

<u>No:</u>	BH2018/03479	<u>Ward:</u>	Moulsecoomb And Bevendean Ward
<u>App Type:</u>	Householder Planning Consent		
<u>Address:</u>	2 Belle Vue Cottages Brighton BN2 6AA		
<u>Proposal:</u>	Erection of two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, revised fenestration, roof extension incorporating rear dormer and front and rear rooflights.		
<u>Officer:</u>	Michael Tucker, 292359	tel: <u>Valid Date:</u>	16.11.2018
<u>Con Area:</u>	N/A	<u>Expiry Date:</u>	11.01.2019
<u>Listed Building Grade:</u>	N/A	<u>EOT:</u>	
<u>Agent:</u>	Mr Andrew Butt 15 Shirley Street Hove BN3 3WJ		
<u>Applicant:</u>	Mr Mark Steel C/o Mr Andrew Butt 15 Shirley Street Hove BN3 3WJ		

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	001	A	12 November 2018
Proposed Drawing	20	F	25 January 2019
Proposed Drawing	21	F	25 January 2019
Proposed Drawing	22	F	25 January 2019
Proposed Drawing	23	E	12 November 2018
Proposed Drawing	24	F	25 January 2019
Proposed Drawing	25	-	16 November 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.

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 site is a two-storey, semi-detached property on the northern side of Belle Vue Cottages. Planning permission is sought to erect a two-storey pitched-roof side extension, a single-storey rear extension, a rear dormer and to insert rooflights onto the front and rear elevations.

3. RELEVANT HISTORY

- 3.1. BH2018/02716 - Erection of two storey side and rear extension, roof extension incorporating rear dormer and front rooflights. Refused 25/10/2018 for the following reasons:
 - 3.2. The proposed side extension would, by virtue of its scale, not appear as a subservient addition to the host building and therefore fails to deliver a high quality of design contrary to policies QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and CP12 of the City Plan Part One.
 - 3.3. The proposed rear roof dormer would, by virtue of its overall scale, give the appearance of an extra storey, relating poorly to the host building. The proposal therefore fails to deliver a high quality of design contrary to policies QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and CP12 of the City Plan Part One.
 - 3.4. The proposed two-storey rear extension would, by reason of overbearing impact and loss of daylight, harm the amenity of neighbouring properties contrary to Policies QD14 and QD27 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.

4. REPRESENTATIONS

- 4.1. **Six (6)** letters have been received, objecting to the proposal for the following reasons:
 - Inappropriate height of development
 - Overdevelopment
 - Overshadowing
 - Poor design
 - Restriction of view
 - Too close to boundary

- Additional traffic
- Noise
- Residential amenity

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 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. RELEVANT 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 design and appearance of the proposed external works and the impact of the proposal on neighbouring amenity.

8.2. Design and Appearance:

The proposal has been amended and significantly reduced in scale and massing since the previous application (BH2018/02716), as well as over the course of the current application. The dormer window no longer extends the full extended width of the rear roofslope and the rear extension no longer extends above the existing eaves level. The rooflights on the front elevation have been reduced in number and realigned so as to better reflect the pattern of fenestration on the front façade.

8.3. The proposed two-storey side extension would have a width of approx. 3.1m, exceeding half of the 4.7m width of the existing building. Nevertheless, a subordinate appearance would be achieved due to the ridge height of the side extension being approx. 0.5m lower than, and the side extension being set back approx. 1m from the front elevation of, the existing building. The roof would match the pitch of the existing roof.

8.4. A distance of approx. 1.6m would separate the northern elevation of the proposed side extension and the boundary of the property, with a further 4.3m between the boundary and the neighbouring property at no3. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not lead to the loss of the open aspect of the neighbourhood.

8.5. The proposed single-storey rear extension would have a width of approx. 4.7m, a height of approx. 2.4m and a depth of 5.1m (2.1m from the rear of the existing outrigger). The footprint of the proposed extension is currently partly occupied by an existing pitched-roof single storey element at the rear of the existing two-storey outrigger, with a maximum height of 2.7, an eaves height of 1.6m and a depth of 2m. A set of bifolding doors would be installed at ground floor level on the rear of the side extension and the side of the rear extension. These doors would not be visible from the street.

8.6. The proposed rear dormer would extend the width of the existing rear roofslope. Although box dormers of this design are contrary to the guidance set out in SPD12, the proposed dormer would be constructible under permitted development legislation, giving the applicant a viable fall-back option. Furthermore, the rear dormer would not be visible from the street and so would have a minimal impact on the character and appearance of the area. Finally, dormers are already a common feature on Belle Vue Cottages, with the adjoining properties at no1 and no3 both being examples with front and rear dormers. For these reasons, on balance the harm caused by the proposed dormer is considered not to be significant enough to warrant refusal of the application based on the dormer alone.

8.7. The amended scheme would include a total of three rooflights, two on the front elevation and one on the rear. All would align with the pattern of fenestration on

the lower storeys and so are considered not to harm the appearance of the building.

- 8.8. Although SPD12 states that the proposed 'cabrio'-style rooflight on the front elevation would generally not be permitted, in this instance the visual impact compared to a standard rooflight is considered not to be significant, and as such is considered not to warrant refusal of the application.
- 8.9. Overall, the proposed extensions are considered suitable additions to the building that would not harm its appearance or that of the wider area, in accordance with policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.

8.10. Impact on Amenity:

Although the proposed side extension would be located to the south of the neighbouring property at no3, the reduction in ridge height and spacing between the properties means that there would be unlikely to be an increase in overshadowing as a result of the proposal. No windows existing on the southern face of no3, and no windows are proposed on the north elevation of the proposed side extension, meaning that no mutual or perceived overlooking will be created.

- 8.11. Due to their location on the ground floor, the bifolding doors on the rear extension would not create overlooking towards no3. The existing boundary wall would further block sightlines from the rear extension towards the neighbouring property. The proposed rear extension would not be significantly higher or deeper on the boundary with no1 than the existing building and so would not result in overshadowing or an overbearing impact on the adjoining property.
- 8.12. The proposed dormer would be unlikely to result in overlooking towards neighbouring properties. No1 has an existing rear dormer, and the existing outriggers would obstruct lines of sight from the dormer into the rear garden of no1.
- 8.13. There are no properties opposite the application site and so the 'cabrio'-style rooflight proposed on the front elevation would not create harmful overlooking.
- 8.14. The two Juliet balconies on the first floor of the rear elevation would not create additional sightlines towards neighbouring properties and amenity spaces that are not already afforded by the existing first floor window.
- 8.15. Overall the proposal is considered not to create significant harm to neighbouring amenity. The impact on the adjacent properties at no1 and no3 Belle Vue Cottages has been fully considered in terms of daylight, sunlight, outlook and privacy following a site visit and no significant harm has been identified.

9. EQUALITIES

- 9.1. None identified.

