



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 February 2012

by David Harmston FRICS DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15 February 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/12/2168424

52 Lark Hill, Hove, East Sussex BN3 8PH

- 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 C Holdstock against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
 - The application (Ref BH2011/03468), dated 10 November 2011, was refused by notice dated 4 January 2012.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the existing single garage to allow the erection of a single-storey side extension with pitched roof (set back from existing) and the widening of the existing crossover and driveway entrance by 2000mm.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of the existing garage to allow the erection of a single-storey side extension (set back from existing) and the widening of the existing crossover and driveway entrance by 2000mm at 52 Lark Hill, Hove, East Sussex BN3 8PH in accordance with the terms of the application (Ref BH2011/03468), dated 10 November 2011, subject to the following conditions:
 - (1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years of the date of this permission.
 - (2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawing – No:- 11-20/PO2.
 - (3) 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow lying within a built-up neighbourhood of Hove. The proposal is to demolish the existing detached garage lying to the eastern side of the dwelling and to erect a pitched-roof side extension to provide accommodation for an additional bedroom with en-

- suite facilities together with a utility room and a hallway. In all key respects the extension would closely match the appearance of the existing building.
4. The front elevation of the extension would be consistent in frontage depth and alignment with that of the existing bungalow. A large proportion of the new structure would occupy the space currently taken up by the garage. With its pitched roof being set back from and lower than the existing roof, the extension would appear as being subservient to the existing building. Because the site is irregularly shaped, the gap between the eastern side of the extension on its frontage and the boundary with the adjoining dwelling to the south-east (No 28 Park Rise) diminishes to about 0.705m at the rear.
 5. The size of the extension, and particularly in its width of 4.04m, has been criticised by the Council as being excessive in that the larger frontage of the building thus created would be uncharacteristic of the area due to its scale and bulk and would lead to be a visual imbalance in the pair of semi-detached dwellings. Nevertheless, taking account of the existing garage, the increase in the total amount of built development present on the site would not be substantially increased. The extension would appear as a neat and well-designed enlargement of the bungalow. Whilst it would introduce a form of development into the streetscene that does not exist elsewhere to this scale, it would cause no material harm to the character or the appearance of the area.
 6. Further, there would be no material detriment arising from the development to the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining dwelling to the south-east. The windows in the side elevation of that property are obscure glass serving a bathroom and a WC. The extension would not protrude behind that building and would be sited an adequate distance away from the boundary to avoid any harm by reason of overshadowing. In all these circumstances the proposal represents an acceptable form of development in compliance with the terms of Saved Policies QD14 and QD27 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan.
 7. Conditions are necessary concerning the time duration of the permission and to ensure that the external materials used in the development match those in the existing building, in the interests of visual amenity. For the avoidance of doubt, and in the interests of proper planning, the drawing to which this permission relates needs to be specified. I have taken into account everything of relevance to this proposal but nothing outweighs my conclusions above and the reasons for them.

David Harmston

Inspector