



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 March 2014

by **J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 11 March 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/14/2212435

188 Hangleton Valley Drive, Hove, East Sussex BN3 8FE

- 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 Kamal Patel against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2013/03160 was refused by notice dated 15 November 2013.
 - The development proposed is first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Whilst the proposal is for a first floor side extension, it is clear from the representations that it comprises a part single- storey, part two-storey front and side extension and associated works as outlined on the decision notice. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

3. I consider the main issues to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding streetscene.

Reasons

4. Saved Policy QD14 in the Brighton and Hove Local Plan 2005 requires the design of extensions to take account of the existing space around buildings and the character of the area. I consider that this policy is broadly in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework as far as it meets the Framework's core principles; particularly that planning should be taking account of the different roles and character of an area and should be seeking to ensure high quality design.
5. Guidance in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations (SPD 12) (2013) states that two-storey side extensions should be subservient to their host building and their roof form should reflect that of the host building.
6. The appeal dwelling lies within a primarily residential area comprising 1960s/70s development in a row of similar detached properties. The proposal includes a side extension set back from the frontage behind a single-storey

front projection. The side extension would replace an existing single-storey side extension. The two-storey element would be set down from the main roof ridgeline with a flat summit and this side extension would extend beyond the rear of the existing dwelling.

7. From my observations, the subservience of the proposed side extension with regard to the front set back would be obscured by the front single-storey projection. In addition, the flat summit roof would be an incongruous addition, not in keeping with the roof design of the host dwelling. I consider these details would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host dwelling. This would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the wider streetscene.
8. At my site visit, I was able to view the rear of the property from a neighbouring garden. The proposed rear elevation to the side extension would be visible to some extent from neighbouring gardens. The proposed rear projection of the side extension would fail to appear subservient. In addition, the proposed ground floor window would appear as an incongruous addition, not in keeping with the positioning of fenestration in the existing rear elevation. These would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.
9. For the above reasons and having taken into consideration all matters raised, I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding streetscene. Thus, the proposal would be contrary to saved Policy QD14 and guidance in SPD 12.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR