

<b><u>No:</u></b>	<b>BH2021/01017</b>	<b><u>Ward:</u></b>	<b>Hangleton And Knoll Ward</b>
<b><u>App Type:</u></b>	<b>Householder Planning Consent</b>		
<b><u>Address:</u></b>	<b>20 St Helens Drive Hove BN3 8EA</b>		
<b><u>Proposal:</u></b>	<b>Erection of single storey side and rear extensions and roof alterations including hip to gable roof extensions, rear dormer and rooflights to the front and rear. Installation of rear decking, other fenestration alterations and associated works. (Amended plans and description)</b>		
<b><u>Officer:</u></b>	Ayscha Woods, tel: 292322	<b><u>Valid Date:</u></b>	07.04.2021
<b><u>Con Area:</u></b>	N/A	<b><u>Expiry Date:</u></b>	02.06.2021
<b><u>Listed Building Grade:</u></b>	N/A	<b><u>EOT:</u></b>	
<b><u>Agent:</u></b>	Darby Architectural Ltd 84 Westbourne Street Hove BN3 5FA		
<b><u>Applicant:</u></b>	Mr and Mrs Colyer 20 St Helens Drive Hove BN3 8EA		

## 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 **MINDED TO GRANT** subject to no new material considerations been raised in representations up until the 28 July 2021, 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	01	-	22 March 2021
Proposed Drawing	02	C	28 June 2021

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. A 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.

4. 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 QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 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. Where possible, bee bricks should be placed in a south facing wall in a sunny location at least 1 metre above ground level.

## **2. SITE LOCATION**

- 2.1. The application site relates to a bungalow property located to the west side of St Helens Drive, opposite St Helens Park. The site is not located within a conservation area and there are no Article 4 directions covering the site. The bungalow is constructed of red brick, white UPVC windows and a red terracotta tiled roof.

## **3. RELEVANT HISTORY**

- 3.1. **BH2021/00108** - Certificate of lawfulness for proposed erection of single storey extensions to rear and both sides and erection of front porch. Loft conversion incorporating hip to gable extension, 3no dormers and 2no rooflights. Installation of rear decking.  
Approved - 19/03/21
- 3.2. **BH2020/02271** - Erection of single storey side and rear extensions, front porch, decking to the rear, roof alterations incorporating hip to gable extensions, front dormer and front, rear and side rooflights.  
Refused - 12/10/20 for the following reason:
- 3.3. The proposed hip-to-barn end and front dormer roof extensions, and front porch extension would be at odds with, and significantly harm the prevailing character and appearance of the existing building and its adjacent set of properties, and would stand out obtrusively within the streetscene, impacting on the visual amenity of the wider area, contrary to policies QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and CP12 of the City Plan Part One.

## **4. APPLICATION DESCRIPTION**

- 4.1. Permission is sought for the erection of single storey side and rear extensions and roof alterations including hip to gable roof extensions, rear dormer and

rooflights to the front and rear. Installation of rear decking, other fenestration alterations and associated works.

- 4.2. It is noted that the scheme was amended throughout the course of the application. As originally submitted, a front dormer was proposed. This was removed and replaced with a proposed front rooflight. In addition, the width of the ground floor side and rear extension to the northern side was reduced to no longer extend beyond the side wall of the original building and a side access is now retained.

## 5. REPRESENTATIONS

- 5.1. **Ten (10)** letters have been received objecting to the proposed development for the following reasons:

- Impact on conservation area
- Impact on property value
- Additional Traffic
- Inappropriate height of development
- Overdevelopment
- Out of character
- Overshadowing
- Overlooking
- Poor design
- Restriction of view
- Too close to boundary
- Noise impact
- Traffic/impact on parking
- Similar to previous scheme
- Set a precedent

- 5.2. **Councillor Barnett** and **Councillor Lewry** have objected to the application. A copy of their representation is attached to the end of this report.

## 6. CONSULTATIONS

- 6.1. **Brighton & Hove Archaeological Society:** Comment  
The Brighton and Hove Archaeological Society suggest contacting the County Archaeologist for recommendations.

- 6.2. **County Archaeology:** No objection  
Although this application is situated within an Archaeological Notification Area, based on the information supplied, it is not considered that any significant archaeological remains are likely to be affected by these proposals.

## 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 Local Plan 2005 (retained policies March 2016);
  - 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).
- 7.3. Due weight has been given to the relevant retained policies in the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005 according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF.

## 8. **RELEVANT POLICIES AND 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 and Hove Local Plan (retained policies March 2016):

QD14 Extensions and alterations

QD18 Species protection

QD27 Protection of amenity

HE12 Scheduled ancient monuments and other important archaeological sites

#### Brighton & Hove City Plan Part Two (Proposed Submission October 2020):

Policies in the Proposed Submission City Plan Part 2 do not carry full statutory weight but are gathering weight as the Plan proceeds through its stages. They provide an indication of the direction of future policy. Since 23 April 2020, when the Plan was agreed for submission to the Secretary of State, it has gained weight for the determination of planning applications. The weight given to the relevant CPP2 policies considered in determining this application is set out in the Considerations and Assessment section below where applicable.

DM18 High quality design and places

DM20 Protection of Amenity

DM21 Extensions and alterations

#### Supplementary Planning Documents:

SPD11 Nature Conservation & Development

SPD12 Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations

## 9. CONSIDERATIONS & ASSESSMENT

- 9.1. Permission is sought for the erection of single storey side and rear extensions and roof alterations including hip to gable roof extensions, rear dormer and rooflights to the front and rear. Installation of rear decking, other fenestration alterations and associated works.
- 9.2. It is noted that following a number of objections to the original proposal, the applicants submitted an amended scheme. The amendments include the removal of a proposed front dormer, replaced with a proposed front rooflight, and a reduced width of the northern side extension and the retention of the side access. The most recently submitted plans are considered in the determination of this application.
- 9.3. The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to the impact of the proposed development on the appearance and character of the building, surrounding streetscene and wider area, and the amenities of the neighbouring properties.

### **Design and Appearance:**

- 9.4. The application site relates to a bungalow property located to the west side of St Helens Drive, opposite St Helens Park. The property as existing retains its original form, with a front projection and hipped roof, and forms part of a set of largely uniform bungalows which retain their original character.
- 9.5. It is acknowledged that the properties to the north of the site (other than no. 21 directly adjacent) are different in character and design from the application site with differing roof forms, various extensions and alterations.
- 9.6. The proposed hip-to-gable roof extension and part flat roof would add some additional bulk to the building and would be somewhat different to the character and roof forms of the adjacent set of uniform properties within the streetscene. The previous planning application (BH2021/02271) considered such roof form, in conjunction with a front dormer and front porch projection to be a level of extension and alteration to the building that would be at odds with, and significantly harm the prevailing character and appearance of the existing building and its adjacent set of properties.
- 9.7. However, the current scheme does not propose a front projection, and following amendments received throughout the course of the application, the front dormer has been removed. As such, the level of overall bulk and development when viewed from the streetscene has been reduced. The appearance of the proposal within the streetscene is therefore considered acceptable.
- 9.8. Whilst the roof extensions may differ from the adjacent set of properties, it must be acknowledged that similar roof extensions, including the proposed hip-to-gable, rooflights and a rear dormer could be constructed under permitted development without the need for planning permission which forms a consideration in the determination of this application. It should be noted that a

Lawful Development Certificate for some significant roof alterations has already been approved under BH2021/00108 which would similarly affect the streetscene. In addition, whilst they do not form part of this current proposed, the applicant has provided further plans which show alternative roof works which could be constructed under permitted development, which are considered to result in a worsened appearance and would further disrupt the character of the adjacent set of properties and exacerbate the impact on the streetscene.

9.9. The proposed single storey side and rear extension would form modest and subservient additions to the main building and retain the ground floor separation from neighbouring properties with the retention of the side access. The proposed rear roof extension would have a pitched roof and form a clearly subservient addition to the main roof. The ground floor terrace is also considered acceptable on design grounds given it's limited visibility.

9.10. Following the amendments to the scheme and for the reasons outlined above, on balance, it is considered that the design of the proposal is considered acceptable and has overcome the previous reason for refusal.

**Impact on Amenity:**

9.11. The impact on the adjacent properties at 19 and 21 St Helens Drive has been fully considered in terms of daylight, sunlight, outlook and privacy, and following a site visit, no significant harm has been identified.

9.12. The hip-to-gable roof extension to both sides would be set suitably away from both adjacent properties at nos. 19 and 21 and there would be no increase in ridge height. This would not result in an overbearing impact on these properties. The front rooflight would give oblique views out to St Helens Park opposite and would not impact on the amenity of the adjacent properties.

9.13. The side extension to the north would be single storey in height with a pitched roof and following amendments, would be set suitably away from no. 21 to the north, in line with the existing property, separated from the boundary of the site by a side access pathway. As such, it would not result in an overbearing or unneighbourly impact on no. 21.

9.14. The rear extension would be single storey in height and would not project beyond the garage structure of no. 21 to the south, or the existing garage structure to the rear of the host site along the north boundary with no. 21. Furthermore, its part pitched roof form would mitigate any potential overbearing impacts on the adjacent properties.

9.15. The proposed terrace at first floor level would be recessed within the proposed rear gable and would be sufficiently screened from views to the adjacent properties to the side. The views would be to the rear gardens of the adjacent properties which would be similar to views which could be achieved from similar roof extensions which could be carried out utilising permitted development rights.

- 9.16. The proposed raised terrace at ground floor level would not project significantly beyond the existing garage structure to the north of the application site, and north of no. 19, and would include sufficient 2m boundary screening. No significantly harmful overlooking or loss of privacy would occur.
- 9.17. The proposed terraces at ground and first floor levels would be for normal domestic use. They would not result in any significant noise disturbance above and beyond that which could occur from use of the rear garden.
- 9.18. It is noted that objections have been received on the grounds of loss of on-site parking. The site has an existing hardstanding, and is not located within a controlled parking zone. There is sufficient on street parking.

**Other matters:**

- 9.19. The scheme includes the removal of the existing garage. There is an existing hardstanding on site which can accommodate vehicle parking, and there is also on-street parking available. The loss of the garage is considered acceptable.
- 9.20. 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 bees. A condition requiring a bee brick has been attached to improve ecology outcomes on the site in accordance with the Policy CP10 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One and Supplementary Planning Document SPD11 Nature Conservation and Development.

**10. EQUALITIES**  
None identified.

