

<u>No:</u>	BH2019/01976	<u>Ward:</u>	Patcham Ward
<u>App Type:</u>	Householder Planning Consent		
<u>Address:</u>	38 Carden Crescent Brighton BN1 8TQ		
<u>Proposal:</u>	Erection of a first floor rear extension		
<u>Officer:</u>	Ayscha Woods, 292322	tel:	<u>Valid Date:</u> 02.07.2019
<u>Con Area:</u>	N/A	<u>Expiry Date:</u>	27.08.2019
<u>Listed Building Grade:</u>	N/A	<u>EOT:</u>	
<u>Agent:</u>	Michael Bullivant Associates 3RP	2A Golding Road	Cambridge CB1
<u>Applicant:</u>	Mr & Mrs Atkinson	38 Carden Crescent	Brighton BN1 8TQ

Cllr Lee Wares has requested this application is determined by the Planning Committee.

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:

Conditions:

1. The proposed rear extension, by reason of its scale, bulk and height in conjunction with the existing extension, would be an overly dominant addition that would, in combination with the existing ground floor rear extension, result in a total loss of the rear elevation of the original building. The extension would detract from the appearance and character of the original property and the wider surrounding area. As such the proposal is contrary to policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan.
2. The proposed extension, by reason of its scale, depth and height within close proximity to the shared boundary would have an unneighbourly and overbearing impact on the neighbouring property at no. 40 Carden Crescent, contrary to policy 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. This decision is based on the drawings received listed below:

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received
Location and block plan	7452/1	-	2 July 2019
Proposed Drawing	7452	-	2 July 2019

2. RELEVANT HISTORY

- 2.1. BN74/1543 - Two storey extension at rear of existing premises to form kitchen and study on ground floor with bedroom over - Approved - 15/10/74

3. CONSULTATIONS

None

4. REPRESENTATIONS

- 4.1. **One (1)** letter has been received supporting the proposed development on the following grounds:

- Good design
- In keeping with neighbourhood
- Required for health reasons

- 4.2. **Councillor Wares** supports the application. A copy of the representation is attached to the report.

5. 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

6. CONSIDERATIONS & ASSESSMENT

- 6.1. Permission is sought for the erection of a first floor rear extension.

- 6.2. 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, surrounding streetscene and wider area, and the amenities of the neighbouring properties.

Design and Appearance:

- 6.3. The application site relates to a semi-detached property with an existing part one, part two storey rear extension with flat roofs.

- 6.4. The proposed extension would adjoin the existing extension at first floor level, resulting in a combined extension which would cover the full width of the rear elevation at two storeys in height.
- 6.5. The extension would add significant bulk and massing to the original building and result in a total loss of the original rear elevation of the building. In addition, the angled design is considered to be of a contrived and incongruous appearance which relates poorly to the existing building.
- 6.6. The result of the proposal would be a level of extension which would be overly dominant to the rear elevation, and which would fail to respect the scale and character of the original building, contrary to guidance contained within SPD12. The extension is considered harmful to the character of the original building, contrary to policy QD14 of the Local Plan.
- 6.7. It is acknowledged that there are a number of examples of two storey rear extensions visible from the application property; however the majority of these are part single, part two storey extensions which do not cover the full width of the rear elevation and are therefore not comparable.
- 6.8. There are two examples of full width rear extensions at two storeys in height to nos. 46 and 48 Carden Crescent which form a semi-detached pair, however these were constructed some time ago and were not considered under the current relevant policies. In addition, it is considered that these extensions serve to illustrate the dominance and harm of inappropriately designed extensions; the proposal would therefore clearly exacerbate this harm by replicating the bulk, height and poor design of large extension across the full width of the rear elevation.

Impact on Amenity:

- 6.9. The properties most likely to be affected by the proposed development are nos. 36 and 40 Carden Crescent adjacent.
- 6.10. The proposed extension would project 3m at two storeys in height in close proximity to the boundary with no. 40 Carden Crescent to the east. It is acknowledged that the extension has been designed to be angled away from no. 40, with a high level window to the side elevation, thus not to result in a harmful level of overshadowing or overlooking. However, by virtue of its height and overall scale in close proximity to the adjoining neighbouring property, the extension would still be an unneighbourly addition. The extension would result in a significantly overbearing impact on the occupants of no. 40, particularly at ground floor level, and the impact is considered enough to warrant refusal of this application. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to policy QD27 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan.

7. EQUALITIES

- 7.1. It is noted that a letter of support refers to the requirement of the development for health reasons. Following the submission of the application,

the Local Planning Authority provided the applicant the opportunity to submit any supporting information in this regard. The information submitted regarding the reasoning and purpose for the application has been taken into consideration and given due weight in the determination of the application, but is not considered to outweigh the harm identified above.