



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 May 2013

**by R Barrett BSc(Hons) MSc, Dip HistCons, Dip UD, MRTPI, IHBC**  
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

**Decision date: 30 May 2013**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/13/2196177**  
**15 The Beeches, Brighton, BN1 5LS**

- 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 Mrs Olivia Olorenshaw against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
  - The application Ref BH2012/04088, dated 23 December 2012 was refused by notice dated 18 February 2013.
  - The development proposed is erection of single storey side extension incorporating conversion of existing garage.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the locality.

## Reasons

3. The appeal site includes a detached bungalow set back from the street behind an open lawned front garden. To one side there is a driveway that provides access to a detached garage which is sited behind the dwelling. The appeal property is located within a cul de sac of similar bungalows, in a generally low density layout. Large plots, open front gardens and substantial planting contribute to a generally spacious, green and sylvan character and appearance. The appeal property contributes to this character and appearance.
4. The appeal proposal, regardless of its width, as it would be set back from the front elevation of the appeal property and would be appropriate in size, it would appear as subservient to the main dwelling, such that the original bungalow would appear as the dominant feature in the street. The front porch which would sit in front of the main part of the proposed extension would be modest in size and would mimic the modelled elevation of the existing bungalow. In addition, even though the proposed pitched roof slope, including that of the proposed front porch, would cut into the roof of the main dwelling, and the roof elements would have different eaves heights, as the angle of these roofs would match, the proposed extension would appear balanced and would integrate successfully with that of the main house, in this respect. As the proposed front window would relate successfully to the proposed front elevation and would have appropriate proportions, as a suitably worded

planning condition could ensure its detail matched that of the existing windows, I consider that this would be acceptable.

5. However, the proposed flat roof of the rear section of the extension would be at odds with the pitched roof of the remainder and integrate unsuccessfully at the junction of the two. The different eaves heights and roof shapes at that junction would appear awkward and poorly detailed. Whilst the flat roofed section would be substantially set back from the street behind the front element of the proposed extension, and views from the street would be limited to those directly in front of the bungalow, this aspect of the appeal scheme would still be visible from the street, and would detract from the character and appearance of the main bungalow.
6. For this reason, I conclude that the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the host dwelling and therefore that of the locality and would fail to accord with Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan (2005), which requires that extensions and alterations to existing buildings are well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended. I find this policy to be generally consistent with The National Planning Policy Framework.

#### *Other Matters*

7. I am aware that the proposal follows a previous refusal and I acknowledge the efforts made to amend the appeal scheme, but I have still found unacceptable harm would arise as a consequence. I am also aware that there is some local support for the proposal but this, in addition to the fact that the proposal would restrict car traffic to the front of the appeal site and this may reduce the noise and general disturbance experienced by neighbours, does not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

#### **Conclusion**

8. For the above reasons, and taking all other matters raised into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*R Barrett*

INSPECTOR