



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2013

by Peter Rose BA MRTPI DMS MCMi

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

Decision date: 11 October 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/A/13/2197646

88 Goldstone Road, Hove, East Sussex BN3 3RH

- 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 A Squires against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2013/00282, dated 30 January 2013, was refused by notice dated 5 April 2013.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension to basement and roof conversion with rear dormer and front rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey rear extension to lower ground floor/basement and roof conversion with rear dormer and front rooflights at 88 Goldstone Road, Hove, East Sussex BN3 3RH in accordance with the terms of the application Ref BH2013/00282, dated 30 January 2013, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with approved drawings 12418-Loc, plan titled 'Existing Floor Plans and Elevations', and plan reference number A-23-01-13.
 - 3) The external finishes of the development hereby permitted shall match in material, colour, style, bonding and texture those of the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. The existing and proposed drawings submitted with the appeal do not contain drawings numbers. This matter was raised at the site visit, and by email dated 5 September, copied to the local planning authority, the appellant has confirmed the relevant drawing number of the proposed development to be A-23-01-13. The 'existing' drawing remains unnumbered and is referred to in Condition 2 by its title 'Existing Floor Plans and Elevations'.
3. The application form describes the extension as a basement extension, whilst the proposed drawing refers to it as a lower ground floor extension. This has also been clarified in the decision above.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed dormer, front rooflights and rear extension upon the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a mid-terrace two-storey residential property plus basement/lower ground floor, and is occupied as three flats. To the rear, the property contains a small rear garden area and original three-storey rear addition. A further single-storey extension is attached to the rear addition and this appears to be in a state of some disrepair.

Rear dormer

6. The proposed rear dormer would be larger than the Council considers appropriate and would not line up with the position and detailed design of the windows below. Nevertheless, it is a single dormer, and is centrally positioned both within the roof and between two windows below. It would be set within the existing roof profile with reasonable spacings left to the eaves, ridge and sides. In overall terms, its scale and design are such that it would not appear disproportionate or discordant. There is also a variety of window designs and materials in this vicinity, and the detailing does not appear inconsistent with the host building or the locality.
7. The dormer would therefore appear as a fairly discreet, subservient element to the host building and not appear incongruous or unsympathetic to its setting.

Rooflights

8. Two 'conservation' style rooflights are proposed in the front elevation. Whilst the position of the lights is not well co-ordinated with the remainder of the front elevation, the lights would be relatively small, and would be set flush within the existing roof plane and not project above. The roof is also on a different plane to the main front elevation which further limits the degree of exposure. The Council refers to an absence of such windows in the immediate vicinity, but they are apparent in other parts of the street.
9. The design and position of the rooflights would be such that they would not appear unsympathetic or incongruous or otherwise be visually harmful to the host building or its setting.

Rear extension

10. The existing flat-roofed, single storey rear extension would be further extended by one metre to a depth of some 5.4 metres, and rendered and painted as part of an upgrade of the host building. Neither of the adjoining properties has a comparable extension.
11. It is noted that the rear garden is already of limited size and is dominated by the existing extension. The main useable area lies to the side of the extension and not to the rear and this side area would be unaffected by the extension. The rear area is of very limited size, is enclosed by a high boundary wall and dense boundary planting, and appears to have limited use.

12. A further extension of one metre would not have any unduly harmful implications for use of the rear garden and would enable internal improvements to the accommodation. Whilst the proposal would make the extension appear larger, the rear of the garden is fairly enclosed and such views would be limited. In these circumstances, it is not considered the further extension would appear incongruous or imposing. Given the existing depth of the extension, a further one metre along the far end of the boundary with the adjacent No 90 would also have no discernible impact upon the outlook from that property.
13. Regard has been given to the general advice set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance SPGBH1: Roof Alterations and Extensions, (the SPG). For the reasons stated, the development does not give rise to significant harm and the general guidance set out in the SPG does not affect those findings on the main issue.
14. It is therefore concluded that the proposed dormer, rooflights and extension would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building or the surrounding area. Accordingly, the proposed development would not be contrary to Policy QD14 (Extensions and alterations) of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan, 2005.

Other Matters

15. Reference has been made to previous planning decisions at 5 and 14 Goldstone Road. Full details of those decisions have not been provided but, in any case, the appeal has been considered on its own merits as identified.
16. Reference has been made by the local planning authority to the Brighton and Hove Proposed Submission City Plan Part One (February 2013) but this is an emerging plan at a relatively early stage of preparation and is afforded limited weight.
17. No objections have been received from adjoining occupiers.
18. The above matters have all been noted but do not affect my findings on the main issue.

Conditions

19. A standard condition is imposed to ensure the development is commenced within 3 years. For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning, a condition is imposed to ensure the development is undertaken in accordance with the relevant drawings. The Council has also suggested a condition be imposed that the external finishes match those of the existing building. This is both necessary and reasonable in order to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the proposed development.

Conclusion

20. For the above reasons, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

Peter Rose

INSPECTOR

