



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 August 2013

**by D Lamont BSc(Hons) MBA MRTPI MCI**

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

**Decision date: 15 August 2013**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/13/2199250**  
**68 Crescent Drive South, Brighton, BN2 6RB**

- 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 Miss L Clifton-Sprigg against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
  - The application Ref BH2013/00867 was refused by notice dated 7 May 2013.
  - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and a roof conversion.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension and a roof conversion at 68 Crescent Drive South, Brighton, BN2 6RB, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BH2013/00867, dated 14 March 2013, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers: 1312012/01 (Location Plan, Block Plan, Existing Plan, Elevations and Sections); 1312012/02 (Proposed Plans and Elevations) and 1312012/03 (Proposed Street Scene and Sections).
  - 2) The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until the details of the external finishing materials have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and completed accordingly.
  - 3) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), no alteration to the roof or installation of rooflights [other than those expressly authorised by this permission] shall be constructed.

### Procedural Matters

2. There is evidence of commencement of the development on site in the form of foundation walls; and I deal with the appeal on that basis.

### Main Issue

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

## Reasons

4. The character of the area is a suburban residential neighbourhood of mid to late 20<sup>th</sup> century housing, varying from single to two-storey accommodation. The subject property and many to its west on the south side of the road, have a bungalow appearance to the street. However, those to its east (i.e. even numbers from no. 74) and on the opposite side of the road, have two storeys of accommodation. A drive between the site and no. 74, serves nos. 70 and 72, which occupy lower land much further to the rear, and comprise a detached chalet and bungalow, respectively. There is a large extension to the rear of no. 66; and nos. 74 and 76 both have significant rear projections with two storeys of accommodation, large first floor south-facing windows and a number of rooflights facing the site. Three of no.74's rooflights are visible from the street.
5. For these reasons, the character and appearance of dwellings in the vicinity varies significantly, and the subject property is the last bungalow before the buildings rise to two storeys of accommodation to the east. Although the bulk, depth, height, massing and fenestration detail of the proposal are somewhat greater than the extension to the rear of the adjacent property to the west, these features are comparable with its neighbouring properties to the east and height of those opposite. Consequently, the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property or surrounding area. Additionally, the retention of the unusually wide gap of the adjacent driveway would assist separation from the property to the east.
6. For these reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposal would be consistent with Brighton and Hove Local Plan 2005 Policy QD14, requiring extensions to relate to the host property and surrounding area and retain appropriate gaps between houses; and allow the appeal.
7. As the development has started, it is not necessary to impose the standard time condition. For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning and appearance, additional conditions are attached to require that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and finishing materials submitted for prior approval. In the interests of protecting neighbours' living conditions, a condition is also included to remove permitted development rights for roof alterations, including rooflights.

*D Lamont*

INSPECTOR