

<u>No:</u>	BH2016/02377	<u>Ward:</u>	Rottingdean Coastal Ward
<u>App Type:</u>	Householder Planning Consent		
<u>Address:</u>	11 Coombe Vale, Saltdean, Brighton, BN2 8HN		
<u>Proposal:</u>	Roof alterations incorporating hip to barn end roof extensions, rear dormers, front rooflight and front and side windows and erection of front porch extension		
<u>Officer:</u>	Charlotte Bush, tel: 292193	<u>Valid Date:</u>	08.07.2016
<u>Con Area:</u>	N/A	<u>Expiry Date:</u>	02.09.2016
		<u>EoT/PPA Date</u>	
<u>Listed Building Grade:</u>			
<u>Agent:</u>	Stephen Bromley Associates West Sussex BN43 5WF	5 West Street	Shoreham-by-Sea
<u>Applicant:</u>	Mr A White 11 Coombe Vale Saltdean Brighton BN2 8HN		

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 **REFUSE** planning permission for the following reasons:

- 1 The proposed scale, bulk, form and overall design of the proposed scheme would appear as over-dominant addition that is out of character with the surrounding streetscene. As such, the proposal would have a detrimental impact on visual amenity and the character and appearance of the wider area and is contrary to policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Document 12: 'Design Guidance for Extensions and Alterations'.
- 2 The proposed rear dormer, by reason of its size and design, would appear as incongruous feature which is unsympathetic to the character and appearances of the host building and the wider streetscene; contrary to policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Document 12 'Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations'
- 3 The proposed roof extension would result in increased overshadowing to No.15, contrary to policies QD14 and QD27 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Document 12 'Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations'

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

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received
Floor plans and elevations proposed	10667-1-19-9-16		21 September 2016

2. SITE LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The site relates to a detached bungalow to the northern side of Coombe Vale. Coombe Vale is prominently comprised of bungalows of a similar style to the host property.

3. RELEVANT HISTORY

BH2016/00828 - Roof alterations incorporating hip to barn end roof extensions, rear dormers, front rooflight and front and side windows and erection of front porch extension. Refused 10.05.2016

Reason for refusal:

1. The proposed scale, bulk, form and overall design of the proposed scheme would appear as over-dominant and out of character with the surrounding streetscene. As such, the proposal would have a detrimental impact on visual amenity and the character and appearance of the wider area and is contrary to policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Document 12: 'Design Guidance for Extensions and Alterations'.
2. The proposed roof extension would result in an unacceptable loss of light and increased overshadowing to No.15, contrary to policies QD14 and QD27 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and SPD12 guidance.

BH2011/03005 - Erection of conservatory extension to side. (part retrospective). Approved 31/10/2011

BH2011/02365 - Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed conservatory to side. Refused 04/10/2011

4. CONSULTATIONS

- 4.1 **Seven (7)** letters have been received from the occupiers of **99 Rodmell Avenue, 15 Coombe Vale (x4), 9 Oakland Avenue and 9 Coombe Vale**, objecting to the proposed development on the following grounds:

- It is too big and obtrusive and will dwarf neighbouring properties.
- The proposed scheme will overshadow No.15 and reduce natural light entering the windows.
- The rear window will reduce privacy to neighbouring properties
- This planned development will be too large for the street

- This scheme would allow others to develop their bungalows, thereby completely changing the appearance of the area.
- Having looked at the local housing market there is no shortage of 4 bedroom homes in Saltdean in all price ranges without the need to change the profile of Coombe Vale.
- This build is too big for the street, and the people who think it has been done sympathetically to the neighbours are not the ones who have to live with a major obstruction blocking the light alongside their house.
- The supporters of this scheme, especially the support from the house in Coombe Vale, maybe looking to extend their home. Approval for this application would set a precedence for this type of extension in the area.
- People come to live in Saltdean because of the architecture of a small seaside village, not large houses everywhere.

4.2 **9 Coombe Vale** subsequently withdrew their objection.

4.3 **Five (5)** letters have been received from the occupiers of **80 Tummulas Road, 50 Lustrells Crescent, 25 Nutley Avenue (x2), 16 Coombe Vale**, supporting the application for the following reasons:

- Development of bungalows in Saltdean is common and is a necessity for families with children and growing families as there are not enough houses in the area.
- Not allowing development drives families out of the area and will ultimately have a negative impact
- The scheme is well designed and considerate to neighbouring properties.
- The proposed scheme is sympathetic to the surrounding properties and will significantly enhance the street scene.
- The proposed scheme is well designed and will fit in with the other properties in the area.
- There are many bungalows and houses in Saltdean which have been developed or extended in various different styles, and this proposal is in keeping with other properties in the area and will not look out of place.
- With the improvements being made to the local area and investment into the Lido it is important to try and encourage young families to stay within Saltdean so they can enjoy the facilities for years to come

4.4 **Councillor Mary Mears** has written in support of the application. A copy of the email is attached to this report.

5. **RELEVANT POLICIES**

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One

SS1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

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

QD14 Extensions and alterations

Supplementary Planning Documents:

SPD12 Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations

6. CONSIDERATIONS & ASSESSMENT

6.1 The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to the impact of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the property and the wider surrounding area. Furthermore the effects upon the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties must also be assessed.

Revised plans 10667-1-19-9-16 for this application were received on the 21/09/2016 in response to comments from the Local Authority and neighbours were consulted on these revised plans. The main differences between the schemes comprise:

- The overall bulk of the original proposed scheme was considered excessive. The two storey front projection shown on plans 100667-1,7-6a was amended to a single bay window, with window above on plans 10667-1-19-9-16
- The original plans 100667-1,7-6a house three individual dormers to the rear which were considered acceptable. These have been altered to a large box dormer on the rear as shown on plans 10667-1-19-9-16. This increases the bulk at the rear of the property.
- The single storey rear extension on amended plans 10667-1-19-9-16 has been reduced in height by 0.4 metres.

6.2 The application will be determined by assessing the revised plans 10667-1-19-9-16.

6.3 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.

6.4 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.

6.5 Design and Appearance

- 6.6 Coombe Vale is predominantly comprised of modest detached single storey residential properties with hipped front elevations. This creates a rhythm in the streetscene, and a consistent roofline roof which would ideally be maintained.
- 6.7 The proposed scheme is for remodelling the existing hipped roof bungalow with single storey front projection, to a two storey house with barn end roof and two storey front projection and single storey front projection.
- 6.8 The proposed scheme is considered to be an improvement on the previous application **BH2016/00828**, and addresses some of the concerns that were raised. The barn-end styled roof has a stronger pitch to reduce the bulk of the proposed first storey and reduce the impact on neighbouring properties. The asymmetrical front projection proposed on application **BH2016/00828** has also been amended.
- 6.9 However, the proposed scheme is still significantly larger in scale than the existing property and 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 steeply pitched. This would look out of place in the street scene as there would be an over dominant, bulky two storey property surrounded by single storey bungalows with hipped roofs. 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.'
- 6.10 Additionally, the proposed rear dormer, occupying a large proportion of the roof, is not considered acceptable in design terms. SPD12 guidance states that 'box dormers constructed using the full width (and/or height) of the roof are an inappropriate design solution and will not be permitted as they give the appearance of an extra storey on top of the building. Dormer windows should instead be kept as small as possible and clearly be a subordinate addition to the roof, set appropriately in the roof space and well off the sides, ridge and eaves of the roof.' The proposed scheme fails to meet this criteria and would appear as an over dominant, incongruous and bulky addition, and is contrary to SDP12 guidance and policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan.
- 6.11 While there are some examples of inappropriate roof extensions in the surrounding area, no precedent has been established. SPD12 Guidance states that 'The presence of inappropriate roof alterations in the street will not be accepted as evidence of an established precedent.' This position is supported by the Planning Inspectorate (appeal ref: APP/Q1445/A/08/2089171, 26 Cowper Street). In the Cowper Street case, which involved the creation of a room in roof with rear dormer and front rooflights, the Inspector considered that 'the proposed dormer would be similar to those already present on the two neighbouring properties. However, these are the only two properties in the terrace with dormers of this type, and I do not see them setting a precedent of any significant weight in favour of allowing a proposal that would be clearly contrary to the development plan. Indeed, their appearance - and that of the other similar dormers that I saw on other nearby terraces - only serves to

reinforce my view that such extensions are, in essence, unsightly and harmful to the area's character.'

- 6.12 The bulky appearance of the proposed dormer is exacerbated by the large areas of cladding to the side of the windows, contrary to SPD12 guidance: 'The supporting structure for the dormer window should be kept to a minimum as far as possible to avoid a "heavy" appearance and there should be no large areas of cladding either side of the window or below. As a rule of thumb a dormer should not be substantially larger than the window itself unless the particular design of the building and its context dictate otherwise.'
- 6.13 The rear dormer would appear as an incongruous addition, which is unsympathetic to the host property and the wider streetscene. The proposed scheme would fail to conform with SPD12 guidance and is contrary to policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan.
- 6.14 Overall, although the plans have been amended from the original scheme to reduce the bulk of the proposed roof, the current scheme is still deemed represent a bulky addition and would appear excessive in scale, unattractive and discordant with the existing property and surrounding streetscene, and is therefore considered unacceptable in design terms.
- 6.15 **Impact on Amenity**
- 6.16 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.
- 6.17 The properties most likely to be affected by the proposed development are No.9 and No. 15 Coombe Vale.
- 6.18 No.9 Coombe Vale:
No.11 is set at a higher land level to No.9. However, the impact on overshadowing, reduced light and privacy is not considered to be significant due to the distance between the two properties.
- 6.19 No.15 Coombe Vale:
The plans have been amended from planning application BH2016/00828 to address concerns raised over the impact on the occupiers of No. 15. The reduced width of the roof at the top is considered to reduce the impact on the neighbouring property, and the submitted drawings attempt to demonstrate that the proposal would meet the 45 degree rule of light entering the side windows.
- 6.20 Nevertheless, as the application site is located close to the boundary to No.15. there is still increased potential for overshadowing the side garden and western elevation of No.15 which houses a principle bedroom window and a secondary window and door to the kitchen.

6.21 The proposed scheme is considered to cause harm to neighbour amenity and is therefore contrary to policy QD27 and QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and SPD12 guidance, and is recommended for refusal.

7. EQUALITIES

7.1 Submitted information regarding the reasoning and purpose for the application has been taken into consideration and given due weight in the determination of the submission.

