

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 April 2017

by **Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 3 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/17/3172087 4A Mansfield Road, Hove BN3 5NN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Thomas Asher against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2016/05487, dated 19 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is a two storey rear extension including conversion of existing roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey rear extension including conversion of existing roof at 4A Mansfield Road, Hove BN3 5NN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BH2016/05487, dated 2 March 2017, subject to the following conditions: -
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans CH747/004 Revision A, CH747/005 Revision D and CH747/006 Revision A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing property.

Main Issue

2. The main issue raised in respect of the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property relates to a building of markedly different form and design to those predominantly two-storey detached dwelling in the area. The property has been subdivided to create two dwellings, one to the front of the plot with the second behind. The building is of pitched roof design with gables running front to rear with a central ridge running parallel to the highway. The front gable is higher than the central roof ridge and the part width gable addition to the rear is set below this central ridge.
-

4. The proposal to the rear would extend to the full width of the property and increase the height above the central ridge. The proposed height of the two rear roof gables would not, in my opinion, be appreciably higher than the existing central roof ridge and would be of similar height to that of the front gable projection. The small area of flat roof would be positioned between the pitched roofs and would not be overly visible for this reason. Whilst the enlargements to the rear of the dwelling would be visible from Mansfield Road and the occupiers of some surrounding dwellings, it would not be extensively apparent in such views. Although the form and design of the enlarged dwelling would change the appearance of the dwelling and be different to that of other properties in the area, I see no reason why the size and design of the proposed extension at the rear and the modest increase in size and height would not appear acceptable in the context of this specific property and this location.
5. The proposed gable roof behind the front entrance porch would be set well back from Mansfield Road and would be positioned behind the existing garage. Although it would be of similar height to that of the existing front gable projection and would change the shape of the roof, I do not consider the pitched roof would be overly prominent as a result of the modest increase in height. Whilst the change in roof shape would again be visible in views from Mansfield Road and from adjoining properties, I see no reason why the size and design of the proposed extension and the modest increase in size and height would not appear acceptable in the context of this property and this location. Given its recessed positioning in relation to the highway I cannot conclude that it would be prominent and harmful in public views from Mansfield Road.
6. In addition to the above, tile hanging is proposed upon the gable ends of the pitched roofs. I observed the existing dormer roof extension at the property to be tile hung. Furthermore, tile hanging has been used in the front elevations of neighbouring dwellings and garages close by. I therefore cannot conclude that the use of tile hanging would be out of keeping in this location.
7. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host building and the area. For the reasons given above, the proposal would not materially conflict with Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan which requires extensions and alterations to existing buildings to be well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended and to the surrounding area.

Conditions

8. I have considered the planning conditions suggested by the Council in light of paragraph 206 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard time limit condition and in the interests of certainty it is appropriate that there is a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. A condition relating to matching materials is appropriate in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusions

9. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR

