



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2013

**by Ms T L Dow BA, Dip TP, Dip UD, MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 25 September 2013**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/13/2201382**  
**4 Brangwyn Crescent, Brighton, BN1 8XJ**

- 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 and Mrs P Fitzgerald against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
  - The application Ref BH2013/00906, dated 15 March 2013, was refused by notice dated 30 May 2013.
  - The development proposed is; Two storey rear extension and first floor side extension.
- 

This decision is issued in accordance with section 56(2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and supersedes the decision issued on 24 September 2013.

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two storey side and rear extension at 4 Brangwyn Crescent, Brighton, BN1 8XJ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref BH2013/00906, dated 15 March 2013, 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: 1257/1677A and 1257/1683, dated 6 February 2013 and 1 March 2013 respectively, and 1257/1304, dated 13 March 2009 but received by the Council on 20 March 2013.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing building.
  - 4) Before the first occupation of the extension hereby permitted the first floor windows and roof lights on the side elevations shall be fitted with obscured glazing and shall be permanently retained in that condition thereafter.

## Procedural matters

2. The development involves a two storey extension to the side as well as to the rear and is more accurately described in the Council's decision notice. I have therefore amended the description of development to the erection of a two storey side and rear extension.
-

3. The Brighton and Hove City Council Local Development Framework, Supplementary Planning Document 12, *design guide for extensions and alterations* (SPDBH12), was adopted in June 2013, after the Council's decision to refuse planning permission. The appellant has referred to the document in the grounds of appeal and I have had regard to it in reaching my decision.

### **Main Issue**

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the host building and the area.

### **Reasons**

5. Brangwyn Crescent is on a hill with the appeal site located towards the bottom of the slope. The Crescent is characterised by relatively large dwellings set in quite spacious plots. The properties are generally well set back from the road with mature landscaping in front gardens. Most of the properties retain a good gap to side boundaries. There is variety in the size and shape of dwellings along the road but there is also consistency in terms of general style, the external materials and the age of the dwellings. The roof forms in the locality include projecting gables, cat-slide roofs, half-hips and full hips.
6. The appeal property has gaps to both side boundaries which would be retained, although the area behind and above the existing garage would be in-filled, with the existing cat-slide roof and dormer replaced with a two-storey extension. The extension would be attached to a two storey addition to the rear.
7. In views from the front of the property, the side extension would give the dwelling a more balanced appearance, the scale and proportions of the addition matching those on the other side of the front elevation. Within the context of dwellings in the locality exhibiting a wide range of roof styles and sizes, the replacement of the asymmetrical roof would not look out of keeping in the street scene. The side extension would maintain the current distance to the boundaries and the sense of spaciousness, so that the extension would not appear overly bulky or large within its setting.
8. In terms of the wider street scene, from the west the roof of the extension with its hipped elevation, would not project beyond the dwelling's existing two-storey gable. Given the sloping nature of the road, it would also be viewed below the roof of No.6. In views from the east, No.2 Brangwyn Crescent is sited well forward of the appeal property and there is extensive planting between the two dwellings. The side extension would be seen within this setting and adjacent to the two-storey, half-hipped gable of No.6. It would not therefore be prominent or appear out of keeping in the street scene or the area more generally.
9. The proposed rear extension would be deeper than the existing conservatory, extending across most of the rear elevation. The proposed roof arrangement would mean that parts of the rear extension would be single storey in effect, so that an element of the existing two storey rear elevation would still be visible. The proposed roof form combines characteristic design features from the existing and surrounding properties and its depth, compared to the existing property, is not excessive. Although the span is wide, the cat-slide roof reduces its impact and reflects the line of the existing rear gable.

10. Overall, although the proposed extensions are large, they are not out of proportion with the scale or setting of the existing dwelling and neither would they diminish its architectural quality for the reasons I have set out.
11. I conclude that the extensions would not harm the character and appearance of the host building, the street scene or the area more generally and that there would be no conflict with Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan 2005. This policy, amongst other things, seeks to ensure that extensions are well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the host property and the surrounding area. Likewise there is no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework in terms of design interests. I have also had regard to the Council's SPDBH12 in reaching this view.
12. In terms of conditions, the Council has suggested a condition requiring matching materials and that the first floor side-facing windows should be obscure glazed. In the interests of the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the protection of the neighbours' living conditions, I agree that these are appropriate conditions.

#### **Other matters**

13. I have had regard to the comments and concerns expressed by adjoining neighbours, which are partly addressed by the imposition of condition 4 regarding the requirement to obscure glaze first floor windows. With regard to the other points raised, I have no reason to disagree with the Council. None of the issues raised therefore affects my overall conclusion.

#### **Conclusion**

14. For the reasons set out above I conclude the appeal should succeed.

*T L Dow*

INSPECTOR

