

<b><u>No:</u></b>	<b>BH2018/01645</b>	<b><u>Ward:</u></b>	<b>Rottingdean Coastal Ward</b>
<b><u>App Type:</u></b>	<b>Householder Planning Consent</b>		
<b><u>Address:</u></b>	<b>7 Marine Close Saltdean Brighton BN2 8SA</b>		
<b><u>Proposal:</u></b>	<b>Erection of two storey side extension and single storey rear extension. Roof alterations including relocating dormer and installation of rooflights and revised fenestration.</b>		
<b><u>Officer:</u></b>	Thomas Emery, tel: 293817	<b><u>Valid Date:</u></b>	23.05.2018
<b><u>Con Area:</u></b>		<b><u>Expiry Date:</u></b>	18.07.2018
<b><u>Listed Building Grade:</u></b>		<b><u>EOT:</u></b>	
<b><u>Agent:</u></b>	Jaimie Blomqvist 50 Grand Parade Brighton BN2 9QA		
<b><u>Applicant:</u></b>	Andrew Sinclair 7 Marine Close Saltdean Brighton BN2 8SA		

## 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.

<b>Plan Type</b>	<b>Reference</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Date Received</b>
Location Plan	A.001		23 May 2018
Elevations Proposed	A.201		23 May 2018
Existing Elevations	A.200		23 May 2018
Existing Section	A.300		23 May 2018
Sections Proposed	A.301		23 May 2018
Roof Plan Proposed	A.103		23 May 2018
Existing Floor Plans	A.100		23 May 2018
Floor Plans Proposed	A.102		23 May 2018
Existing Floor Plans	A.101		23 May 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 external finishes of the development hereby permitted shall match in material, colour, style, bonding and texture those of the existing building.  
**Reason:** To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development in the interests of the visual amenities of the area and to comply with policies QD14 of

the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and CP12 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One.

4. The first floor windows in the north elevation of the development hereby permitted shall be obscure glazed and non-opening, unless the parts of the window(s) which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed, and thereafter permanently retained as such.

**Reason:** To safeguard the privacy of the occupiers of the adjoining property 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. The permission hereby issued is based upon the applicant's submission for a part single and part two storey extension as part of the overall use of the property as a single dwellinghouse. The applicant is advised that any use of the accommodation for a purpose separate to a single dwellinghouse such as subdivision of the plot would constitute a material change of use which requires permission in its own right.

**3. RELEVANT HISTORY**

**BH2017/00536** Demolition of garages, remodelling of existing dwelling and erection of 1no three bedroom dwelling (C3). Refused on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2017, and subsequent appeal dismissed on 6<sup>th</sup> December 2017. The reasons for the refusal were as follows:

1. The proposed subdivision to form a building plot would fail to emphasise and or enhance the positive qualities of the local neighbourhood and would result in an overly cramped form of development, contrary to the prevailing plot sizes and layouts within the immediate vicinity and detracts from the appearance and character of the site and the wider surrounding area. The development would therefore be contrary to policy CP12 and CP14 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan.
2. The proposed dormer window on the eastern section of the rear roofslope on the new dwelling by reason of its first floor height, proximity to the shared boundary and 15m unobstructed distance to the rear elevations of numbers 3 and 5 Lenham Avenue would be unneighbourly due to overlooking into the rear gardens and perception of overlooking into the rear windows causing the occupiers a significant loss of privacy contrary to Policy QD27 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.
3. The proposed dormer on the rear roofslope of the existing building forming number 7 Marine Close would expand across the entire width of the rear elevation and would appear as a bulky addition which would occupy a

majority of the rear roofslope, giving the impression of an extra storey on top of the property featuring large areas of cladding. The resultant structure would be bulky and overly dominant on the rear elevation which would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host building and wider area contrary to Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and SPD12 guidance.

**BH2016/04368** Remodelling of dwelling including two storey rear extension, extension to roof and raised ridge height, reduction to width of dwelling, creation of front balcony, relocated dropped curb and associated alterations. Refused on 18<sup>th</sup> March 2016.

**BH2015/04367** Erection of 1no four bedroom bungalow (C3) and alterations to existing dwelling. Refused on 18<sup>th</sup> March 2016.

#### **4. CONSULTATIONS**

4.1 None

#### **5. REPRESENTATIONS**

5.1 **Six (6)** letters have been received objecting to the proposed development on the following grounds:

- Overdevelopment
- Overshadowing
- Proximity to boundary
- Poor design
- Detrimental effect on property value
- Restriction of view
- Noise
- Inappropriate height of development

#### **6. 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

QD27 Protection of Amenity

Supplementary Planning Documents:

SPD12 Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations

#### **7. CONSIDERATIONS & ASSESSMENT**

7.1 The application site is a detached dwelling that proposes the erection of a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension including roof alterations.

7.2 The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to the impact of the proposed development on the appearance and character of the building, the wider streetscene and the impact on neighbouring amenity.

**7.3 Impact on Amenity:**

The nearest neighbour is 159a Marine Drive to the west but only the single storey extension is positioned to the west of the main house which will have no amenity impacts in this direction.

7.4 The nearest property to the north side of the application site where the two storey extension is positioned is 7 Lenham Avenue. The main house of no.7 is located at a distance of 16m and so the proposed extension is not deemed to cause any overshadowing of the main house. The closest element of the proposed development is the single storey extension of approximately 2.7 metres in height located to the end of the neighbouring garden which is not deemed to cause a significant impact on their amenity. A small window is proposed at first floor level on this elevation which poses a risk of a new overlooking vantage point; a condition is recommended to address this.

**7.5 Design and Appearance:**

In terms of design and appearance the proposed extension is deemed to resemble that of the existing building by using matching materials and forms and is therefore acceptable. Guidance in SPD12 recommends side extensions are set back by at least 0.5 metres. However, at this site a setback would be more noticeable than the proposal which provides a seamless extension to the existing house.

**8. EQUALITIES**

8.1 None identified