



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2013

by Thomas Shields DipURP MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 25 October 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/13/2205058

39 Greenfield Crescent, Brighton

- 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 Carl Fidler against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2013/02072, dated 14 June 2013, was refused by notice dated 13 August 2013.
 - The development proposed is a two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey rear extension at 39 Greenfield Crescent, Brighton in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BH2013/02072, dated 14 June 2013, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 575/01, 575/02.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the area.

Reasons

3. 39 Greenfield Crescent is a semi-detached two bedroom bungalow with an existing conservatory. To the rear of properties on this side of the road the land falls away allowing distant views of the outskirts of Brighton and the countryside beyond. There is a significant drop immediately to the rear of the property where a store room has been constructed below the conservatory.
4. The proposed development is a two storey extension to replace the rear lower ground store room and ground level conservatory above.
5. During my visit to the site and the area I was able to obtain some views of the rear of other properties nearby, many of which have been extended over time in a variety of differing designs and roof forms. These include the two dwellings either side of the appeal property at 37 and 41 Greenfield Crescent.

6. There is a two storey rear extension to the rear of the adjoining semi-detached property (No 37) and the proposal would project only a little further back than its rear elevation. No 41 sits on higher ground than No 39 and has also been extended to the rear. These, and other extensions in the area, may have been built at times when the current Development Plan policies and Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) did not apply, and I agree with the Council that they do not set precedents. However, they do nevertheless form part of the existing character and appearance of the area.
7. On the north-eastern side the extension would project outwards in line with the side elevation of the existing dwelling, and the slope of the proposed hipped element would follow the slope of the existing roof. Although the levelled roof top is unusual it would reduce the overall height and mass of the extension and would be compatible with the flat roof of the adjacent two storey extension at No 37. Furthermore, it would not be readily visible in the street scene.
8. Additionally, although the extension has two storeys, the first floor would be at ground level with the bungalow, and would have a lower height than both the rear addition at No 37, and the property at No 41 which sits on higher ground.
9. Having regard to all of these factors, I consider the proposal would not be visually intrusive or bulky and would not be out of keeping with the host property or the properties on either side. Furthermore, given that views of the extension would be very limited indeed, I consider it would not harm the overall character and appearance of the area.
10. Consequently, I find the proposal would accord with the aims and objectives of saved Policies QD2 and QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan (2005) which together seek to ensure that extensions are well designed in relation to the host property, adjoining properties, and the surrounding area, and make use of appropriate materials.
11. I have had regard to the Council's SPD 12 Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations (2013) which states that as a general rule extensions should not dominate or detract from the original building or the character of an area, and should respect the design, scale and proportions of the host building. For the reasons given above the guidance does not affect my findings on the main issue.

Conclusion

12. For all the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

13. In addition to the statutory three year time limit condition I consider it is necessary, in the interests of proper planning and the character and appearance of the area, to impose a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
14. I have not imposed the suggested condition requiring external materials to match those of the existing building, as this would be superfluous given that matching and other materials are already specified on the submitted plans.

Thomas Shields INSPECTOR