

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2016

**by David Reed BSc DipTP DMS MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 10 March 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/W/15/3136306**

**472 Falmer Road, Brighton BN2 6LH**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Ms C Hey against Brighton & Hove City Council.
  - The application Ref BH2015/02662, is dated 20 July 2015.
  - The development proposed is a first floor extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and permission is granted for the erection of a first floor extension at 472 Falmer Road, Brighton BN2 6LH, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BH2015/02662, dated 20 July 2015, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Cat 10C - Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations.
  - 3) The external finishes of the development hereby permitted shall match in material, colour, style, bonding and texture those of the existing building.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building concerned and the street scene as a whole.

## Reasons

3. No 472 Falmer Road is a two storey detached house set in a large plot on the eastern side of the B2123 opposite open countryside. It faces the road behind a parking area with other detached houses on one side and a linked pair of newly built houses backing onto the site on the other.
4. At present No 472 has a steep double pitched roof with a full gable end facing the road. On one side at first floor level is a further small side facing gable with a half hipped roof; on the other a large single storey extension with a flat roof.
5. The proposal is for a first floor side extension above this existing single storey extension. It would have a sloping roof facing both the front and rear, a central flat roof section at the same height as the existing ridge and a barn

style half hipped gable to the side. The front facing roof slope would have a double rooflight corresponding to a living room window below and the rear facing roof slope would have a flat roofed dormer window corresponding to a set of patio doors below.

6. The existing single storey side extension is a poorly designed addition to the house which unbalances its front elevation. By contrast, the first floor side extension would rebalance the front elevation, complementing but not visually dominating the main front facing gable. Due to the proposed sloping roof the full gable would remain the main feature with the extension being seen as subservient. The half hipped side gable would further reduce the bulk of the extension and would reflect the existing half hipped side gable on the other side of the house. Unlike the other houses nearby, No 472 has already been altered with the single storey extension; the proposal would complete this with a second storey resulting in an overall more coherent design.
7. The design would involve quite a large central flat roof section but this would be unseen from the ground. In addition it would be much smaller than the existing large unattractive flat roof which is very apparent in views of the house. Contrary to the Council's view, the front facing rooflight would be a relatively unassuming feature, not seen as clutter, and would not be excessive in scale, being similar in size to the main first floor window and smaller than the living room window below. The rear facing dormer would be simple in design and would not be particularly large. In any event it would only be seen from within the rear garden of No 472 and not from the road.
8. There is a reasonably wide gap between No 472 and the two new houses which have been built to the south, in fact it is slightly wider than the gap between No 472 and the detached house on the other side. There is a tall hedge along the common boundary. Consequently, there would be nothing unusual about the relationship between No 472 as further extended and the two new houses, and as a result they would not appear cramped together in the street scene.
9. For these reasons the proposal would enhance rather than detract from the character and appearance of the building concerned and the street scene as a whole. It would therefore comply with Policies QD1, QD2 and QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan 2005 which require development to take into account the local characteristics and extensions to be well designed in relation to the property to be extended, adjoining properties and to the surrounding area. It would also comply with the Council's Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations 2013 which seeks to ensure extensions do not dominate or detract from the original building but play a subordinate 'supporting role'.
10. The Council has suggested three conditions should the appeal be allowed and I agree they meet the relevant tests. In addition to the standard implementation time limit it is necessary to define the plans which have been approved in the interests of proper planning. A condition controlling the external finishes to be used is also required to ensure the development has a satisfactory appearance.
11. Having regard to the above the appeal should be allowed.

*David Reed*

INSPECTOR