

<b><u>No:</u></b>	<b>BH2017/00071</b>	<b><u>Ward:</u></b>	<b>Woodingdean</b>
<b><u>App Type:</u></b>	<b>Householder Planning Consent</b>		
<b><u>Address:</u></b>	<b>150 Warren Road, Brighton, BN2 6DD</b>		
<b><u>Proposal:</u></b>	<b>Roof alterations including roof extensions, raising of ridge height and installation of roof lights and solar panels to front and rear elevations. Erection of porch to side elevation, balcony to front elevation and associated works.</b>		
<b><u>Officer:</u></b>	Andrew Huntley, tel: 292106	<b><u>Valid Date:</u></b>	16 January 2017
<b><u>Con Area:</u></b>	N/A	<b><u>Expiry Date:</u></b>	13 March 2017
<b><u>Listed Building Grade:</u></b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b><u>EOT:</u></b>	
<b><u>Agent:</u></b>	Graham Johnson Designs, 134 Hollingbury Road, Brighton, BN1 7JD		
<b><u>Applicant:</u></b>	Secom Technical Services Ltd, 15 The Cliff, Brighton, BN2 5RF		

**This application was deferred at Committee on 12<sup>th</sup> July 2017 to allow Members to carry out a site visit.**

## **1. RECOMMENDATION**

1.1 That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out below to **REFUSE** planning permission for the following reasons:

1. The proposed roof extension, by reason of its excessive size, bulk and design would form a dominant and unsympathetic feature, to the detriment of the original character of the bungalow and the surrounding streetscene. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and to Supplementary Planning Guidance 12 Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations.
2. The proposed rear access, by reason of its elevated position constitutes an unneighbourly development which would result in harmful overlooking and loss of privacy to 69 Chanel View Road and 148 Warren Road, contrary to policies QD14 and QD27 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan, and guidance within Supplementary Planning Document 12 Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations.

### **Informatives:**

1. This decision is based on the drawings received listed below:

<b>Plan Type</b>	<b>Reference</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Date Received</b>
Site Location Plan	36072/3		9 <sup>th</sup> January 2017
Block plan	36072/4		9 <sup>th</sup> January 2017
Details as Existing	36072/1		9 <sup>th</sup> January 2017
Details as Proposed	36072/2 A		9 <sup>th</sup> January 2017

## 2. SITE LOCATION & APPLICATION DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site is located on the northern side of Warren Road at the junction with Channel View Road and opposite the Woodingdean Memorial Park. The area is characterised by a mix of two-storey properties, chalet bungalows and bungalows. The property on the application site is a modest detached bungalow which has existing flat roofed extensions to the front, side and rear. At the rear of the garden is a detached flat roof garage with access onto Channel View Road. The site is bounded by a mature hedge.

## 3. RELEVANT HISTORY

- 3.1 None.

## 4. REPRESENTATIONS

- 4.1 Three (3) letters have been received from occupiers in the locality, supporting the proposed development on the following grounds:

- No major impact on light coming into our house and feel the upgrade to his property will benefit the area in terms of the look of the property.
- Warren Road is a road of very mixed and varied residences, some very large. Many have been extended over the years and have had front balconies added allowing them spectacular views that don't impact on neighbours.
- The property sits on a large corner plot set back from both adjacent roads with plenty of amenity space around it so it won't have a negative impact on the street scene.
- The property is currently badly designed with 1980 extensions. This redevelopment will bring these together whilst allowing the opportunity to remove asbestos panelling.

- 4.2 **Two (2)** letters have been received from occupiers in the locality objecting to the proposed development on the following grounds:

- This is and has been a single story building for many years. This proposed development is out of character for the area
- It will cause diminished light to neighbouring properties and overlook properties that are currently free from being so.
- This development will have an adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbours by reason of overlooking, loss of privacy.
- It also raises concerns of over development by loss of garden and mature shrubs.
- The development is out of character and scale with what has been here for many years.
- Concerns over the fact that the applicant is a property developer and the way that they sought support from neighbours and the Ward Councillor.

4.3 Councillor Simson has supported the scheme. A copy of the letter is attached to the report.

## **5. CONSULTATIONS**

5.1 None.

## **6. MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 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

6.2 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);

6.3 Due weight should be given to relevant policies in the development plan according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF.

## **7. POLICIES**

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One

SS1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

CP12 Urban design

Brighton & Hove Local Plan (retained policies March 2016):

QD14 Extensions and alterations

QD27 Protection of Amenity

Supplementary Planning Document:

SPD12 Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations

## **8. CONSIDERATIONS & ASSESSMENT**

8.1 The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and wider streetscene. In addition, the impact to the amenities of neighbouring properties shall also be assessed.

### **Design and Appearance**

- 8.2 Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan states that planning permission for extensions or alterations to existing buildings, including the formation of rooms in the roof, will only be granted if the proposed development:
- a) Is well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended, adjoining properties and to the surrounding area;
  - b) Would not result in significant noise disturbance or loss of privacy, outlook, daylight/sunlight or amenity to neighbouring properties;
  - c) Takes account of the existing space around buildings and the character of the area and an appropriate gap is retained between the extension and the joint boundary to prevent a terracing effect where this would be detrimental to the character of the area; and:-
  - d) Uses materials sympathetic to the parent building.
- 8.3 SPD12 states that 'the original design of the building and its setting (including the general character of the street/area) should form the primary influence on the design of any extension or alteration.'
- 8.4 The proposal seeks to significantly extend the roof, in essence making it two storey with a mezzanine at third floor level, which adds even greater mass and bulk to the existing modest bungalow. The proposal is significantly larger in scale than the existing property and many of the surrounding properties. The width of the proposed roof extension when viewed from the front is at odds with roofs of the existing property and the surrounding properties which are pitched or hipped. This would look out of place in the street scene as there would be an over dominant, bulky two storey property surrounded by more modest dwellings. The resultant design is contrived and has a large area of flat roof, which is considered to be visually poor and out of character with the surrounding properties which have hipped and gabled roofs. This highlights the fact, that the proposal is a poor design solution to extending this property.
- 8.5 Overall, the proposed roof extension, by reason of its excessive size, bulk and poor design would form a dominant and unsympathetic feature, to the detriment of the original character of the bungalow and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding streetscene. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and to Supplementary Planning Guidance 12 Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations.

#### **Impact on Amenity**

- 8.6 Policy QD14 states that in considering whether to grant planning permission for extensions to residential and commercial properties, account will be taken of sunlight and daylight factors, together with orientation, slope, overall height relationships, existing boundary treatment and how overbearing the proposal will be.
- 8.7 Policy QD27 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan states that planning permission for any development or change of use will not be granted where it would cause material nuisance and loss of amenity to the proposed, existing and/or adjacent

users, residents, occupiers or where it is liable to be detrimental to human health.

- 8.8 It is considered that due to the siting of the dwelling, the proposal would not result in a loss of sunlight or daylight or appear overbearing due to its siting being sufficiently distant from neighbouring dwellings.
- 8.9 However, the proposed rear access, by reason of its elevated position constitutes an unneighbourly development which would result in harmful overlooking and loss of privacy to 69 Chanel View Road and 148 Warren Road, contrary to policies QD14 and QD27 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan, and guidance within Supplementary Planning Document 12 Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations.

#### **Other Considerations**

- 8.10 The representation also included the concern over the loss of garden and mature shrubs. While this proposal may indeed result in the loss of some existing planting, the site is not within a protected area and the existing garden could be cleared by the owner in any event. Therefore, this loss would not warrant the refusal of planning permission and in addition, a suitably worded landscaping condition could have been attached if an approval were to have been recommended.
- 8.11 In addition, one representation raised concerns over the fact that the applicant is a property developer and the way that they sought support from neighbours and the Ward Councillor. Whether the applicant is a property developer or a member of the public is not a material planning consideration. All planning applications are determined on their planning merits. Nor is it unusual for applicants to discuss their proposal and seek their opinions and/or support from neighbours prior to the formal submission of a planning application. As such, this is not a material planning consideration and therefore cannot be a reason to refuse the application.

### **9. EQUALITIES**

- 9.1 None identified.

