



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 December 2011

by Gareth Symons BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22 December 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/11/2164405
8 Hove Park Way, Hove, BN3 6PS

- 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 & Mrs A Brookes against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref: BH2011/01970, dated 16 June 2011, was refused by notice dated 7 September 2011.
 - The development proposed is a side extension above a garage to form a bedroom at first floor and additional roof space accommodation at the second floor.
-

Decision

1. I allow the appeal and grant planning permission for a side extension above a garage to form a bedroom at first floor and additional roof space accommodation at the second floor at 8 Hove Park Way, Hove, BN3 6PS, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: BH2011/01970, dated 16 June 2011, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin 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 drawings: 1:1250 Site Location Plan; 1:500 Site Block Plan; 1135/02/Rev A Existing and Proposed Plans, Elevations and Sections.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The new roof of the proposed first floor extension above the existing garage would be set back from the main front roof slope and stepped down below the height of the existing ridgeline. In these circumstances, although the new roof would be relatively large, it would not over dominate the appearance of the original house when viewed from the road or have an unacceptable massing effect. The side of the new roof would be hipped back away from the next door house no. 10, such that between the roofs of the two houses there would be a

wide open space. It is noted that the appeal house and no. 10 are quite close together. However, there are several other houses in the road which have side elevations close to each other. The relationship between nos. 8 and 10 would not therefore look out of place. Against this background the proposed extension would not create a cramped and overbearing appearance.

4. Having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal proposal would not be visually detrimental to the street scene. The scheme would comply with the design aims of policy QD14 from the Brighton and Hove Local Plan. The Council has supplied a copy of its Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 1 Roof Alterations & Extensions (SPG). Although the Council did not identify any specific conflict with the SPG, in view of my findings I consider that this particular scheme is also not contrary to the design aims of the SPG.
5. Condition 2 is needed in the interests of proper planning and for the avoidance of doubt. Condition 3 is necessary in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Gareth Symons

INSPECTOR