



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2013

**by Jennifer Tempest BA(Hons) MA PGDip PGCert CertHE MRTPI IHBC**

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

**Decision date: 4 July 2013**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/13/2197644**

**14 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 Dr Stephen Hempling against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
  - The application Ref BH2012/03971, dated 10 December 2012, was refused by notice dated 13 February 2013.
  - The development proposed is single storey side extension with bedroom and en-suite bathroom. Single storey rear extension with dining room and extended kitchen.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side extension with bedroom and en-suite bathroom and a single storey rear extension with dining room and extended kitchen at 14 The Beeches, Brighton BN1 5LS in accordance with the terms of the application Ref BH2012/03971, dated 10 December 2012, 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: TB/01; TB/02; TB/03; TB/04; 1:500 scale site plan; 1:1250 scale location plan.
  - 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 in this appeal is the effect of the proposed side extension on the character and appearance of the area.

## Reasons

3. The Beeches is a spacious development of bungalows. The sense of space derives from the relatively low height of the dwellings coupled with the open plan nature of the frontages. I do not consider that the distance between properties makes a significant contribution to this sense of spaciousness. The properties are not all of uniform design. There are variations in orientation with some, including the appeal property, having their longer elevation facing the road whilst others are 'end on' to the road. There are also variations in facing materials and other design elements. The overall impression is therefore not one of a single style or design.

4. The decision and report of the Council make clear that although the development proposes two extensions, only the side extension is in dispute. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.
5. The Council's approach to extensions and alterations is set out in policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan (2005). The relevant parts of the policy in respect of this appeal require development to be well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended, adjoining properties and to the surrounding area. Account must also be taken of existing space around buildings and the character of the area, and there is a requirement to use materials sympathetic to the parent building.
6. Entering The Beeches from Dyke Road Avenue, the appeal property becomes evident in views from the south west as it occupies a corner plot which faces the road. There is a substantial open area in front of Nos 14, 12 and 10 which would not be directly affected by the proposed side extension.
7. Although there are other several other properties in the area with a similar L-shaped plan form including a projecting gable at one end, the appeal property does not sit between others like this. The properties to either side are sited with their narrower gable ends towards the road. Hence, the appeal property is not obviously 'read' in the context of a close knit group of similar properties. The existing roof form of the appeal property, unlike some other properties, already has a main ridge line which extends beyond the projecting gable. The extension would extend this ridge line further, rather than introducing a wholly new feature.
8. The dominance of the projecting gable would not be lost as a consequence of the proposed extension which would be set back from the front wall of the gable. The importance of the gable is also emphasised by the brick piers on either side of the tile hung gable wall. The width of the proposed extension is relatively modest in comparison with the overall length of the existing frontage. Furthermore, in views from the north west, the extension would be masked by the projecting gable. The extension is proposed to be finished in bricks and tiles to match the existing bungalow.
9. The Council's policy with regard to extensions does not expressly require extensions to be subservient to the host dwelling. Notwithstanding this, the proposed extension would not be unduly prominent and is of a modest size in the context of the existing bungalow.

### **Conclusion and Conditions**

10. For the reasons given about I consider that the proposal would comply with policy QD14 of the Local Plan and would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.
11. I have imposed conditions requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and that the materials match the existing dwelling. These are necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

*Jennifer Tempest*

INSPECTOR