

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|----------------------------|----------------------|
| <u>No:</u> | BH2018/00865 | <u>Ward:</u> | Withdean Ward |
| <u>App Type:</u> | Householder Planning Consent | | |
| <u>Address:</u> | 31 Harrington Road Brighton BN1 6RF | | |
| <u>Proposal:</u> | Hip to gable roof extension, creation of rear dormer, installation of rooflights, windows and removal of chimney. | | |
| <u>Officer:</u> | Laura Hamlyn, tel: 292205 | <u>Valid Date:</u> | 16.03.2018 |
| <u>Con Area:</u> | Preston Park | <u>Expiry Date:</u> | 11.05.2018 |
| <u>Listed Building Grade:</u> | N/A | <u>EOT:</u> | N/A |
| <u>Agent:</u> | Thomas Booker 23 De Montfort Road Brighton BN2 0EN | | |
| <u>Applicant:</u> | Mr Mike Thomson 31 Harrington Road Brighton BN1 6RF | | |

This application has been called to committee by the Conservation Advisory Group, who have advised that the application should be recommended for refusal.

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 and block plan | PP/HL/001 | / | 16 March 2018 |
| Floor Plans Proposed | PP/HL/110 | / | 16 March 2018 |
| Roof Plan Proposed | PP/HL/111 | / | 16 March 2018 |
| Elevations Proposed | PP/HL/120 | / | 16 March 2018 |
| Sections Proposed | PP/HL/130 | / | 16 March 2018 |
| Design and Access Statement | | | 16 March 2018 |

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. The windows to the gable ends and to the rear dormer hereby approved shall be painted timber double hung vertical sliding sashes with no trickle vents and shall match exactly the original sash windows to the building, including their architrave, frame and glazing bar dimensions and mouldings, and subcill, masonry cill and reveal details, and shall have concealed sash boxes recessed within the reveals and set back from the outer face of the building to match the

original sash windows to the building, and the windows shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to comply with policy HE6 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and CP15 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One.

4. The front and rear rooflights hereby approved shall have steel or cast metal frames fitted flush with the adjoining roof surface and shall not project above the plane of the roof.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to comply with policy HE6 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and CP15 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. **RELEVANT HISTORY**

PRE2018/00041- Hip to gable loft conversion with conservation skylights and rear dormer. Pre-application advice was provided in March 2018.

BH2017/01021- Roof alterations including hip to gable roof extension, rear dormer, rooflights to front, side and rear elevations, removal of 1no chimney. Refused 19/05/2017 for the following reason:

1. *The proposed development would have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the host building and harm the positive impact the building currently has on the wider conservation area by virtue of:*
 - *the hip to gable roof extensions which would add significant and harmful bulk to the building, and which would detract from the varied roofscape of the area;*
 - *the excessive size of the proposed dormer;*
 - *the visual clutter created by the number and variety of rooflights that would be visible from Harrington Road;*
 - *the loss of the rear east chimney, which will harm the roofscape of the area.*

The proposed works would therefore result in a building that is excessively large and bulky, overly prominent and incongruous, and that would fail to preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area. Accordingly, the proposal is considered to be contrary to policies QD14 and HE6 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan, CP15 of the City Plan Part One, and guidance within Supplementary Planning Documents 09 Architectural Features and 12 Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations.

APP/Q1445/D/17/3178559- Appeal dismissed 02/10/2017.

The appeal inspector concluded that as a result of the proposed hip to gable extensions "*the appearance of the building as a whole would be improved by the construction of a roof of proportions better suited to those of the existing house. [...] the proposed conversion from hip to gable would improve the appearance of the building and make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area*".

With regard to the rear dormer and rooflights, the inspector concluded that "*the dormer window and rooflights would detract from the appearance of the remodelled roof [... and] would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area*". With regard to the loss of the chimney, the inspector concluded that it would "*diminish the interest in the streetscene provided by such a feature*", but that "*this would not be sufficient reason, on its own, to dismiss the appeal*".

In summary, the Inspector took the following view on the Council's reason for refusal:

- The proposed hip to gable extensions were supported by the Inspector.
- The proposed rear dormer was not supported by the Inspector.
- The proposed rooflights were not supported by the Inspector.
- The Inspector considered that the loss of the chimney would not warrant refusal.

BH2017/01022- Erection of single storey rear extension to replace existing incorporating removal of two garden sheds. Approved 19/05/2017.

BH1998/01490/FP- Detached single storey building to be used as a study and storage area. Approved 09/09/1998.

3. REPRESENTATIONS

No representation have been received from the public.

4. CONSULTATIONS

4.1 Conservation Advisory Group: Objection.

The Group recommended refusal on the grounds that the proposal would radically change what is presently an attractive and elegant house.

The Group is cognisant of its past comments on the previous application that was refused and as there are little changes to that past application reiterates the points made by officers accompanying that decision. The proposals would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host building, and harm the positive impact the present building has on the wider conservation area by virtue of;

- The hip to gable roof extensions which would add significant harmful and bulk to the building and would detract from the varied roofscape of the area.
- The excessive size of the proposed dormer.

- The visual clutter created by the number and variety of rooflights that would be visible from Harrington Road.
- The loss of the rear east chimney would harm the roofscape of the conservation area.

4.2 **Heritage: No objection.**

The Inspector stated in their decision that they consider the principle of the roof conversion is acceptable, that is the hip to gable extensions, therefore no comment will be made on this part of the scheme.

The two proposed modest sized roof lights to the front elevation line up with the windows below as required by SPD12. These are acceptable, subject to a condition that the rooflights are metal and sit flush with the roof.

The retention of the existing chimneys straddling the building is welcomed. The proposed loss of the rear chimney was commented on by the Inspector in the Appeal decision. The Inspector stated that the loss of the chimney on its own would not be sufficient reason to dismiss the appeal.

5. **RELEVANT POLICIES & GUIDANCE**

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One

SS1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
CP15 Heritage

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

QD14 Extensions and alterations

QD27 Protection of Amenity

HE6 Development within or affecting the setting of conservation areas

Supplementary Planning Document:

SPD09 Architectural Features

SPD12 Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations

6. **CONSIDERATIONS & ASSESSMENT**

6.1 This application is a resubmission following the refusal of BH2017/01021 which was subsequently dismissed at appeal. The previous scheme included hip to gable extensions, a rear dormer, rooflights to the front, rear and side elevations and the removal of 1no chimney.

6.2 The appeal inspector concluded that as a result of the proposed hip to gable extensions "*the appearance of the building as a whole would be improved by the construction of a roof of proportions better suited to those of the existing house. [...] the proposed conversion from hip to gable would improve the appearance of the building and make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area*". With regard to the rear dormer and rooflights, the inspector concluded that "*the dormer window and rooflights would detract from the appearance of the remodelled roof [...] and] would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area*". With

regard to the loss of the chimney, the inspector concluded that it would "*diminish the interest in the streetscene provided by such a feature*", but that "*this would not be sufficient reason, on its own, to dismiss the appeal*".

- 6.3 The appeal decision is given significant weight in the recommendation for the current application, which includes the hip to gable extensions, two rooflights to the front roofslope and one to the rear, the loss of a chimney and a modestly sized rear dormer.
- 6.4 It is proposed that the roof would be covered in natural slate, which is welcomed, and clay tiles to the gable ends. In light of the appeal decision, the hip to gable extensions are not objected to.
- 6.5 The number of rooflights has been reduced compared with the previous application. Two modestly sized conservation style front rooflights are proposed and they would align well with the fenestration below. These are considered to be acceptable additions to the building that would not harm its appearance or that of the wider Preston Park Conservation Area.
- 6.6 Both the front and rear rooflights should have steel or cast metal frames and be fitted flush with the adjoining roof surface, as is typical for conservation style rooflights. It is recommended that this be secured by condition.
- 6.7 At the rear there would be one rooflight and one rear dormer. The proposed rear dormer is an appropriately subservient addition to the roof, and is centred over the first floor window below. The supporting structure has been kept to a minimum and the proposed zinc cladding would be an appropriate material. The proposed rear rooflight would be modestly sized, and would not result in a cluttered appearance to the rear roofslope. Both the rear rooflight and the rear dormer are considered acceptable additions to the building that would not harm its appearance or that of the wider Preston Park Conservation Area.
- 6.8 Windows are proposed to both gable ends, and are described as matching existing. The window to the dormer window should also match the existing timber sash windows. It is recommended that this be secured by condition.
- 6.9 The remaining design issue is the loss of the rear chimney on the east elevation. The Inspector determined that the loss of the chimney on its own would not be sufficient reason to dismiss the appeal. In light of the appeal decision and given that all other design elements of the scheme are now considered to be acceptable, the proposed loss of the chimney is not objected to. It is accepted that this chimney would be subsumed into the hip to gable extension and the retention of a short or partial chimney would appear awkward.
- 6.10 As at the time of the previous application it is considered that the roof conversion in terms of its bulk would not result in significant harm to neighbouring amenity, and the inspector made no reference to amenity in the appeal decision.

6.11 The proposed rooflights are positioned 1.7m high from internal floor level, and so would provide mostly sky views rather than views of neighbouring properties. The proposed rear dormer would provide some additional views of neighbouring gardens; however in the context of a city where mutual overlooking from upper storey windows is common, this would not result in significant harm and is unlikely to be no different than fenestration on the lower levels. The proposed windows to the gable ends would overlook the blank gable side walls of 29 and 33 Harrington Road. Given the approx. 23m depth of the rear garden, it is considered that there would not be an appreciable impact on occupiers of 33 Surrenden Road to the rear.

7. Other matters:

7.1 This application has been considered under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (Habitats Regulations) for its potential impacts on the Natura 2000 (European) sites. A pre-screening exercise has been undertaken which has concluded that there is no potential for in-combination “likely significant effects” on European sites and therefore it is not necessary to carry out further appropriate assessment under the Habitats Regulations.

8. Conclusion:

8.1 Having regard to the previous appeal decision, the visual impact of the hip to gable extensions and loss of the chimney are not considered to warrant the refusal of planning permission. The proposed rooflights and rear dormer are broadly in compliance with policies QD14, HE6 and CP15, and the guidance set out in SPD12. No significant harm to neighbouring amenity would be caused. Approval is therefore recommended.

9. EQUALITIES

9.1 None identified.