



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2009

by **JP Roberts BSc(Hons) LLB(Hons) MRTPI**

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

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
21 October 2009

Appeal Ref: **APP/Q1445/D/09/2112030** **10 Radinden Manor Road, Hove BN3 6NH**

- 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 and Mrs Kendrick against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
- The application Ref BH2009/01516, dated 23 June 2009, was refused by notice dated 13 August 2009.
- The development proposed is described as "a two storey extension to the side of an existing property to provide additional accommodation for a growing family – 2 adults and 4 children. The proposal consists of extending their living room and rebuilding the existing garage on the ground floor and adding two additional bedrooms, one with en-suite to the first floor".

Procedural matter

1. The Council's decision notice describes the proposal as the "*Erection of a two storey front and side extension*". I consider that this description more concisely and appropriately describes the proposal and I shall adopt it.

Decision

2. I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission for the erection of a two storey front and side extension at 10 Radinden Manor Road, Hove BN3 6NH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BH2009/01516, dated 23 June 2009, and the plans submitted with it, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match in colour, style, bonding and texture those used in the existing building.

Main issue

3. The effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding residential area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached L-shaped two storey dwelling set back from the road. The part of the house nearest the road has two gabled roofs, only slightly lower than the main part of the roof. The only element of the proposal to which the Council objects is the provision of a third gabled element at the front, and I shall confine my consideration to this aspect of the proposal.

5. There is a variety of designs and sizes to the houses in Radinden Manor Road, and those on either side of the appeal site are dissimilar to the appeal property. There are pitched roof gabled elements to properties in the area, including the school opposite, the house next door at no 8, and most notably, in the new dwelling at 2a Radinden Manor Road, which has a plethora of gables.
6. Double pitch roofs are a means of replicating the pitch of the main roof of a house when spanning a wide elevation, as in this case. The appellants drew my attention to a triple gable on a property in elsewhere in Hove, but as they acknowledge, it is at the rear, which in my view is of less importance than the front elevation. In my experience triple gables of this sort are usually only seen on the front elevations of much larger houses, along with other elements. However, given the variety of design in the area, I consider that replication of traditional design features is not essential.
7. Even so, the three gabled elements would be identical, and in my assessment, this would appear repetitive, lacking any focus, and would alter the balance between the main part of the dwelling and the forward projection, allowing the forward part to become the more dominant.
8. It would be in full view of passers-by and I agree with the Council that it would not be in sympathy with the design of the dwelling, and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding residential area. It would also conflict with policies in the saved Brighton and Hove Local Plan 1995 which promote good design, and in particular Policies QD1 and QD14 which deal with design quality and extensions. I have had regard to the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG note 1 *Roof Alterations & Extensions*, but other than promoting good design, I found little that is relevant to this specific proposal which adds to the policies to which I have referred.
9. I have had regard to the recent planning permission (Ref: BH2009/00419) for a similar sized extension which incorporates a single pitched roof with a flat roofed section over the forward element of the dwelling in place of the three gables proposed here. I consider that this would have some of the shortcomings that I have identified in respect of the appeal proposal. Moreover, the approved roof, despite the pitched recessive roofplane, would be unbroken and more dominant than that now proposed, albeit of a more traditional form.
10. Taking this into account, I consider that although the issue is finely balanced, the proposal would not be materially worse than that already approved. Added to this is the benefit that the appeal proposal would have in being able to utilise the existing roof, thereby avoiding wasteful demolition and re-building. I therefore conclude that these considerations outweigh the harm that I have found.
11. The Council has suggested a condition to require matching materials and finishes to be used in the extension which I consider is necessary in the interests of appearance.
12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

JP Roberts

INSPECTOR
