



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 June 2014

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 June 2014

Appeal Ref: **APP/Q1445/D/14/2218021**

10 Lloyd Road, Hove, BN3 6NL

- 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 D Green against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2013/03541 was refused by notice dated 18 March 2014.
 - The development proposed is two storey rear extension and enlargement of existing front dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey rear extension and enlargement of existing front dormer at 10 Lloyd Road, Hove, BN3 6NL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BH2013/03541, 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: 246/01 & 02.
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on, firstly, the character and appearance of the host property and the locality and, secondly, the living conditions of neighbours.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is an attractively elevated two storey detached home. It is within a locality of established residential suburban character comprising mainly detached and semi-detached well proportioned properties which come together to form a pleasing streetscene. The proposal is as described above.
4. The Council is concerned that the planned increase in size for the front dormer would lead to the structure appearing cramped, mis-placed and incongruous on the building and in the streetscene. However, I noted that dormers locally vary in depth, width and positioning. Furthermore the existing dormer has a

somewhat strange asymmetrical location on the roof and in relation to the fenestration below and the scheme would bring some rectification to this. Whilst the dormer would be enlarged it would, to my mind, continue to be very much a subordinate feature on the front elevation as a whole and to the projecting hipped gable element in particular. The dormer would be comfortably located well below the gable roof and very much lower than the main roof's ridge. The elevation qualities and character of the property, helped through the use of matching materials and the planned consistent window form, would remain virtually unvaried and my assessment is that this enlarged dormer would not be jarring on the eye from any vantage point.

5. Saved Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan (LP) calls for, amongst other matters, development to be well designed to protect local distinctiveness and respect the character of local buildings and the streetscene. I conclude that the appeal scheme would not run contrary to these objectives which are similar to those embodied in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document No.12, Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations (SPD) – a guidance document unable in any event to cover every eventuality in detail.

Living conditions

6. The Council is concerned that rear extension would result in loss of light and outlook to the neighbours to the north east. The planned addition would indeed be sited outward relative to the neighbouring main wall but I did note some variation locally in rear building lines and the projection itself at some 2.8 metres in depth would be relatively modest. There would be some set back off the immediate shared boundary and the Appellant's ground level is a little below the neighbouring garden. The proposed roof would pitch away from the neighbouring dwelling and would be fully hipped thus minimising bulk. I consider that given the scale, design, levels and siting there would not be undue 'blinking' of outlook and that the change to levels of light entering the nearest part of the neighbouring garden and windows would be minimal with no effect elsewhere on this large plot and elevation. There would be some reduction in sunlight towards the end of the day at certain times of the year to a limited part of the neighbouring property but this would not be of sufficient degree to justify refusal of the scheme before me.
7. One benefit of the proposal is that privacy would be improved for neighbours as the planned upper window would be more helpfully sited in this regard and the new structure itself would lie between 'patio' areas.
8. The Council's LP Saved Policies QD14 and QD27 seek, amongst other matters, to protect living conditions of neighbours. This is also a key consideration of the SPD. I conclude that this development would not run contrary to this policy objective for the reasons I have given.

Conditions

9. The standard commencement condition should apply and there should be a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans; for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I agree with the Council that there should be a condition relating to the use of matching materials in the interests of visual amenity.

Overall conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have an unacceptable adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host property or the locality or on the living conditions of neighbours. Accordingly the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR