

<b>App.No:</b> 171322	<b>Decision Due Date:</b> 25 December 2017	<b>Ward:</b> Hampden Park
<b>Officer:</b> William De Haviland-Reid	<b>Site visit date:</b> 12 December 2017	<b>Type:</b> Householder
<b>Site Notice(s) Expiry date:</b> 28 November 2017 <b>Neighbour Con Expiry:</b> 28 November 2017 <b>Press Notice(s):</b> N/A		
<b>Over 8/13 week reason:</b> Within time		
<b>Location:</b> Kenley House, 3 Brand Road, Eastbourne		
<b>Proposal:</b> 2no. Single storey extensions to the side and rear of the host property.		
<b>Applicant:</b> Mr Simon Naish		
<b>Recommendation:</b> Approve Conditionally		

### **Executive Summary:**

The application is brought to committee by request of an objector to address committee.

The proposed development provides an acceptable form of residential development that would be consistent with the site and surrounding area.

Scheme is recommended for approval with conditions.

### **Planning Status:**

A detached property located within a predominantly residential area. The property is not a Listed Building nor is it located within a Conservation Area.

### **Relevant Planning Policies:**

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

- 2. Ensuring the vitality of town centres
- 3. Supporting a prosperous rural economy
- 7. Requiring good design
- 8. Promoting healthy communities
- 12. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Core Strategy Local Plan 2013 Policies  
B2 Creating Sustainable Neighbourhoods  
C7 Hampend Park Neighbourhood Policy  
D5 Housing  
D10a Design

Eastbourne Borough Plan Saved Policies 2007  
HO2 Predominantly Residential Areas  
HO20 Residential Amenity  
NE16 Dev within 250m of former landfill site  
UHT4 Visual Amenity  
US4 Floor Protection and Surface Water

**Site Description:**

A detached property located in 3 Brand Road, Eastbourne.

Many of the properties in this area are of a broadly similar design and have a front and rear gardens.

The application site has a driveway in place of the front garden and a garage extension to the North elevation and a glass conservatory to the West (rear) elevation. The south Elevation (side) has a grassed area used primarily as a private rear garden.

**Relevant Planning History:**

EB/1958/0249  
Erection of domestic garage.  
Granted.  
1958-06-26

EB/1955/0418  
Alterations, making 2 existing flats self-contained.  
Granted.  
1955-12-08

EB/1958/0192  
Erection of detached house, with garage.  
Granted.  
1958-05-23

020760  
Provision of replacement conservatory at rear.  
Planning Permission  
Approved unconditionally  
04/03/2002

**Proposed development:**

It is proposed to create an annexe extension to the rear of the property and also extend the side of the property.

Annexe extension on North (side) elevation

The annexe extension is single storey with a flat roof with a mono pitched roof to the front.

The height to the top of the flat roof is 3.2m and extending to the side of the property and having a floor area of 56sqm.

This new floor area accommodates a residential annexe containing separate living and sleeping accommodation from the main house.

There will remain access to the rear annexe via a separate door to the front of the property and from the hall in host property itself, with a door to the rear of the annex allowing access to a small courtyard which can also be accessed by the main house.

There are no windows to the North elevation facing the neighbouring property.

West (rear) extension to the host property

The extension to the rear of the property measures a total height of 5.64m tall and 2.67m to the eaves height. The total width of the proposed West (rear) extension is 7m and the total length is 8.88m. The total area of the proposed extension is 60.59m<sup>2</sup> and the extensions planned use is for a kitchen and dining room to the main family home.

To the South facing elevation of the extension there will be bi-fold patio doors which open onto a patio area which is replacing the decking which already exists. The North area of the extension has a small window which looks onto the courtyard and towards the boundary with No 5 Brand Road

The West (rear) extension will also have 6 no. roof lights (3 on either pitch of the roof).

**Neighbour Representations:**

There have been two neighbour representations

*1no. Letter of Support:*

"I have no objection to the Proposal"

*1no. Letter of Objection requesting to speak at Committee and covering the following points:*

- *Size, scale and bulk of the extension out of character with the wider area*
- *Potential impacts upon the boundary wall*
- *Maximum height of the extension of 4.2m would be overpowering and unneighbourly; no need for an annex to be so high*
- *Loss of light*
- *Height would overshadow limited amenity space currently enjoyed by neighbour*
- *Length of side extension given stepped nature of the existing properties would accentuate the impacts*
- *Roof lights may cause impacts*
- *Given extent of additions these may affect the spacious setting and character of the area*
- *Result in a form of overdevelopment of the site and result in town cramming*
- *Size of the annex is sufficient to sustain as an independent dwelling*
- *Difficulty for the Council to enforce interconnectivity to the main house*
- *Use of the annex may have an adverse impact upon the enjoyment of the adjacent property.*

## **Appraisal:**

### Principle of development:

There is no objection in principle to the proposed development and making alterations to the building provided it would be designed to a high standard, respect the established character of the area and would not have an adverse effect on the amenity and is in accordance with the policies of the Core Strategy 2013, and saved policies of the Borough Plan 2007 and the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

The main issues to consider with this application are the design of the proposed extensions with the resulting impacts upon the character of the plot in particular and the wider area generally and the potential impact that the development may have upon neighbouring amenity.

### Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers:

Given the size of the extensions their relationship with the common boundaries and their separation to the neighbouring dwellings/plots it is considered that any impacts resulting from light loss would be less than substantial and a refusal based solely on this issue could not be substantiated.

It is noted that the rear extension incorporates a kitchen window that directly faces the shared boundary between Nos 3/5 Broad Road. It is considered

that any perceived overlooking from this window is mitigated by the distance to the boundary and the height of the retained boundary wall.

Similarly the inclusion of roof lights and bi-folding doors to the rear extension would not give rise to any material impacts to the occupiers of the neighbouring plots/properties.

#### Size of annex

The scheme clearly proposes an annexe for dependant relatives; the size of the proposal reflects the needs/aspirations of the applicant however a kitchen/diner and separate bedroom/shower is not an uncommon form of annexe accommodation across the Borough.

The objector has commented that the size/design of the annexe is such that it could sustain independent living; this is always an area of concern when dealing with annexe proposals; however consistent with other similar proposals a condition is recommended to control/prevent the independent use of the annexe.

The use of the annexe may well give rise to a greater intensity of use to parts of the existing garden/plot closer to the common boundaries than currently exists, this impact however does not amount to material harm sufficient to justify a refusal of permission.

#### Design

It is considered that the extensions have been designed taking architectural references from the host and neighbouring properties and as such are considered to be an acceptable form of development that is respectful to the character of the site and the surrounding area.

Given that the scale, form and design of the extensions are not outwith many others across the Borough it is considered that a refusal could not be substantiated.

#### Other Matters

Given the proximity of the annexe to the common boundary a condition is proposed controlling water runoff.

#### Impact on character and setting of a listed building or conservation area:

The host property is not located within a Conservation Area and not a Listed Building.

#### Impacts on trees:

There are no trees and or soft landscaping that are considered to be an impediment to development.

Impacts on highway network or access:

Given that the proposal relates to a domestic extension and additional ancillary accommodation it is considered that the development would not have any material impact upon the local highway impacts.

**Human Rights Implications:**

The impacts of the proposal have been assessed as part of the application process. Consultation with the community has been undertaken and the impact on local people is set out above. The human rights considerations have been taken into account fully in balancing the planning issues; and furthermore the proposals will not result in any breach of the Equalities Act 2010.

**Conclusion:**

It is considered that the proposed development will not negatively impact the amenity of the occupiers of surrounding properties or be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. Proposal therefore complies with local and national policies.

**Recommendation:**

Approve Conditionally

**Conditions:**

- 1) Time Limit
- 2) Approved Plans
- 3) No PD for windows and dormers within the extension approved
- 4) Ancillary use
- 5) Surface water run off

**Appeal:**

Should the applicant appeal the decision the appropriate course of action to be followed, taking into account the criteria set by the Planning Inspectorate, is considered to be written representations.