction with render at first floor level, located in Ashford Road. The area is predominantly residential in character and features mainly terraced houses. The site is not within a conservation area and is not subject to any Article 4 Direction restricting external alterations to the property.

3. RELEVANT HISTORY

None identified.

4. APPLICATION DESCRIPTION

- 4.1. Planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing rear extension and for the construction of the following:
 - erection of part one, part two storey rear extension,
 - loft conversion with rear dormer and 2 rooflights to front elevation
- 4.2. The proposal has been revised during the course of the application to reduce the height and depth of the rear extensions.

5. REPRESENTATIONS

- 5.1. Representations have been received from 6 people, objecting to the proposed development for the following reasons:
- Proposal is excessive in size for the plot and would significantly intensify site coverage,
 - Loss of sunlight and daylight
 - Loss of outlook, increased sense of enclosure/overbearing impact
 - Bulky, dominant, and out of scale
 - Out of keeping with local pattern and open garden character
 - Overdevelopment of the site
 - Would set a precedent for large-scale developments eroding character of the area
- 5.2. Full comments can be found on the online planning register.

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; revised October 2024; revised October 2024);
 - 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:

DM1	Housing Quality, Choice and Mix
DM18	High quality design and places
DM20	Protection of Amenity
DM21	Extensions and alterations

Supplementary Planning Documents:

SPD12	Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations
-------	---

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 on neighbouring amenity.

Design and Appearance

- 9.2. The proposed development is considered against Policies DM18, DM20, and DM21 of the City Plan Part 2.
- 9.3. The proposal comprises a two-storey rear extension, along with a rear dormer and two rooflights on the front roof slope. The original plans were amended to reduce the impact of the development on neighbouring properties as follows.
- The depth of the ground floor element has been reduced from 4.8m to 4.5m, with the maximum height reduced from 3m to 2.8m.
 - The depth of the first-floor extension has been reduced from 2.5m to 2m.
- 9.4. The ground floor extension measures 4.6m in width, while the first-floor extension measures 3.4m in width.
- 9.5. It is acknowledged that the proposed dormer would not fall within permitted development rights, as the proposed materials (zinc) do not match those of the existing dwelling and the dormer is not sufficiently set back from the eaves. However, a dormer of a very similar size could be constructed under permitted development rights. Furthermore, the dormer is not considered to be out of character with the surrounding area. Rear dormers are a common feature within the wider area and are evident on Ashford Road in a variety of forms, sizes, and designs. Additionally, the dormer is located at the rear of the property and therefore not clearly visible from public vantage points.
- 9.6. Having regard to materials, the dormer will be clad in zinc and will include a uPVC window facing the rear garden. The first-floor extension will be finished in brick while the ground floor extension will be finished in white render. All windows proposed in the rear elevation will be UPVC with light (Chartwell) green frames. The ground floor extension will have a flat roof incorporating a rooflight. Despite the use of non-matching materials such as zinc and green UPVC windows, it is not considered that the proposal would adversely impact the character of the wider area given these differing materials would be located at the rear of the property.

- 9.7. The surrounding area is characterised by a variety of rear garden extensions of differing sizes and designs, some of which are of a greater depth than the current proposal.
- 9.8. Whilst there are no first-floor additions in the immediate vicinity, there are many such extensions to the east on Ashford Road and in the wider surrounding area. The proposed first floor element is modest in depth and despite extending above the eaves of the main dwelling, would still appear suitably subservient to the main dwelling.
- 9.9. The alterations to the rear as a whole would not be visible from the public realm and would not significantly harm the appearance and character of the wider area.
- 9.10. Furthermore, the inclusion of rooflights on the front roof slope is not uncommon within the street scene. As such, their addition would appear in keeping with the prevailing character of the wider area and would not appear out of place.
- 9.11. Overall, the proposal is not considered to be unacceptable in design and would not harm the appearance or character of the property, the streetscene or the wider surrounding area, in accordance with policy CP12 and DM21.

Impact on Amenity

- 9.12. As set out above, reductions to the height and depth of the proposal were secured during the determination of the planning application to help reduce the impacts on neighbouring amenity.
- 9.13. The proposed rear extension and dormer do not include any side-facing windows. The proposed windows and door on the rear elevation of the extension, together with the dormer window, would provide views mainly towards the applicant's own rear garden. The front rooflights would face the street and would be angled upwards, thereby limiting potential for overlooking. As such, there would be no significant increase in overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring properties and the proposal is considered to be acceptable in this regard
- 9.14. In terms of overbearing impact, the introduction of the rear extension would have the greatest impact on No. 16, the immediately adjoining property to the east. There is, as existing, a low boundary wall between these properties and as such the introduction of a 4.5m extension tight on the boundary, in conjunction with a shallow first floor element would result in a somewhat enclosing impact to No.16. However, an overall depth of 4.5m is not considered to be excessive, particularly when considering the very mixed character to the rear of Ashford Road, which includes a number of extensions deeper than that proposed under this application. It is therefore not considered that any overbearing or enclosing impact would be so harmful as to warrant refusal of the application.
- 9.15. In relation to No. 12, there would be no discernible overbearing impact from the ground floor element as the proposal would be screened by the existing built form at this property. Whilst there would likely be some limited enclosing impact and loss of outlook to the first floor window at No.12 from the proposed first floor

element, the shallow depth (2m) of the proposed first floor extension would be such that any impact in this regard would not be so significant as to warrant refusal of the application.

- 9.16. The proposed rear extensions would be located on the south elevation of the property and would therefore be south-facing. The property most affected in terms of daylight and sunlight would be No. 16. It is acknowledged that there would be some loss of sunlight to the rear windows, door and garden area of No. 16 in the later part of the day; however, given the overall size of the extensions this impact is not considered to be so significant as to warrant refusal and, on balance, the proposal is considered to be acceptable.
- 9.17. In relation to No. 12, there would be no discernible loss of light from the ground floor element as the proposal would be screened by the existing built form at this property. Whilst there would likely be some limited overshadowing to the first-floor window at No.12 from the proposed first floor element in the earlier part of the day, this would be relatively limited and any loss of light would not be so significant as to warrant refusal of the application.
- 9.18. Overall, the proposal would not have a significantly detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity, in accordance with Policies DM20 and DM21 of The Brighton and Hove City Plan Part Two.

Other Matters Including Those Raised in Representations:

- 9.19. Whilst concerns have been raised in neighbouring representations regarding an outbuilding being constructed on the site, and the general overdevelopment of the site as a cumulative result of the outbuilding and proposed extension, this outbuilding does not form part of the current application. The applicant has stated that the outbuilding has been constructed under permitted development rights and therefore would not require planning permission. Whilst no measurements have been taken of the outbuilding on-site to confirm whether it constitutes permitted development, should neighbouring residents have any concerns that the proposed outbuilding exceeds permitted development allowances, they can request that the Council's enforcement team investigate.
- 9.20. The cumulative impact of the new outbuilding and the proposed development does require consideration but it is considered that even with both the outbuilding and proposed extension in place, a reasonable amount of garden space (approximately 32sqm) would still be retained and the site is not considered to be overdeveloped to the extent that would warrant a refusal of planning permission.

Biodiversity Net Gain

- 9.21. This scheme was considered exempt from the need to secure mandatory biodiversity net gain under Schedule 7A of the TCPA because: [pick one]
- It does not impact a priority habitat or habitat of more than 25sqm or 5m of linear habitat;
 - It is a retrospective application under s73A.
 - It is a self-build/custom build application.

10. EQUALITIES

10.1. 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.

10.2. 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.

