



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 August 2011

by Megan Thomas BA Hons in Law, Barrister

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

Decision date: 10 August 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/11/2155154

3 Brangwyn Way, Brighton, East Sussex BN1 8XA

- 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 Derek Simmons against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2011/00942, dated 25 March 2011, was refused by notice dated 1 June 2011.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 2 storey extension at 3 Brangwyn Way, Brighton, East Sussex BN1 8XA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BH2011/00942, dated 25 March 2011, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 7751, 7751/1 & 7751/2.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and on the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two-storey detached dwelling with two bedrooms. It has a front and rear garden and forecourt area and a detached garage to the north side of the house. It is located on Brangwyn Way which is a residential road running parallel to London Road. It is visible from London Road as there are no houses opposite the appeal dwelling.
 4. The form of the house is somewhat unusual in that it has a projecting front gable and to the northern side a long cat-slide roof from ridge line to first floor
-

level. There are two dormer windows in that sloping roof facing the neighbouring house. In my view any two storey extension to the house presents a challenge to the designer.

5. The proposal consists of a two storey front extension which would also project beyond the northern flank wall by about 1.3m. It would sit slightly in front of the existing front gable by about 0.3m. Whilst it would undoubtedly change the appearance of the house, I do not consider that it would unduly harm its appearance. The lower ridge line of the proposed extension and the hipped roof would mean that it would not overwhelm the front gable, despite its bulk and massing. Moreover, the black and white detailing on the upper part of the gable contrasted with the use of matching brick on the extension would help to maintain the prominence of the gable. The use of first floor pitched roof half-dormers at eaves level would also help to lower the impact and would echo the shape of the front gable.
6. In my view, the new extension is likely to be equally as prominent as the front gable and views of the cat-slide roof would be concealed from the front. Again, the character of the house would be changed but I would not judge this to be detrimental. In fact, views of the existing dormers and the fenestration in the recessed front facade are not particularly attractive and the extension would eradicate or mask those elements. This would be beneficial.
7. Turning to the appearance of the house from the side (north) elevation and from the rear (west) elevation, the dual pitch roof profile created by the proposal would not be unduly fussy or unattractive. Views of it from the public realm would in any event be very limited.
8. In respect of the streetscene, I agree with the Council that the design and style of dwellinghouses within the locality varies significantly but the majority are either detached or semi-detached. As a result there are many contrasting roof profiles and the houses are not uniformly orientated towards the street in a regimented fashion. The extension would sit reasonably well back from the footpath with a front forecourt remaining. Taking into account all these factors, the proposed extension would not intrude into or unduly impose itself upon the character of the streetscene.
9. I conclude therefore that the proposal would not unduly harm the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the streetscene and would not be contrary to policies QD2 and QD14 Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005 or SPG note 1 *Roof Alterations & Extensions*.

Conditions

10. I have considered the imposition of conditions in the light of advice in Circular 11/95 *The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions*. In the interests of the appearance of the completed development, I have imposed a condition requiring materials used in the external surfaces of the new extension to match those in the existing building. For the sake of clarity and in the interests of proper planning I have attached a condition specifying that the scheme shall be built in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusion

11. Having taken into account all representations made, I allow the appeal.

Megan Thomas

INSPECTOR

