No:	**BH2017/00767**	**Ward:**	**Hove Park Ward**
App Type:	**Householder Planning Consent**		
Address:	**7 Meadow Close Hove BN3 6QQ**		
Proposal:	**Erection of additional storey with associated alterations and single storey rear extension.**		
Officer:	Mark Thomas, tel: 292336	**Valid Date:**	03.03.2017
Con Area:	N/A	**Expiry Date:**	28.04.2017
Listed Building Grade:	N/A		
Agent:	RSP Architects Ltd 1 Westbourne Grove Westbourne Gardens Hove BN3 5PJ		
Applicant:	Mr Saaid Abdulkhani 7 Meadow Close Hove BN3 6QQ		

This application was deferred at the last Committee on 9th August 2017 for 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 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
Location Plan	-	-	3 March 2017
Block Plan	-	-	3 March 2017
Elevations Proposed	03	B	5 June 2017
Floor plans/elevations/sect proposed	02	A	5 June 2017

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 No development of any part of the development hereby permitted shall take place until samples of all materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, including (where applicable):

a) Samples of all brick, render and tiling (including details of the colour of render/paintwork to be used)

b) Samples of the proposed window, door and balustrade treatments
c) Samples of all other materials to be used externally

Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to comply with policies QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and CP12 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One.

4 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows, dormer windows, rooflights or doors other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed without planning permission obtained from the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and to comply with policies QD14 and QD27 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.

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. SITE LOCATION & APPLICATION DESCRIPTION

2.1 The application relates to a detached bungalow on the east side of Meadow Close.

2.2 Planning permission is sought for an additional storey to the bungalow and single storey side and rear extensions.

3. RELEVANT HISTORY

3.1 **BH2015/02792** Demolition of existing three bedroom chalet bungalow and erection of 1no five bedroom house. Refused 30/11/2015 for the following reasons:

3.2. The proposed dwelling by virtue of its number of storeys, its height, width, depth, bulk, scale and form including roof form, would appear as an overly prominent and intrusive addition to the streetscene, relating poorly to the prevailing scale and character of properties in the locality. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to policies QD1 and QD2 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.

3.3 The proposed dwelling by virtue of its height, scale, bulk, rearward projection and proximity to the shared boundary with no. 6 Meadow Close would have an overbearing impact on this neighbouring property resulting in significantly harmful overshadowing, loss of outlook and increased sense of enclosure. Moreover, the proposed upper floor windows would result in harmful levels of

overlooking and loss of privacy to the rear gardens of nos. 6 and 8 Meadow Close and the proposed roof terrace would provide similarly harmful views towards a bedroom window at no. 8 Meadow Close. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to policy QD27 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.

4. REPRESENTATIONS

4.1 Thirty-three (33) representations have been received objecting to the proposed development for the following reasons:

- Overshadowing.
- Loss of light.
- Overlooking.
- Loss of outlook.
- Increased sense of enclosure.
- Overdevelopment of the site. The building would be inappropriate in terms of its height, width, depth, bulk, scale and form.
- The building would be higher than the adjacent houses.
- The building would appear unduly prominent.
- The proposals would be out of character and have a harmful impact on the streetscene.
- The house would appear too modern and out of character.
- The submission doesn't mention nearby trees and shrubs.
- The building would be higher than shown on the submitted plans.

4.2 A petition has been received from 8 Meadow Close and 16 other respondents objecting to the proposed development for the following reasons:

- The scale and height of the proposed development.
- The visual impact at street level.
- The precedent for future development within the Close.

5. CONSULTATIONS

5.1 None received

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 has been given to the relevant retained policies in the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005 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 Documents:
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 proposed development on the character and appearance of the recipient property and the wider streetscene, and the impact on the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring properties.

8.2 **Background:**
BH2015/02792 proposed the demolition of the property and the construction of a five bedroom house. The proposed house had three storeys over basement, with a flat roof and single storey elements to the side and rear. The multi-storey part of the house occupied the same footprint as the bungalow. The scheme was refused due to concerns relating to design and impact on neighbour amenity.

8.3 The current scheme proposes the remodelling of the bungalow to a two storey house with a pitched roof. A single storey extension is proposed to the rear to a depth of 4m, which is the depth to which an extension could be constructed under permitted development. The main differences between the refused and the current application are that; the proposal is now for a remodelling rather than a new build house, the proposal does not have a second storey or basement level, and there is a reduction in bulk and height towards the rear due to the use of a pitched rather than flat roof. The overall design and form is more in keeping with the character of two storey houses within the Close.

8.4 **Character and appearance:**

Meadow Close comprises a mix of detached bungalows and two storey houses with pitched roofs. As such, the proposal for the remodelling of the bungalow to a two storey house is acceptable in principle. The hipped roofs within the street create a sense of openness and space between dwellings at roof level and it is welcome that the additional storey would feature this roof form. The proposed dwelling would stand approximately 0.7m higher than adjacent properties, although it is noted that the site is at an elevated position to its neighbours, and as such the overall height is not considered excessive. Moreover, the overall height increase to the ridge would be limited to 1m due to the deeper slope of the bungalow's roof. It is acknowledged that the existing bungalow occupies a larger width and footprint than the two storey properties in the vicinity, including no. 6 Meadow Close adjacent. Notwithstanding this, it is considered that the overall bulk and scale of the resultant dwelling would not result in an unduly prominent building, to an extent which would significantly detract from the character and appearance of the streetscene.

8.5 The proposal involves a large coverage of glazing to the front elevation, and would lend the property a contemporary appearance. This approach is considered acceptable, and would not significantly detract from the character of the locality. The development would utilise brick and render elevations, and a slate roof. These materials would be compatible with the character of the locality. The frame material for the proposed windows has been specified as metal or UPVC. Neither of these would be unacceptable in principle although further detail would be required. Samples of the external materials shall be secured by condition to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development.

8.6 The proposed side extension would enlarge the attached side garage by extending it further rearwards. To the rear, a full width single storey extension is proposed to a depth of 4.0m. Both of these extensions are appropriately subservient and sympathetic additions in terms of their scale and form.

8.7 The proposed development is considered to address the design concerns raised for BH2015/02792. The removal of the basement and third floor levels and the use of a traditional pitched roof means that the scale, form and bulk would be more in keeping with the character of the Close.

8.8 **Impact on Amenity:**
The properties most affected by the proposed development would be the adjacent properties at nos. 6 and 8 Meadow Close.

8.9 The proposed development would be at a single storey adjacent the shared boundary with no. 8 Meadow Close to the south. There are ground floor windows to the rear part of this building although these are set sufficiently away from the additional height and bulk of the development to avoid harmful overshadowing, loss of outlook or increased sense of enclosure. At roof level, no. 8 Meadow Close features a window serving a bedroom to the gable end. This window is secondary to the dormer window to the front elevation, and any overshadowing would not represent significant harm.

8.10 No. 6 Meadow Close has previously been extended with a two storey rear extension which means that the rear elevation of this neighbouring property sits marginally further back in the site than the bungalow at no. 7. The impact of the remodelling, therefore, is limited to the side elevation windows of this neighbouring property which serves a bathroom (obscure glazed) and windows with a secondary function to windows/doors to the rear elevation. The impact on these windows in terms of overshadowing is considered acceptable given their nature. The proposed single storey extension would protrude 4m beyond the rear elevation. To the rear elevation of no. 6 Meadow Close are the primary fenestration serving the ground floor living space. It is noted that the ground floor level of no. 6 is lower than that of the application site although there is high planting on the shared boundary. It is also noted that both properties are set away from the boundary. For these reasons the proposed development would not cause significantly harmful overshadowing, loss of outlook or increased sense of enclosure beyond the existing arrangement.

8.11 Overall, the reduction in the bulk and height of the proposal to that deemed unacceptable under BH2015/02792 is considered to address the concerns regarding the impact on occupiers of no. 6 Meadow Close in terms of overshadowing and increased sense of enclosure. The removal of the third floor level and roof terraces as previously proposed addresses concerns which related to overlooking of neighbouring properties and gardens.

9. EQUALITIES

9.1 No issues identified.