No: BH2021/04303 Ward: Patcham Ward

App Type: Householder Planning Consent

Address: 13 Cuckmere Way Brighton BN1 8GA

Proposal: Hip to gable roof alterations incorporating rear dormer, 4no

rooflights to front slope, erection of front porch with associated

alterations.

<u>Officer:</u> Charlie Partridge, tel: <u>Valid Date:</u> 07.12.2021

292193

<u>Con Area:</u> None. <u>Expiry Date:</u> 01.02.2022

<u>Listed Building Grade:</u> <u>EOT:</u>

Agent: Brendan Haworth 4 Devonport Place Devonport Place Selden

BN11 BN11 2SU

Applicant: Ruth Fretwell 13 Cuckmere Way Brighton BN1 8GA

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:

The proposed rear dormer and hip to gable extension would present as an unsympathetic, oversized and dominant addition to the property that would have a harmful impact upon the appearance of the dwellinghouse, semi-detached pair and wider area, contrary to Brighton & Hove Local Plan policy QD14, Submission Brighton & Hove City Plan Part Two policy DM21 and guidance contained within SPD12.

Informatives:

 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
Location and block plan	100		7 December 2021
Proposed Drawing	200		7 December 2021
Proposed Drawing	201		7 December 2021

2. SITE LOCATION

2.1. The application site relates to a single storey semi-detached dwellinghouse on the north-west side of Cuckmere Way. Cuckmere Way comprises a number of

semi-detached bungalows with a variety of roof extensions and alterations. The bungalow has a hipped roof which is typical of the character of the adjacent properties in the streetscene. The main roof of the semi-detached pair remains unaltered. The site is not within a conservation area and there are no Article 4 Directions covering the site.

3. RELEVANT HISTORY

- 3.1. **BH2022/00004** Certificate of lawfulness for proposed loft conversion, hip to gable roof alterations incorporating rear dormer, 4no rooflights to front slope with associated alterations
- 3.2. **BH2021/01881** Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed loft conversion incorporating hip to gable roof extension, front and side windows and rear dormer with Juliet balcony. Formation of front porch. Withdrawn 04.08.2021
- 3.3. **BH2021/01834** Certificate of Lawfulness for existing single storey rear extension. Approved 06.07.2021

4. APPLICATION DESCRIPTION

4.1. Householder planning consent is sought for hip to gable roof alterations incorporating a rear dormer, four front rooflights and the erection of a front porch with associated alterations. A site visit was not undertaken, but it was considered that the proposal could be assessed adequately based on site photographs provided, along with 3D satellite views.

5. REPRESENTATIONS

5.1. One (1) letter has been received from **Councillor Meadows** supporting the scheme. A copy of the representation from Councillor Meadows is attached.

6. CONSULTATIONS

None

7. MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

7.1. 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.

7.2. The development plan is:

• Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One (adopted March 2016);

- Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005 (retained policies March 2016);
- Brighton & Hove City Plan Part Two
- 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);
- Shoreham Harbour Joint Area Action Plan (adopted October 2019)
- 7.3. 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.

8. RELEVANT POLICIES & GUIDANCE

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One

SS1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

CP10 Biodiversity CP12 Urban Design

Brighton & Hove Local Plan (retained policies March 2016)

QD14 Extensions and alterations QD27 Protection of amenity

Brighton & Hove City Plan Part Two (Proposed Submission October 2020)

Policies in the Proposed Submission City Plan Part 2 do not carry full statutory weight but are gathering weight as the Plan proceeds through its stages. They provide an indication of the direction of future policy. Since 23 April 2020, when the Plan was agreed for submission to the Secretary of State, it has gained weight for the determination of planning applications. The weight given to the relevant CPP2 policies considered in determining this application is set out in the Considerations and Assessment section below where applicable.

DM20 Protection of Amenity
DM21 Extensions and alterations

<u>Supplementary Planning Documents:</u>

SPD12 Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations

9. CONSIDERATIONS & ASSESSMENT

9.1. The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to the design and appearance of the proposed alterations and whether they would have a detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity.

Design and Appearance

9.2. The proposed roof works would include a hip to gable extension, a large rear dormer and four front rooflights.

- 9.3. The four front rooflights have been kept to a minimal scale and would not appear overly incongruous within the street scene as many of the surrounding properties currently have multiple front rooflights. This element of the scheme is therefore considered acceptable.
- 9.4. The proposal would also involve the construction of a front porch. The proposed front porch would be appropriately scaled, and the materials would match those of the main dwellinghouse. The porch would represent a modest and sympathetic addition to the host property that would not harm its appearance or that of the surrounding area so is therefore considered acceptable.
- 9.5. The proposed dormer and hip to gable roof extensions, however, are not considered acceptable in their current form. The hip to gable extension would essentially create an 'L-shaped' or wraparound rear dormer and would result in an overall development with an awkward relationship with the existing features of the front roofscape. The hip to gable extension would be set down from the ridge and set up from the eaves, resulting in a triangular section of roof that would protrude from the main roof slope to the visual detriment of the host property. While the materials would be acceptable, the scale, form and design of the hip-to-gable extension is considered detrimental to the character of the area.
- 9.6. The scale of the rear dormer is also considered inappropriate to that of the host building and surrounding area. The dormer would be far wider than a standard-sized window and despite being slightly set down from the ridge and slightly set back from the eaves, would occupy almost the entirety of the roof area. It would result in an oversized and bulky addition that would dominate the rear roofscape of the property.
- 9.7. The dormer would therefore be contrary to guidance contained within SPD12 which states that: "they should clearly be a subordinate addition to the roof set appropriately in the roof space to avoid looking disproportionate to the property. As a rule, rear dormers should be appropriately set in from the side, set down from the ridge and set up from the eaves so as not to appear as an additional storey or appear "top heavy"." and that rear dormer windows must "be generally well -proportioned to the roof space and do not appear overly dominant."
- 9.8. The proposed dormer would form an unduly visually dominant and incongruous addition to the building. Whilst it is acknowledged that the dormer would be to the rear and would not be highly visible from the public realm, it would be evident in views from the rear of a number of neighbouring properties and would be seen as a discordant addition, to the detriment of the visual amenity of the host property and wider area, particularly in combination with the hip-to-gable extension.
- 9.9. In addition, the principle of installing a rear dormer of this scale and design on this property is considered to be unacceptable within the wider context of the site. Although there is evidence of a limited number of full-sized 'box' dormers along Cuckmere Way, it is prudent to assess the proposal on its own merits and

the presence of other development in the area does not mitigate the harm. These existing dormers are in the harmful minority and are not considered to set a precedent. They clearly demonstrate the harm an inappropriate addition can have on a property and the wider area. The majority of the properties along Cuckmere Way do not feature rear dormers and the proposed 'wraparound' rear dormer would therefore appear incongruous within the surrounding context of the site, to the further detriment of the visual amenity of the area. There are also no recent examples of the Local Planning Authority granting planning permission for comparable dormers in the vicinity of the site.

- 9.10. The adjoining neighbour at No.11 Cuckmere Way currently has an unaltered rear roofscape. The addition of a large dormer on this property would unbalance the existing pair of semi-detached properties and would be out of keeping with the majority of the semi-detached bungalows along the street. Development which creates differences between matching pairs is discouraged.
- 9.11. During the course of determining the application, amendments were sought from officers to the design of the proposal to reduce the scale of the proposed scheme to lessen its visual prominence and improve its relation to the host property. Despite officers seeking amendments, no design changes were proposed by the applicant and agent and as such the proposal remains unacceptable.
- 9.12. Overall, the proposed extensions to the roof are considered to be an unsympathetic and dominant addition to the host building that would be detrimental to its external appearance and that of the wider area, contrary to Brighton & Hove Local Plan policy QD14 and Brighton & Hove City Plan Part Two policy DM21, (which is considered to have more weight than the adopted Local Plan policy QD14).

Impact on Neighbours and Amenity

9.13. With regard to amenity, no significant adverse impacts are expected as a result of the proposed development. The dormer is not expected to result in any overlooking into neighbouring properties.

10. CLIMATE CHANGE/BIODIVERSITY

10.1. The proposed scheme would help to make better use of an existing residential property in a sustainable location.

11. EQUALITIES

None identified