



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 March 2013

by Elizabeth Fieldhouse DIPTP DIPUD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18 March 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/13/2191191
7 Brangwyn Drive, Brighton, BN1 8XB

- 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 P Gower against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2012/02519 was refused by notice dated 25 October 2012.
 - The development proposed is a two storey front extension to form additional accommodation and demolition of existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the appearance of existing property and the overall street scene.

Reasons

3. The proposal would replace the existing garage which projects forward of the dwelling by a two storey gable extension of a similar depth that would project about 7m forward of the main front wall of the existing property. The proposed forward extension would link onto the dwelling that would also be extended forward by about 1.5m. There would be a new obscure glazed dormer window in the forward projection of the main roof but no harm is found in this element. The proposal would respect the original ridge height.
4. Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005 (LP) policies QD2 and QD14 require, among other points, that the development takes account of, and relates well to the local character and context in terms of the parent property and the surrounding area. The appeal property is on a bend in the road near the entrance to The Close and set forward of no.9 and at an angle to no.5. The appeal property is viewed over an open green when approaching along Brangwyn Drive and, as a result, is prominent in the street scene. There are a range of designs and styles in the area with many properties having gable front elevations that use stained timber around generally rectangular rendered panels.
5. The form and detailing of the pair of gables would be uncharacteristic of the area as a result of the subdivision of the white rendered panels and the use of a feature brick insert. These would draw attention to the extension that would already prominent extension due to its forward siting. In addition, the proposed ground floor windows in the two storey forward extension do not relate well to the first floor window causing a discordant front gable elevation.

6. The National Planning Policy Framework came into force on 27 March 2012. As indicated in paragraph 214 until 26 March 2016 the relevant policies adopted since 2004 may continue to be given full weight. The identified policies from the Local Plan are largely consistent with the Framework and therefore carry weight. By reason of its form, projection to the front, design particularly the detailing, the proposal would result in a property that would appear over dominant and detrimental not only to the original property but to the street scene. Therefore LP policies QD2 and QD14 would not be met.
7. An in/out drive as proposed would mean that vehicles could exit in forward gear. Nevertheless, single drives are prevalent in the vicinity and the appeal property exits at the entrance to a short cul-de-sac with limited properties and therefore a corresponding limited number of vehicular movements. The in/out drive does not provide justification for the harm identified.
8. The proposal would provide additional accommodation to meet the needs of the occupiers and a larger house. The value of the property and possible increase in Council tax as a result do not go to the planning merits of the proposal. For the reasons given and having regard to all other matters raised, including the other properties in the area to which I was referred, the appeal should fail.

Elizabeth Fieldhouse

INSPECTOR