



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2014

by **E A Lawrence BTP MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 18 March 2014

Appeal Ref: **APP/Q1445/D/14/2213305**

17 Meadow Close, Hove, BN3 6QQ

- 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 R Noel against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref: BH2013/03488 was refused by notice dated 16 December 2013.
 - The development proposed is described as proposed two storey pitched roof side extension to form a garage at ground floor level with bedroom and en-suite over.
-

Preliminary matter.

1. On 6 March 2014 the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) was published by the Department for Communities & Local Government. In relation to this Appeal the PPG refers to the design statements set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which are addressed in this decision.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for proposed two storey pitched roof side extension to form a garage at ground floor level with bedroom and en-suite over at 17 Meadow Close, Hove, BN3 6QQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: BH2013/03488, dated 9 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) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1222008/01 Rev.B, 1222008/04 Rev.A & 1222008/02 Rev.B.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the side extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main issues

3. The first main issue is the effect of the scheme on the character of the street scene. The second main issue is the effect of the scheme on the living conditions of the occupiers of Les Reveurs, with particular regard to visual impact, daylight and sunlight.

Reasons

Character of the street scene

4. Meadow Close is characterised by individually designed dwellings, with varied building lines and occupying generous sized plots. The steeply sloping topography provides views over and between dwellings and together with the soft planting within the front gardens and the central grass islands within the highway, it contributes to the spacious and suburban character and appearance of the street scene.
5. Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan requires extensions to be well designed sited and detailed both in relation to the host and adjoining properties. Extensions should take into account space around buildings and retain appropriate gaps between dwellings to prevent a terracing effect.
6. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document 12: Design guide for extensions and alterations is consistent with policy QD14 of the Local Plan. It advises that side extensions can cause harm by excessively filling the rhythm of spaces between dwellings to create a terracing effect and that greater care has to be taken with side extensions to ensure they assimilate well with the host building and the street scene. Gaps between buildings are usually an important component of the street scene. With this in mind the SPD advises that two storey extensions should be subservient to the host dwelling and a minimum gap of one metre left between the site boundary and the extension.
7. The proposed extension has been designed to respect the proportions and design detailing of the host dwelling. Although the two storey element would share the same front building line as the main house, it would be set behind the projecting single storey porch and front section of the garage. Overall the extension would relate well and would be subservient to the host dwelling.
8. Previously the former garage at No.17 was physically attached to the side wall to Les Reveurs and the front wall of the garage was physically attached to the main dwelling at No.17. As such the two properties were physically attached at ground floor level. With the proposal the two properties would be fully detached and would be separated by a one metre open gap. At the same time the roofs of the two properties would be hipped away from the party boundary and the dwelling at Les Reveurs is both single storey and has a very shallow pitched roof.
9. Both No.17 and Les Reveurs are positioned at a lower level to the highway and there is a tall boundary hedge around the front garden of Les Reveurs. As a result Les Reveurs is largely screened in most views within the street scene. Instead, above ground floor level there is a large open gap between the Appeal property and the two storey dwelling at No.16 Meadow Close.
10. As a result of these factors the proposed relationship between Les Reveurs and the Appeal dwelling would not appear awkward or cramped. The extension would be readily assimilated into the street scene and would respect the diverse, spacious and undulating character and appearance of the street scene.
11. It is noted that permission was granted for a similar two storey extension in 2008, although the first floor element was set in further from the boundary with Les Reveurs. With the current proposal the first floor element would be closer to the dwelling at Les Reveurs, although the ground floor element would

be further away. For the reasons outlined above the new scheme would blend in appropriately with the street scene and would comply with policy QD14 of the Local Plan and the SPD, which have been adopted since the 2008 decision.

12. The Council has suggested the imposition of a materials condition which is necessary to ensure the proposed extension blends in appropriately with the host property. It is also necessary to impose a condition which requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings. This is for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
13. I conclude on this main issue that the scheme would not harm the character of the street scene. It would therefore comply with policy QD14 of the Local Plan and the SPD. It would similarly comply with the NPPF which states that new development should respond to local character and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation.

Living conditions

14. The two storey element of the proposed side extension would not project beyond the front elevation of the dwelling at Les Reveurs, or more than half way along the depth of the dwelling at Les Reveurs. In addition, there are no windows in the northwest elevation of Les Reveurs. As a consequence the proposed extension would not dominate the outlook from that dwelling or its rear garden.
15. The extension would be clearly visible from the front garden of Les Reveurs, although the physical relationship between the two dwellings would be unexceptional. Also, the proposed two storey extension would be less than eight metres in depth and its roof would be both lower than that of the main house and hipped away from the boundary with Les Reveurs. As a result the extension would not be visually dominant or oppressive when seen from the front garden at Les Reveurs.
16. There are two new roof-lights on the northwest roof-slope of Les Reveurs which serve bathrooms. These roof-lights are elevated slightly above the roofline and are angled, one to the front and one to the rear of the property. In view of the fact that the proposed two storey extension would be located to the northwest of Les Reveurs, it would not have a material impact on the level of sunlight and daylight within the bathrooms concerned.
17. For these reasons I conclude on this main issue that the proposed extension would not have a materially harmful impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of Les Reveurs due to visual impact or loss of daylight or sunlight. The scheme would therefore comply with policy QD27 of the Local Plan, which seeks to ensure that new development does not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

18. Having regard to the conclusions on both main issues the Appeal is allowed.

E Lawrence

INSPECTOR