
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 April 2017

by C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/17/3168353
44 Old Shoreham Road, Hove, BN3 6GF

- 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 & Mrs Langley against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2016/05621, dated 10 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension linking the house to the adjacent garage.
-

Preliminary matters

1. I noted at my site visit work was underway relating to raised decking at the rear of the property. Such work is not included on the submitted drawings or the description of development proposed, and so forms no part of my decision.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension linking the house to the adjacent garage at 44 Old Shoreham Road, Hove, BN3 6GF in accordance with the terms of the application Ref BH2016/05621, dated 10 October 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 0294-16-01, 0294-16-02, 0294-16-03, 0294-16-04, 0294-16-05, 0294-16-06 & 0294-16-07.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The proposed extensions would see the infilling of a small area at ground level, but above this would be a much wider addition at first floor. This would increase the width of the dwelling by incorporating the existing garage, with a
-

new front gable projection to the house. The resulting house would not be symmetrical, but there is not an existing symmetry to the building at present; nor, indeed, is there a predominant character of such in the surrounding area. Houses show variation in the position and size of gable ends and pitched roofs – both on individual properties and between adjoining properties – and the design and form of the building that would result from the extensions to No. 44 would fit within that non-uniform character. The property is set lower than the pavement and road, and the design and scale would not be imposing in views along the road.

5. The extended part of the house would join the existing front gable to the property, and it would relate well in scale and design by continuing the ridge line that is lower than the main house, and by showing proportions in the new gable to match the existing gable. I acknowledge that the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD): Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations (2013) advises that two storey side extensions should generally be set back from the frontage and main ridge line by at least 0.5m and have a width no greater than half the frontage width of the main building. The extension would not accord with these dimensions. However, the particular circumstances of the design of the existing property, and the manner in which the extension has been designed to relate to the front gable and the setting of the house, mean that the extension would in fact appear as a subservient addition to the house. The character of the property would not be overwhelmed by the proposals, and so the scheme would be consistent with the over-arching general principle of the SPG that requires extensions to not dominate or detract from the original building or the character of an area.
6. It is therefore concluded on the main issue that the proposed development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would be consistent with the objectives of Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan, and the SPD, which seek to ensure that extension and alterations to buildings are well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended, adjoining properties and to the surrounding area.
7. The appeal is therefore allowed. I have attached the Council's suggested conditions requiring matching materials, to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development, and a further condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty.

C J Leigh

INSPECTOR