
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2014

by L Gibbons BA (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18 February 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/14/2211678
126 Stapley Road, Hove, East Sussex BN3 7FG

- 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 Sherwood & Miss Goodman against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2013/03356, dated 1 October 2013, was refused by notice dated 26 November 2013.
 - The development proposed is to erect a PVCu conservatory and brick extension to replace the existing extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the host property.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached house, which has a simple design. At the rear there is a single storey side extension and a single storey conservatory both of which appear to have been in place for some time.
4. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations (SPD) 2012 at Section 2 refers to the original design of the building in informing the design of extensions and alterations. The appellants submit that the proposed extensions would be in keeping with the host property and that it would add architectural detailing to the host property. However, although the conservatory roof is designed to be a similar shape to that of the main roof, the detailed design of the conservatory would be at odds with the simple appearance of the host property.
5. Some of the detailing on the roof ridge of the proposed conservatory would protrude slightly above the lower part of the window and this would appear out of place. Moreover, the windows and doors on the proposed conservatory would differ from the design of the windows of the host property resulting in an unbalanced appearance. Therefore, the proposed conservatory would appear as an incongruous feature against the simple rear elevation of the host property.

6. I consider that the remaining depth of the garden will be sufficient for the amenity of the occupiers of No 126 Stapley Road, nevertheless the increase in mass and bulk of the proposed extensions, when coupled with their contrasting designs, would lead to a significantly more cramped appearance to the host property when viewed from within the garden.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that the appeal proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property. It would conflict with policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan (2005) which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure that extensions and alterations are well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended. It would be contrary to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework relating to the need for high quality design.
8. I understand the concerns of the appellants that the existing extensions are outdated and that they are seeking to improve living conditions by upgrading and expanding their current accommodation. I also note that the appeal property is located in an accessible location and that water and energy saving measures would be incorporated into the design. However, none of these are sufficient reasons to justify the proposal before me.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters including the lack of objection from neighbours, the appeal is dismissed.

L Gibbons

INSPECTOR