



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 January 2013

by J Mansell Jagger MA(CANTAB) DIPTP MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 9 January 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/12/2186370
10 Park View Road, Hove, BN3 7BF

- 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 C McNicholl against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2012/01942 was refused by notice dated 24 August 2012.
 - The development proposed is extensions and alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a substantial semi-detached house set above road level, overlooking Hove Park. There are two main elements to the proposal: a part two-storey, part single-storey rear extension and, at the front, extending the ground floor bay window up to first floor. The Council does not object to the bay window but considers the rear extension to be over large and poorly related to the existing property.
4. Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan requires extensions to be well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended, adjoining properties and the surrounding area.
5. The rear elevation is quite plain but is relieved by a gabled feature that is mirrored in the adjoining semi. The proposed extension would span the full width of the ground floor and over two-thirds of the width at first floor level. The proposed gabled roof would be appropriate, but the width of the extension means that the roof would significantly overlap the existing gable, creating an awkward relationship between the original and new elevations. The proportions of the first floor to the ground floor, and the lack of any clear distinction between the two, would also produce an unbalanced design. In my view, despite the gabled roof form, this would result in an unduly dominant and unsympathetic addition.

6. The adjoining house has a two-storey flat roofed extension and a large conservatory at the rear, but retains the gabled feature. The principle of an extension is not in doubt, but to produce a successful design would require the scale and proportions to be more in keeping with the existing house.
7. Because of the sizeable gardens at the rear and the height of boundary fences, trees and shrubs, the extension would not be readily visible from public view or from nearby properties; however it would significantly harm the character and appearance of the existing property and conflict with Local Plan Policy QD14.
8. For these reasons, I dismiss the appeal.

J Mansell Jagger

INSPECTOR