

## Pre-application advice



**Application No:** PRE2021/00063

**Address:** Flat 4, 32 Brunswick  
Terrace, Hove BN3 1HN

**Description:** Works to enable rearrangement of uses for interior spaces and renewal of services in a second floor flat.

---

### Statement of Significance

This is a grade I listed building in the Brunswick Town Conservation Area. It is part of the planned Busby estate in one of the south-facing terraces which form the backdrop to Hove Lawns and give this part of the seafront its distinctive Regency style.

Built 1824-8 to the design of Architects Amon Wilds and C.A. Busby, the building is listed as part of a group 7-32 consecutive Brunswick Terrace. The south façades of this terrace form a single architectural piece of high status and architectural quality, designed symmetrically as a temple front with wings, finished in stucco and displaying pilasters and giant columns with Corinthian capitals. A majority of these properties are now subdivided into flats.

No.32 is at the western end of the terrace and turns the corner into Lansdowne Place. In contrast to the south elevation this western façade is of exposed brick with rendered flat string courses and parapet. It has a central entrance with a full-height bow above 3-bay Greek Doric colonnade.

Internal alterations have taken place in the past in relation to the subdivision of the property into self-contained flats. Flat 4 occupies the second floor of the property and interventions to the planform are evident as a result of provision of private access from the common ways and the introduction of modern kitchen and bathroom facilities at this level.

### Proposed work

The proposed work for which advice is sought concerns the re-configuration of the layout and moving the kitchen location, along with alteration to internal architectural details and finishes

### Heritage Advice

The proposed re-configuration of the accommodation is generally considered to be consistent with the aim to sustain or enhance the significance of the heritage asset and there is therefore no objection in principle to the submitted scheme, however as discussed during the meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> April there are matters of detail that will require careful consideration to ensure elements of the works that could be considered minor do not cause issues at formal application stage.

It is considered likely that the south facing rooms have always been 2 separate spaces, therefore their inter-connection would be acceptable subject to retaining elements that allow the former layout to be interpreted. The proposal to retain a nib on the southern wall and a downstand beam at ceiling level in alignment with the room division will allow this former arrangement to be understood and is in line with the guidance in SPD 09.

The routes and outlets for kitchen waste and venting need to be included within the application. The indication that there is an existing internal waste route that will not impact either of the principle elevations is encouraging and should be investigated and detailed on the application. Without a similar solution for the cooker hood flue and vent, a circulating filter cooker hood should be specified

Likewise, the routes and outlets for new toilet and shower room waste and ventilation (internal and external) and also the gas supply and boiler flue positions should be demonstrated to be possible whilst avoiding sensitive locations.

The provision of under floor heating can have consequences for historic flooring (which can be damaged) and the resultant floor levels within the property (which can affect the depth of lower door panels and skirtings). Full information on the specification would be required with the application which will be considered along with the consequent impact on original features. The proposal for parquet flooring has similar potential concerns. The heritage team would need to be assured that original details and fabric would not be impacted and that the work would be fully reversible.

Existing original or historic paneled doors should be retained/reused. The arrangement for the proposed study door was discussed at the meeting and a single leaf opening was agreed in preference to the arrangement indicated on the plan. A jib or pocket door without architraves or paneling is considered appropriate for the non-original ensuite door.

The replacement of the Victorian fire surround is not encouraged – non-original yet historic features can represent significance as layers of history in the evolution of an interior, and unless it can be demonstrated to be not authentic or of the expected quality it should be retained.

Full details of any proposed secondary glazing and its fixing arrangements will need to be submitted for consideration as part of the application.

Where there is potential harm/loss of historic fabric, the opportunity for heritage benefit should be sought to balance this. It is suggested that improvements to the lobby screen would be welcomed in this respect.

Guidance on appropriate cornice detailing for rooms at this level of the building are best obtained by identifying surviving original details in neighbouring properties that can be matched. The Regency Townhouse may be a convenient resource <http://www.rth.org.uk/> for appropriate cornice details.

### **Relevant Policies and Guidance**

Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990,

National Planning Policy Framework,

Planning Practice Guidance,

Historic England Good Practice Advice Notes,

Local Plan policies HE1, HE4 & HE6,

City Plan part 1 policy CP15,

Proposed Submission City Plan Part 2 policies DM26 & DM27

Supplementary Planning Document 09,

Supplementary Planning Guidance BH11.

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 policies DM26 & DM27 in the consideration of this application is 'significant weight'.

### **Disclaimer**

The Local Planning Authority seeks to provide the best advice possible on any enquiry received. However, the advice given does not bind the authority to any particular decision on any planning application that may subsequently be submitted which will be the subject of publicity and consultation. The advice given may subsequently be affected by external factors (e.g. new government guidance, local appeal decisions) which could result in a different view being subsequently put forward. Please note that pre-application enquiries and responses will only be retained by the Local Planning Authority for a period of two years.

---

Date: **27 April 2021**

Lesley Johnston  
Principal Planning Officer (Conservation)  
Policy, Projects and Heritage Team  
City Development and Regeneration  
Brighton & Hove City Council