

<u>No:</u>	BH2016/02278	<u>Ward:</u>	Patcham Ward
<u>App Type:</u>	Householder Planning Consent		
<u>Address:</u>	2 Highview Way, Brighton, BN1 8WS		
<u>Proposal:</u>	Erection of single storey extensions to south and north elevations. Landscaping works including raised decking and new driveway, alterations to front boundary and other associated works.		
<u>Officer:</u>	Justine Latemore, tel: 292138	<u>Valid Date:</u>	20.06.2016
<u>Con Area:</u>		<u>Expiry Date:</u>	21.07.2016
<u>Listed Building Grade:</u>			
<u>Agent:</u>	DW Planning 59 Sadlers Way Ringmer Lewes BN8 5HG		
<u>Applicant:</u>	Mr Randell Dimery 2 Highview Way Brighton BN1 8WS		

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:
- 1.2 The proposed side extension, by reason of its excessive depth, footprint and positioning represents an overextension and disproportionate addition that would dominate the appearance of the host property. The proposal therefore represents an unsympathetic addition that is out of keeping and would not appear as a subservient addition to the original property. It is therefore contrary to policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan and design guidance contained in Supplementary Planning Document 12: Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations.

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. This decision is based on the drawings received listed below:

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received
Floor plans/elevations/sect proposed	PL-01	B	20 June 2016
Block Plan Existing	EX-01	A	20 June 2016
Roof Plan Proposed	PR-02	C	20 June 2016

2 RELEVANT HISTORY

- 2.1 **BH2016/00483** - Erection of single storey extensions to south and north elevations. Landscaping works including raised decking and new driveway, alterations to front boundary and other associated works. Refused 29/04/2016.

Reasons for refusal:

1. *The proposed side extension, by reason of its depth and roof design, represents an incongruous and unsympathetic addition to the host property resulting in a disjointed overall appearance that lacks an overall design cohesion; contrary to policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan and design guidance within Supplementary Planning Document 12.*
2. *The proposed rear decking, by reason of its depth and height positioned on falling land, would result in overlooking and loss of privacy to the rear elevations and private space of no. 4 and 6 Highview Way, contrary to policy QD27 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan.*

3 CONSULTATIONS

3.1 Internal:

Highway Authority: Approve with suggested informative:

The applicant wishes to widen the existing crossover on the southern edge to access a new garage being created on the sites northern edge. The residents will have to drive across the front of the house to park their vehicle, whilst a usual arrangement, the Highway Authority recommends approval however a license will be required from the councils Network Coordination team and be subject to detailed design.

Arboriculture: No Comment

4 REPRESENTATIONS

- 4.1 **One (1)** email has been received from **Councillor Lee Wares**, supporting the proposed development. A copy of the email is attached to this report.

5 MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 5.1 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

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 and Brighton & Hove Waste Local Plan (February 2006); Saved Policies WLP 7 and WLP8 only - site allocations at Sackville Coalyard and Hangleton Bottom and Hollingdean Depot.

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.

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 main considerations in the determination of this application relate to the design of the proposed extension in relation to the existing building and the effect it will have on the surrounding residential amenity of the neighbouring properties.

7.2 Design and appearance

The siting of the existing bungalow alongside no. 4 and 6 is at odds with the prevailing arrangement and appearance of Highview Road and Highview Way. Highview Way to the south is of similar small scale detached bungalows and to the north on Highview Road are two storey dwellings with side garage extensions. As a result of the existing contrast there is no objection in principle to extending the building, subject to appropriate design and detailing.

7.3 The current application is a resubmission following the refusal for similar works within BH2016/00483. The two main concerns underpinning the previous reasons for refusal were the depth and roof design of the proposed side extension, and the depth and height of the rear decking; which would have resulted in overlooking to the adjoining neighbouring occupiers. The resultant design lacked a cohesive overall design, appearing incongruous and unsympathetic to the roof form and floor plan of the existing property.

7.4 As revised, the current scheme demonstrates a simplified roof design for the side extension by raising the ridge height of the extension to meet the ridge height of the existing projection to the rear; creating a cohesive relationship with the original roof scape of the host property.

7.5 The proposed footprint of 81.6sqm for the side extension remains as proposed within BH2016/00483 and does not address the previous concerns raised regarding the scale and footprint of the extension. The total depth of 15.1m is still considered to be an over extension of the property, directly contrary to best

practice extension guidance with Supplementary Planning Document 12 (p.11), which states
"Side extensions, if poorly designed, can over-extend buildings in a disproportionate and unbalanced manner."

- 7.6 The SPD states that if an extension was sited flush with the front elevation, as the proposal is, it would only be appropriate where it can be clearly demonstrated that the extension integrates well with the design of the host property. The proposed design exceeds the depth of the host property by 2m at the rear and would appear as an out of scale, awkward addition. This would be exacerbated future by the high visibility of the property from surrounding streets given its plot, positioning of the extension and boundary treatment. For these reasons the proposal would not appear as a subservient addition and contravenes guidance contained in SPD12, which states:
- 7.7 *"As a general rule, extensions should not dominate or detract from the original building or the character of an area, but should instead play a subordinate 'supporting role' that respects the design, scale and proportions of the host building."*
- 7.8 The extensions floor area of 81.6sqm when compared with the original host property's floor area of 94.4sqm further displays the dominating, out of scale and disproportionate addition that would result if the application were to be built alongside the existing bungalow. Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan (p. 86) supports the SPD in regards to expectations for extension applications to be as stated:
"Well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended, adjoining properties and to the surrounding area "
- 7.9 It is therefore concluded that the side extension would create an overly dominant structure that is out of keeping with the host property and is contrary to guidance contained in SPD12 and policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan.
- 7.10 **Impact on neighbour amenity**
Policy QD27 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan states that planning permission for any development or change of use will not be granted where it would cause material nuisance and loss of amenity to the proposed, existing and/or adjacent users, residents, occupiers or where it is liable to be detrimental to human health.
- 7.11 The impact on the adjacent surrounding properties and rear adjoining no. 4 and 6 Highview Way has been fully considered in terms of daylight, sunlight, outlook and privacy following a site visit.
- 7.12 The raised rear decking has been reduced by 2m in depth (as measured from the original rear elevation) to align with the rear elevation of the proposed side extension, having a total depth of 2m and sited well away from the rear boundary. It has been demonstrated through the reduction of depth within the decking, that the falling land levels have been taken into account, avoiding the

need to level and therefore raise floor heights and have addressed the previous concern of overlooking to the rear adjoining private gardens of nos. 4 and 6 Highview Way.

- 7.13 The area of decking to the rear of the side extension has been removed and replaced by steps providing direct access to the garden space, further reducing potential overlooking. The proposal is considered to be in accordance with policy QD27 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan.

8 EQUALITIES

- 8.1 None identified

