

<b>App.No:</b> 130673 (HHH) & 130674 (CA Consent)	<b>Decision Due Date:</b> 15 November 2013	<b>Ward:</b> Upperton
<b>Officer:</b> Toby Balcikonis	<b>Site visit date:</b> 09 October 2013	<b>Type:</b> Householder
<b>Site Notice(s) Expiry date:</b> 16 October 2013		
<b>Neigh. Con Expiry:</b> 16 October 2013		
<b>Weekly list Expiry:</b> 23 September 2013		
<b>Press Notice(s):</b> N/A		
<b>Over 8/13 week reason:</b> To align with Planning Committee schedule.		
<b>Location:</b> 11 Park Close, Eastbourne, BN20 8AG		
<b>Proposal:</b> Proposed two storey rear extension. Demolition of existing garage and erection of replacement garage (REF: 130673) Conservation Area Consent also applied for Demolition of existing garage and erection of replacement garage? (REF: 130674)		
<b>Applicant:</b> Mr & Mrs Williams		
<b>Recommendation:</b> Refuse planning permission and listed building consent.		

**Planning Status:**

Conservation Area

Park Close Conservation Area

Convenants

Trustees of The Chatsworth Settlement

**Relevant Planning Policies**

Eastbourne Core Strategy Local Plan Policies (2006-2027)

B2 Creating Sustainable Neighbourhoods  
C10 Summerdown & Saffrons Neighbourhood Policy  
D5 Housing - High Value Neighbourhoods  
D10 Historic Environment - Conservation Area  
D10A Design

Eastbourne Borough Plan Saved Policies (2007)

UHT1: Design of New Development

UHT4: Visual Amenity  
UHT15: Protection of Conservation Areas  
HO20: Residential Amenity

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

Section 7: Requiring good design.

Section 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

**Site Description:**

This large, detached Tudor-bethan dwelling is located on the South West corner of Park Close, a set of 20 similarly styled dwellings arranged around a large central grasses 'island' with roadway all around serving the close.

Between the application property and its neighbour to the East at number 10 is an existing tarmac covered driveway leading down between the properties to a private garage serving 11 Park Close, and some metres beyond that, the rear boundary backing onto the newly opened free school at Gildredge House.

**Relevant Planning History:**

EB/2006/0467 - Erection of a single storey extension and dormer window to the rear plus a car port to the side, demolition of the existing sun room and removal of chimney stack  
Approved – conditional 2006-08-14

EB/2013/0098 - Single storey extension at rear (to replace existing conservatory).  
APPROVED CONDITIONAL 2013-04-25

EB/1995/0160 - Construction of a footpath to upgrade the existing lower driveway.  
Granted, subject to conditions. 1995-05-25

EB/1995/0432 - Installation of replacement windows (UPVC and aluminium).  
Granted (Five years) 1995-10-25

EB/1999/0235 - Single-storey rear extension.  
Approved 1999-08-16

**Proposed development:**

The applicant seeks to build a two-storey rear extension which projects from the rear (South West) elevation by a maximum of 5.5metres and a maximum height of just under 8.5 metres to ridge of the proposed addition to the property.

At ground floor level the new extension (excluding any roof overhangs)stretches almost the entirety of the existing property's 9.0 metre width, except a 215mm step in on either side which helps to differentiate the new part of the building from the older parts. Supporting a second floor, narrower in width, the Western side of the ground floor extension is capped with a roof sloping down from 4 metres at the ridge down to 2.75 metres at the eaves.

The upper floor of the proposed extension, at width of almost 4.9 metres is much more modest in comparison to its almost full-width lower floor component with an eaves height

of almost 5.5 metres with a roof sloping back up towards the parent building at an angle to match the existing roof slope to a ridge height 8.4 metres (some 0.8 metres lower than the highest part of the existing roof of the dwellinghouse).

The applicant proposes to glaze the extension with a 5.75 metre door and window combination centred at ground floor level and a multi glazed unit window opening measuring 2.35 metres x 1.15 metres high along the same plane as the existing rear second floor windows. The applicant does not propose the flank elevations of the new extended part of the existing dwellinghouse to be glazed.

Finishes to the brick built extension are proposed to be plain tiled roofs to match the existing finish, with tile hanging at second floor level and brick facing at ground floor level up to the lower floor eaves height.

In addition to the a new rear extension, the applicant seeks permission to demolish the existing brick built garage and rebuild 11 metres further back along a similar plane towards the rear boundary, also seeking to afford the applicant a greater degree of privacy from the closest school buildings nearing the properties boundary.

The new garage will be nearly 6 metres in length and 3.15 metres in width to accommodate a vehicle at a height of over 3.7 metres tall (2.16 metre to the eaves). The rebuilt garage is proposed to be clad with wood to finish, and will be accessed via a new gate for the driveway, positioned at the point of the entrance door to the existing garage which the applicant seeks to replace.

## **Consultations:**

### Internal:

Conservation Officer – 29<sup>th</sup> October (based on Amended Plans)

Site Visits on 2 April 2013 and again on 8<sup>th</sup> October 2013.

No. 11 is situated to the SE corner of The Park Close. The original layout of the 20 houses was planned by Architect Goulburn Lovell, which was approved in 1929 and completed by PD Stonham in the 1930s. The planned layout included the provision of a communal garage accessed between numbers 10 and 11, which are consequently well spaced, with a handed design. Number 11 is designed to be viewed from its principal and side elevations and is detailed accordingly.

The previously submitted plans have been amended to show a rebate equivalent to one brick (215mm) in the proposed extension. Although this breaks the line in mass of walling to this elevation of the building, it is considered that this amendment is minimal in the general mass and effect to loss of balance and proportion of the building and its relationship with the other buildings in the Conservation Area.

Therefore, It is still considered that the proposed two storey extension, while noted as a 'rear extension' represents a large mass visible to the side of the property, and alters the intended balance of façade and detail intended to be viewed from the public realm. It is considered that the proposed extension would compromise the intended spacing between

properties and adversely affect the roofscape of this part of the Park Close, encroaching on the planned effect of the buildings.

A previous application has been approved for a single storey extension to the rear (EB 2013 098), which would be the effective recommendation in relation to this application.

It is therefore recommended that this application be refused. The application also details the demolition of the existing garage and rebuild towards the rear of the plot. This element of the proposal has not been amended.

The existing garage is a modern, flat roofed brick and asphalt construction, and there is no objection to its removal. It is recommended that this element of the application be approved. The proposed construction is a simple plain construction of tiles pitched and hipped roof, with feather edged boarding to elevations. The finish of the boarding, window and gate details are not specified and should be subject to detail. It is preferred that the timber should be left to weather naturally, and not be painted or given any coloured finish.

The proposal notes 'gates to client spec' it is recommended that these are omitted from the scheme, as they would create a visual boundary on a site where none exist, and would necessitate the building of wall and/or piers which are not detailed in the application. The surface treatment to extended driveway is not specified in the application, and it is recommended that the surface be similar in appearance and texture to existing, as it is a characteristic feature of the Park Close.

NOTE: The Park Close Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Plan was formally adopted on 23rd October 2013, including recommendation of consideration of Article 4 Direction.

Conservation Area Advisory Group - Objections to the mass (height and bulk at first floor level) of the extension and the impact on the space between the pair (no.10).

Neighbour Representations:

No neighbour objections have been received.

**Appraisal:**

**Design:**

The extension is considered in the main to harmonise with the appearance and the character of the local environment; seeking to replicate the existing architectural style of the parent dwellinghouse, and use matching materials the proposed scheme ensures this criteria is achieved.

The extension is appropriate in terms of design to the parent building but the setting and site context mean the extension is detrimental visually and increases the bulk and scale of the property when viewed from the street scene and for these reasons does not fully accord to Policy UHT1: Design of New Development of the Eastbourne Borough Plan Saved Policies 2007.

**Residential Amenity:**

Due to the positioning of the neighbouring buildings from each other, with the primary elevations facing in to a single central area within the central grassed island within Park Close, it means that the flank elevations of neighbouring building increase in distance from each other the further to the rear elevation they get.

Even more significantly, the viewing angle from, an in-turn overlooking a rear elevation from / by neighbouring buildings becomes less enabled, helping to ensure good levels of privacy afforded from increasing obscure viewing angles in to neighbouring properties.

The major effect of the proposed extension at the application property on residential amenity would come from the second floor element, and its potential effect on the neighbouring property at 10 Park Close. However, due to the aforementioned obscured viewing angle there is no loss of outlook or privacy from overlooking in to habitable rooms caused to either neighbour as a result of the proposed extension.

It is considered that the layout and positioning of the buildings from each other also affords protection in that it negates any loss of light and or overshadowing on to the neighbouring properties and for these reasons accords to much of Policy HO20 governing Residential Amenity.

The Conservation Officer and CAAG have raised strong concerns over the rear extension when viewed between numbers 10 and 11 Park Close having an effect of closing up the gap between the buildings, which due to the layout of the Park Close, is particular prominent from certain viewing angles from the public realm as well as other properties in the locale, critically when viewed from the Southern part of Park Close.

In a circular layout such as is evident here, the spacing between the buildings can severely upset the rhythm of the area if not controlled, and it is felt that the second floor element particularly, has the effect of closing up the visual gap between the buildings to an unacceptable degree, negatively impacting the special character of the Park Close Conservation Area. For this reason, it is considered that the development does not accord with Borough Plan Saved Policies UHT15 and HO20 part E), Policies D10 and D10a of the Eastbourne Core Strategy and Chapter 12 (Conserving and Enhancing the historic environment) of the NPPF in that as a result of the development, there will be loss of character to the Conservation Area.

A characteristic of the Close are the 2 driveways on the South East Corner of the Close (leading to communal garages) and the driveway on the South West leading down to the existing garage of 11 Park Close. It is considered that the gaps afforded by these two driveways are as a deliberate result of a considered design, and thus seeking to close the gap, would harm the character and visual amenity of the area. For this reason the proposal does not fully accord with Policy HO20 concerning the loss of character to conservation areas.

Saved Policy UHT 4 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2007 concerning Visual Amenity states that proposals that have an unacceptable detrimental impact on visual amenity will be refused, citing erosion of local distinctiveness and effect on an important vista as key components of the Policy. It is considered that in impacting on the natural spacing between 10 and 11 Park Close to a

level considered unacceptable the proposal does not accord with this policy, and should be refused on these grounds.

The Conservation Officer states in her feedback that 'Number 11 Park Close is designed to be viewed from its principal and side elevations and is detailed accordingly' and goes on to say 'the two storey extension, while noted as a 'rear extension' represents a large mass visible to the side of the property, and alters the intended balance of facade and detail intended to be viewed from the public realm'.

Saved Policy UHT 15 of the Borough Plan 2007 concerning the 'Protection of Conservation Areas' and policy D10 of the Core Strategy 2013 state that a planning application in a conservation area, or affecting the setting of a conservation area, will be required to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area. Given the concerns raised by the Conservation Officer it is considered that the proposed extension would fail to preserve or enhance the visual appearance of the conservation area and therefore fails to comply with the above policies.

In seeking to replace the existing garage (11 metres further back in to the site) with what could be argued a simple but more visually appealing design, this component of the proposal is considered to be acceptable, as the existing feature is not considered to be important within the character of the conservation area.

**REF: 130674** – An application for Conservation Area Consent is also under determination and which includes the demolition of the existing garage to be replaced with a rebuilt new design further back in to the site. Although the demolition of the garage and erection of a replacement is agreed in principal, and supported by the Conservation Officer, it is not considered that the application can be approved without an approved replacement scheme in place, given the potential impacts on the appearance of the host building and the conservation area.

### **Human Rights and Equality & Diversity Implications:**

The proposal is considered to have no negative Human Rights or Equality & Diversity Implications.

### **Conclusion:**

The proposed scheme by virtue of the mass (height and bulk at first floor level) of the extension and the impact on the space between the pair of properties (no.10 & no.11) is inappropriate to its setting, detracts from the aesthetic quality of the subject building, and fails to harmonise with the existing form and pattern of development seen throughout Park Close.

### **Recommendation:**

#### **REF 130673:**

The proposed scheme by virtue of the mass (height and bulk at first floor level) of the extension and the impact on the space between the pair of properties (no.10 & no.11) is inappropriate to its setting, detracts from the aesthetic quality of the subject building, and fails to harmonise with the existing form and pattern of development seen

throughout Park Close. The proposal therefore fails to accord with saved policies UHT4, UHT15 and HO20 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan (2007) Policy D10 of the Core Strategy Local Plan 2013 and National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

**REF130674 (Conservation Area Consent):**

The proposed demolition is considered unacceptable as there is no approved scheme for a rebuilt garage and therefore the works are considered inappropriate to the setting, and would likely detract from character of this part of the Conservation Area. The proposal therefore fails to accord with saved policy UHT15 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan (2007) concerning protection of the Conservation Area, Policy D10 of the Core Strategy Local Plan 2013 and guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

**Appeal:** Should the applicant appeal the decision the appropriate followed, taking into account the criteria set by the Planning Inspectorate, is considered to be **written representations.**