



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2014

by **P Jarvis Bsc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 28 February 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/13/2210475

4 Ryde Road, Brighton, BN2 3EG

- 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 Terry Blount against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2013/02911 was refused by notice dated 31 October 2013.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single-storey rear extension at 4 Ryde Road, Brighton BN2 3EG in accordance with the terms of application ref: BH2013/02911 dated 20 August 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: 1:1250 Site Location Plan, 1:500 Block Plan, Existing Elevations, Existing Rear Elevation, Existing Side Elevation, Existing Ground Floor Plan, Existing First Floor Plan, Proposed Rear Elevation, Proposed Rear Side Elevation, Proposed Ground Floor Plan, Proposed Foundation Plan, Section AA and BB, Proposed Beam Layout and Proposed Roof Fall Plan, all received by the Local Planning Authority on the 21 August 2013.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external faces of the development shall match those on the existing dwelling.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area.

Reasons

3. The dwelling is a modest terraced property which has been extended to the rear with two and single storey flat-roofed extensions across part of its width. The proposal would infill the existing open area to the side, extending to the same depth as the existing single-storey element, with which it would be integrated with a new opening across the whole rear elevation.

4. The Council's Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations (2013) (SPD) provides detailed guidance to achieve subordinate extensions that are respectful of the design, scale and proportions of the host building. It sets out examples of how such 'infill' additions might be achieved and indicates that the acceptability of such extensions is generally dependant on the design, relative land levels and whether the adjoining property has such an extension.
5. Whilst the proposed extension would result in a single-storey element at ground floor which would 'wrap around' the existing two-storey rear addition, it is my view that it would not be so large as to dominate or detract from the form and appearance of the original dwelling. It would be 'contained' by the existing boundary wall to the adjoining property (No. 2 Ryde Road) and would leave a reasonable sized garden area to serve the existing modest property.
6. Whilst of flat roofed design, in contrast with the pitched roof of the original dwelling, it would be clearly read as a later modern addition and the form and appearance of the original dwelling would be identifiable. The use of a flat roof would also match the form of existing additions and would ensure that the impact on the host property and wider area is minimised. It would be finished in materials to match the host dwelling. Overall I consider that it would provide a contrasting but nevertheless respectful addition to the existing property.
7. I therefore find that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area. It would comply with Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan (2005) which seeks to ensure that extensions are well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended and use materials sympathetic to the parent building. I also find that it would satisfy the more detailed guidance in the SPD.
8. I also find no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks good design which contributes positively to making places better for people.
9. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR