Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2014

by Les Greenwood MRTPI

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

Decision date: 12 February 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/14/2211323 72 Shirley Drive, Hove, East Sussex BN3 6UF

- 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 Thomas Peel against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
- The application Ref BH2013/02190 was refused by notice dated 18 October 2013.
- The development proposed is a 2 storey extension to the north-east side of an existing 2 storey house.

Decision

- 1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 2 storey extension to the north-east side of an existing 2 storey house in accordance with the terms of the application Ref BH2013/02190, dated 1 July 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: SDE/1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8.
 - 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 is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the house and of this part of Shirley Drive.

Reasons

3. Shirley Drive is a residential street lined mainly by detached houses, often with complex roof forms including gables, hips, cat-slides and dormer windows. Although the houses are architecturally varied, they combine to form an interesting and attractive street scene. The L-shaped house at No 72 complements this character, with its highly articulated and well detailed design. The proposal would fill in part of the 'L' at the front/side with a 2 storey

- extension that would fit flush with the main forward gable, but behind a section of cat-slide roof with a dormer window.
- 4. In line with the National Planning Policy Framework's emphasis on high quality design, Brighton and Hove Local Plan 2005 Policy QD14 allows for extensions to houses providing that, amongst other things, they are well designed, sited and detailed. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document 12 (SPD12) *Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations* further advises that in order to assimilate well with the building and street scene, 2 storey side extensions should be subservient to their host building: they should generally be set back from the frontage and down from the main ridge line by at least 0.5m. SPD12 explains that extensions that would sit flush with the front elevation will only rarely be considered appropriate, in instances where the extension would integrate well with the design of the host building.
- 5. The proposed extension would be set more than 0.5m down from the main roof line and would match the general form and detailing of the existing house. Although it would sit flush with the main wall of the forward projecting gable, it would still sit well back from the visually important cat-slide element of that gable. The Council argues that the resulting front elevation would be cluttered, but the articulation and intricacy of the design is characteristic of the area. I note that the plans include a small section of flat roof, but this would be concealed behind appropriately designed and proportioned pitched roofs.
- 6. I conclude that, subject to a condition requiring the use of matching materials, the proposal would integrate well with the existing house and would not harm the character or the appearance of either the house or this part of Shirley Drive. It therefore accords with the aims of the above-mentioned policies. I also impose a condition listing the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning.
- 7. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Les Greenwood
INSPECTOR