



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2008

by **J M Trask BSc (Hons) CEng MICE**

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

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
23 December 2008

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/A/08/2082257

251 Hangleton Road, Hove BN3 7LR

- 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 Brian Boon against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
- The application Ref BH2008/01197, dated 31 March 2008, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2008.
- The development proposed is a room in the roof with rear dormer and side half gable.

Decision

1. I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission for a room in the roof with rear dormer and side part gable at 251 Hangleton Road, Hove BN3 7LR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BH2008/01197, dated 31 March 2008, and the plans submitted with it, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. While the proposal is described as including a side half gable, the gable element would not extend to half height and I therefore consider part gable would be a better description.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the pair of semi-detached houses and the street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is one of a pair of semi-detached houses that currently both have hipped roofs. The proposed roof extension would extend the ridge and raise the side eaves of the house but the hipped element would remain dominant retaining the basic shape of the roof. While the symmetry of the pair of houses would be altered to some extent there are other houses nearby that have substantial roof extensions and this, together with the variety of dwellings

- in the area, has created an irregular character and appearance in the locality that in my view could accommodate the proposal without serious harm.
5. The appellant has referred to other roof extensions in the area including that at 9 Victoria Avenue which was allowed on appeal. The Council has advised that those extensions nearby may have been carried out under permitted development rights, and while I have taken the appeal decision into account, the surroundings of that site differ from this one. In any event the appeal decision is consistent with my conclusion in this case which I have assessed on its own merits.
 6. The Council has suggested a condition requiring the external finishes of the proposed development to match those of the existing house and in the interests of the appearance of the area I shall impose such a condition. However, I do not consider a waste minimisation statement is necessary given the limited size of the scheme.
 7. I therefore consider that, subject to condition, the proposal would not conflict with the objectives of the development plan, particularly Policies QD1 and QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan and would not significantly conflict with supplementary planning guidance. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J M Trask

INSPECTOR