

**PLANS LIST  
ITEM J**

**Westview, Cornwall Gardens, Brighton**

**BH2013/00491  
Householder planning**

**05 JUNE 2013**

# BH2013/00491 Westview, Cornwall Gardens, Brighton.



**Brighton & Hove  
City Council**



**Scale: 1:1,250**

<b><u>No:</u></b>	<b>BH2013/00491</b>	<b><u>Ward:</u></b>	<b>WITHDEAN</b>
<b><u>App Type:</u></b>	<b>Householder Planning Consent</b>		
<b><u>Address:</u></b>	<b>Westview Cornwall Gardens Brighton</b>		
<b><u>Proposal:</u></b>	<b>Extensions and alterations to existing chalet bungalow to form a two storey house.</b>		
<b><u>Officer:</u></b>	Robert McNicol Tel 292322	<b><u>Valid Date:</u></b>	14/02/2013
<b><u>Con Area:</u></b>	Preston Park	<b><u>Expiry Date:</u></b>	11/04/ 2013
<b><u>Listed Building Grade:</u></b>	N/A		
<b><u>Agent:</u></b>	Lewis & Co Planning SE Ltd, Paxton Business Centre, Hove		
<b><u>Applicant:</u></b>	Mr & Mrs Anderson, C/O Lewis & Co Planning		

## 1 RECOMMENDATION

- 1.1 That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 11 and the policies and guidance in section 7 and resolves to **REFUSE** planning permission for the reasons set out in section 11.

## 2 SITE LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application relates to a detached chalet bungalow on the east side of Cornwall Gardens. Westview is in a group of three detached bungalows, with two similar bungalows opposite. These are inter-war buildings in an English Vernacular style.
- 2.2 Cornwall Gardens slopes down from north to south. To the immediate north is Cinderford, also a bungalow but with significantly higher eaves and roof level. Further to the north the road has mainly semi-detached Edwardian houses on the east side, with prominent gable ends and other attractive decorative features.
- 2.3 Cinderford, to the north, is built on higher ground, and the windows on the south elevation therefore look onto the side roofslope of Westview. There are two windows on the southern side of Cinderford: a secondary window to the front bedroom and the sole window of another bedroom. There is some low shrubbery between the properties.
- 2.4 To the immediate south of Westview is a three storey block of flats. The side elevation of this is over 5 metres from the side wall of Westview, with a stepped brick wall on the boundary. The side elevation of this block facing the application site has small, secondary windows on all floors.

## 3 RELEVANT HISTORY

**BH2012/01933:** Extensions and alterations to existing chalet bungalow to form a two storey house. Refused 17/08/12.

#### **4 THE APPLICATION**

- 4.1 Planning permission is sought for extensions and alterations to the existing chalet bungalow to form a two storey house.

#### **5 PUBLICITY & CONSULTATIONS**

##### **External**

- 5.1 **Neighbours: Seven (7)** letters of representation have been received from **Lydstep, Cornwall Gardens; Flat 7, 2 Cornwall Gardens; 8 Cornwall Gardens; 45 Stepney Court, New England Street; 42 Florence Road; Flat 3, 43 Preston Park Avenue; and 2 Rugby Road, supporting** the application, primarily supporting the design of the proposed extension.

##### **Internal:**

- 5.2 **Heritage: Object.** The proposal is to add an additional storey to the building in a traditional form, but with modern detailing and approach to materials with substantial extensions at the rear as well. The roof would be slate covered and it appears that the front walls would be rendered. Extensive use would be made of timber cladding to the rear.
- 5.3 It is considered that an additional storey could be added to the building without harming the street scene as the buildings on either side are taller. However, the loss of the building's original features and materials are considered harmful to the character of the building and the street scene.
- 5.4 The proposed mix of materials and styling conflict with its traditional English Vernacular form and would be out of character with the street. The loss of the building's original front door with its stained glass leaded lights and side window in the porch detracts from the character of the building. The fully glazed gables with leaded lights are also an inappropriate and incongruous feature.
- 5.5 Too many materials are proposed and some of these are not appropriate to the building or this part of the conservation area, or in the case of render is used excessively. The use of slate for the roof and hanging on the bays and room over the garage is not appropriate in this street which is entirely dominated by red and red-brown roof tiles and tile hanging. Dark timber cladding is also inappropriate and out of character with the original building the conservation area. The rendering over of the existing brickwork and the resultant fully rendered front and side elevations (apart from the slate hanging) also results in the loss of the original character of the building.
- 5.6 Rooflights are not a traditional feature on the front of buildings of this period and form and where visible from the street would detract from the character of the street scene.
- 5.7 **Arboriculture: No objection.** There would be a loss of 1 Macrocarpa that is not of fine form. No objection subject to suitable conditions being attached to any consent granted.

## **6 MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

- 6.1 Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that “If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.”
- 6.2 The development plan is:
- Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005 (saved policies post 2007);
  - East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Plan (Adopted February 2013);
  - East Sussex and Brighton & Hove Minerals Local Plan (November 1999); Saved policies 3,4,32 and 36 – all outside of Brighton & Hove;
  - 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.
- 6.3 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27 March 2012 and is a material consideration which applies with immediate effect.
- 6.4 Due weight should be given to relevant policies in the development plan according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF.
- 6.5 The Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One (submission document) is an emerging development plan. The NPPF advises that weight may be given to relevant policies in emerging plans according to their stage of preparation, the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies and the degree of consistency of the relevant policies to the policies in the NPPF.
- 6.6 All material considerations and any policy conflicts are identified in the “Considerations and Assessment” section of the report.

## **7 RELEVANT POLICIES & GUIDANCE**

### The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

#### Brighton & Hove Local Plan:

QD2	Design – key principles for neighbourhoods
QD14	Extensions and alterations
QD16	Trees and hedgerows
QD27	Protection of Amenity
HE6	Development within or affecting the setting of conservation areas

#### Supplementary Planning Documents:

SPD06	Trees & Development Sites
-------	---------------------------

#### Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One (submission document)

SS1	Presumption in favour of sustainable development
CP12	Urban Design
CP15	Heritage

## **8 CONSIDERATIONS & ASSESSMENT**

8.1 The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to the impact of the extension on the appearance of the existing property and the surrounding Preston Park conservation area, and the effect of the proposed extension on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

### **Planning Policy:**

8.2 Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan states that planning permission for extensions or alterations to existing buildings, including the formation of rooms in the roof, will only be granted if the proposed development:

- a) is well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended, adjoining properties and to the surrounding area;
- b) would not result in significant noise disturbance or loss of privacy, outlook, daylight/sunlight or amenity to neighbouring properties;
- c) takes account of the existing space around buildings and the character of the area and an appropriate gap is retained between the extension and the joint boundary to prevent a terracing effect where this would be detrimental to the character of the area; and
- d) uses materials sympathetic to the parent building.

8.3 In considering whether to grant planning permission for extensions to residential and commercial properties, account will be taken of sunlight and daylight factors, together with orientation, slope, overall height relationships, existing boundary treatment and how overbearing the proposal will be.

8.4 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.

8.5 Policy HE6 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan states that proposals within or affecting the setting of a conservation area should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area and should show:

- a. A consistently high standard of design and detailing reflecting the scale and character or appearance of the area, including the layout of the streets, development patterns, building lines and building forms;
- b. The use of building materials and finishes which are sympathetic to the area;
- c. No harmful impact on the townscape and roofscape of the conservation area;
- d. The retention and protection of trees, gardens, spaces between buildings, and other open areas which contribute to the character or appearance of the area;

- e. Where appropriate, the removal of unsightly and inappropriate features or details; and
- f. The retention and, where appropriate, the reinstatement of original features such as chimneys, chimney pots, gates, railings and shopfronts and small scale architectural details such as mouldings which individually or cumulatively contribute to the character or appearance of the area.

**Design:**

Design of the Scheme:

- 8.6 The proposal would involve the addition of a full second storey to the property and raising the roof. The property would also be extended to the rear.
- 8.7 The resulting front elevation would have a significantly altered appearance, with the front bays continued into the first floor. The windows would be leaded with white painted timber frames, and the first floor windows would continue into the projecting gable ends. The front roofslope would have one rooflight, with the roof, the first floor above the garage and the bays between the ground and first floor windows all tile hung with dark slate. The front of the building would be rendered.
- 8.8 To the rear, the building would have a two storey projection on the southern side of the plot and a single storey, flat-roofed projection on the northern side. The ground floor and the projecting part of the first floor would be clad in dark timber cladding, with the first floor rendered. A green/living wall with creepers would be installed on the rear wall above the flat roof extension. Windows and doors on the rear would have grey aluminium frames.
- 8.9 The proposed design is an amended scheme, following the refusal of a previous application (BH2012/01933). The amended scheme has sought to address the issues raised in the reasons for refusal, with the use of timber cladding to the front elevation replaced with hung slate to the window bays, the ground floor front windows retained and timber windows with leaded lights on the upper storey. The roof forms to the sides and rear of the building are simplified in comparison to the previous scheme.
- 8.10 The design of the upper floor front windows is considered to be an unattractive feature. The combination of fully glazed gable ends and leaded timber windows would be a contrived combination of modern design and traditional features. It is recognised that the design is a response to the site location, with the low eaves height positioned to match the eaves height of the neighbouring bungalow (Cinderford). However, this is not considered sufficient justification for this awkward design feature which would harm the character and appearance of the original building and wider area.
- 8.11 In addition, the proposed front rooflight does not line up with the fenestration below and is oversized and would be overly visually prominent within the roofslope.

Design in Context:

- 8.12 The property is located within the Preston Park Conservation Area. The surrounding streets were developed in the early years of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, with a variety of attractive residential buildings. These buildings are predominantly of brick construction with red or red-brown clay tile roofs and timber windows. Westview is an inter-war bungalow in an English vernacular style, and is one of a small group of similar properties at this end of Cornwall Gardens.
- 8.13 Whilst the resulting house would be higher than the other nearby bungalows, the design of the scheme has sought to minimise this impact by matching the eaves height of the adjacent property (Cinderford). The building would also be a storey lower than the adjacent block of flats. The addition of a storey to this building is not objected to in principle and is not considered in itself to be detrimental to the character of the area.
- 8.14 The use of slate and render for the front elevation would give the building a more modern appearance than the existing building and the nearby houses, which are predominantly of brick construction with tiled roofs. Whilst some other properties in Cornwall Gardens are rendered, these are more usually either pebble-dash rendered to the first floor or rendered in conjunction with the use of part-timbering. The combination of the slate roof, timber cladding, and aluminium framed doors and glass balustrades would also be a significant departure from the appearance of most nearby buildings in the conservation area and would thereby not preserve or enhance its character in accordance with policy HE6.

Landscaping:

- 8.15 The positioning of trees and hedges has been identified on the site plan. The scheme would result in the loss of one Cupressus Macrocarpa tree to the rear of the property; this is considered acceptable by the Arboriculturalist. Other trees would need to be protected during the course of construction, should permission be granted; this could be secured by condition.

**Impact on Amenity:**

- 8.16 The current scheme would have less bulk on the northern side of the plot, closest to Cinderford, than the previously refused application. The previous reason for refusal relating to the impact on a side window on the south side of Cinderford has now been overcome through the reduction in massing on this side of the proposed building. Whilst the extension would be noticeable from the side bedroom window of Cinderford, it is not considered that it would be significantly overbearing nor cause a significant loss of outlook or in relation to this room to an extent that would now justify refusal on these grounds.
- 8.17 The proposal would introduce a significant addition of bulk to the southern side, however there is a driveway of over 4 metres in width to the north of Cornwall House, the block of flats to the south. The property would not be any nearer to the adjacent boundary than the current property. The scheme would not lead to additional overlooking or loss of privacy that would justify refusal on these grounds.



## 9 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The design of the proposed front windows and rooflight would be an unattractive feature that would detract from the appearance of the property. The use of modern materials would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the Preston Park Conservation Area.

## 10 EQUALITIES

- 10.1 No issues identified.

## 11 REASON FOR REFUSAL / INFORMATIVES

### 11.1 Reasons for Refusal:

1. By virtue of the use of fully glazed gable ends in conjunction with the use of leaded windows and oversized and poorly sited rooflight, the proposed front elevation would have an unattractive and contrived appearance that would be detrimental to the appearance of the recipient property and the Preston Park Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies QD14 and HE6 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.
2. By virtue of the use of slate, render and timber cladding, the proposed development would have a modern appearance that would be unsympathetic to the character and appearance of the Preston Park Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy HE6 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.

### 11.2 Informatives:

1. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy SS1 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One (submission document) 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 listed below:

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received
Location plan, existing block plan, street scene elevation and site plans	CGWRPO/01		14 February 2013
Existing ground and first floor plans	CGWRPO/02		14 February 2013
Existing front and rear elevations	CGWRPO/03		14 February 2013
Existing side elevations	CGWRPO/04		14 February 2013
Location plan, proposed block plan, street scene elevation and site plans	CGWRPO/05		14 February 2013
Proposed ground and first floor plans	CGWRPO/06		14 February 2013

PLANS LIST – 05 JUNE 2013

Proposed front and rear elevations	CGWRPO/07		14 February 2013
Proposed side elevations	CGWRPO/08		14 February 2013