



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: 8 January 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/12/2185551
27 Roundway, Brighton BN1 9AQ

- 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 T Harrison against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2012/02457 was refused by notice dated 14 September 2012.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, garden shed and porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted for two-storey side and single-storey rear extensions, new shed to rear and new porch to front elevation at 27 Roundway, Brighton BN1 9AQ in accordance with the terms of the application ref. BH2012/02457, dated 30 August 2012, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Main issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a semi-detached house on the south-eastern corner of Roundway, a 1940s development of brick and render houses around a large, featureless expanse of grass. Due to its corner position, the plot is of irregular shape, widening at the rear. There is high hedge along the side boundary, which adjoins a public footpath that runs between this property and its neighbour. The Council does not object to the shed or front porch, which have already been constructed, or to the single-storey rear extension; the issue is with the two-storey side extension.
4. Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan states that extensions should be well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the existing building and the surrounding area.
5. Because the extension would be set back slightly from the front elevation and the ridge height would be some 1.5m below the main ridge, the main roof would remain intact and the new work would appear as a subservient addition to the house; it would also match the existing in style and materials.

6. The Council's main criticism is directed at the splayed form of the development. The increase in width towards the rear reflects the corner position and shape of the garden and, although it would be unusual, I do not think that it would be especially noticeable, particularly given the different alignment of the pairs of semis and the presence of the high boundary hedge.
7. The neighbouring houses on the west side (nos.29 & 31) are on higher ground and step down the hill, with the result that the proposed extension would not be significantly higher than the existing single-storey extension at no.29 on the opposite side of the footpath. The combination of the high screening hedge and the situation of the house on falling ground, with steps down from the road level, means that the extension would not be over-dominant or intrusive and would have only a limited impact in views from the road or public footpath. There are examples of other two-storey extensions to houses in the immediate vicinity that are larger and more visible in the street scene and I see no reason why the present proposal should be any less acceptable.
8. In my view, the proposed extension would not detract from the character or appearance of the existing property or the surrounding area and would not conflict with Policy QD14 or other provisions of the development plan. I therefore allow the appeal.
9. With regard to conditions, I agree that the extensions should be constructed in matching materials in order to ensure a satisfactory appearance and, for the avoidance of doubt I have added a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Protection of the hedge along the boundary is necessary in the interests of the visual amenities of the area, but I have adjusted the wording of the Council's suggested condition to take account of the Arboricultural Report already submitted by the appellant.

J Mansell Jagger

INSPECTOR

Schedule of 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 extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
- 3) Works for the protection of the existing hedge and creation of a new garden entrance shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Report. Protective fencing shall be provided in accordance with British Standard 5837 2012 *Trees in relation to Design, Demolition and Construction* and erected before the development is commenced and retained until the works are completed.
- 4) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Plan; Proposed Block Plan; Existing and Proposed North, South and West Elevations; Existing and Proposed Plans and First Floor Plans; Proposed Shed; Arboricultural Report.