



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 February 2014

by **C J Leigh BSC(HONS) MPHIL MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 7 March 2014

Appeal Ref: **APP/Q1445/D/14/2212001**

14 Tower Road, Brighton, BN2 0GF

- 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 Ms N Lewis against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2013/03587, dated 21 October 2013, was refused by notice dated 19 December 2013.
 - The development proposed is conversion of garage, proposed works to ground floor single storey extension, replacement of hung tile with brickwork, creation of single storey extension to rear.
-

Procedural matters

1. The content of the National Planning Practice Guidance has been considered but in light of the facts in this case the Guidance does not alter my conclusions.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted for the conversion of garage, proposed works to ground floor single storey extension, replacement of hung tile with brickwork, creation of single storey extension to rear at 14 Tower Road, Brighton, BN2 0GF in accordance with the terms of the application, ref BH2013/03587, dated 21 October 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) No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions and alterations hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 0152/PA/101, 0152/PA/201, 0145/SK/102, 0145/SK/103, 0145/SK/202 & 0145/SK/203.

Main issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property lies within a terrace of housing which appears to date from the 1970s. There is some consistency in the appearance of this terrace, but I noted at my site visit that a number of properties have had alterations to their front elevations. Most notably, Nos. 22 and 24 have seen the reconfiguration of the front facade and the incorporation of new materials to their elevations. A new dwelling has also been erected at the end of the terrace, and the wider area contains a variety of building forms and architecture. These changes have not diminished the quality of the area or harmed the appearance of the terrace or the wider Queens Park Conservation Area.
5. The proposed development would see, at the front of the property, the conversion of the garage, a new lobby created and the use of new materials to the façade. This would be a similar approach to that seen at the houses referred to above. The alterations would be sensitive and low-key modifications to the building that would not appear out of character with the area.
6. The proposals also show a new cycle/bin store at the front of the property, within the garden area. I saw at the site visit that the new house adjoining No. 24 incorporates a store, whilst No. 24 itself has a large wall and seating area in the front gardens. Other gardens are more open and a number contain extensive parking areas. Thus, there is a variety in appearance. The proposed store to No. 14 is modest and well-designed, being not excessive in height and using materials that would reflect the re-modelled house. It would not be prominent in the street. Furthermore, it would allow for the safe storage of cycles and bins, which would be a positive feature of the scheme rather than having such items stored in the open.
7. The proposed development would therefore be consistent with the character of the surrounding area and the host property, and so would comply with the objectives of Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005. The character and appearance of the Queens Park Conservation Area would be preserved, and so there would be no conflict with Policy HE6 of the Local Plan. With the provision of sensitive alterations and additions to the property, the general thrust of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 12: Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations (2013) would also be satisfied.

Other considerations

8. The proposed development would see a rear extension to the property. This would be in line with the existing rear projection of the adjoining house at No. 16. The rearward extent of this addition would not be imposing upon the neighbours at Nos. 16 or 12. The location and design of the extension would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the Conservation Area.

Conclusions and conditions

9. For the reasons given, and having regard to all other matters raised, it is concluded that the proposed development accords with the objectives of the development plan and planning permission is granted. The Council have

suggested only the time limit condition in the event of the appeal being allowed. I note that the appellant's Design & Access Statement suggested a condition to secure the exact specification of the materials to be used for the proposed works. As the scheme would see new materials to the building, I agree such a condition is necessary to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development.

10. Finally, a condition is also necessary specifying the approved drawings is necessary in order that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning

C J Leigh

INSPECTOR