



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2014

by **P Jarvis Bsc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 28 February 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/14/2211791

9 Glebe Villas, Hove, BN3 5SL

- 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 Donna M and Daniel E Clitheroe against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2013/03494 was refused by notice dated 9 December 2013.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on (a) the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings and (b) the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining property, No. 11 Glebe Villas.

Reasons

3. The dwelling on the appeal site is a two-storey semi-detached traditional property, probably of Victorian age, with two-storey rear outrigger. The attached property, No. 11, is essentially a mirror image of the form and size of the dwelling on the appeal site and lies to the north.

Effect on character and appearance

4. The proposed single-storey addition would extend out from the rear of the existing two-storey rear projection but would be wider than it, albeit having the same width as the main front part of the dwelling. It would have a high, simple mono-pitch roof extending above the cill level of first floor windows.
5. The mono-pitch shaped roof would result in the inner facing wall, where it extends beyond the side wall of the rear outrigger, appearing as a rather incongruous addition with high facing wall unrelated to the design and appearance of the existing dwelling. In my view, the proposed addition would not relate well to the host property in design terms and would appear overly large and out of scale with the existing proportions of the dwelling.
6. Overall I consider that by reason of its awkward design and relative scale, the proposal would fail to complement and harmonise with the host dwelling. Thus it would conflict with policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan which

seeks extensions that are well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended.

7. It would also fail to satisfy the guidance contained in the Council's Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2013) (SPD) which seeks to ensure that extensions are subordinate and respectful of the design of the host dwelling. It specifically recommends that single storey extensions should not normally be wider than that of the main house, including rear projections, and that where a pitched roof is proposed the ridge height must be visibly lower than the cill height of first floor windows. The proposed extension would not satisfy either of these criteria and in my view would result in an extension which would not appear subordinate or complementary to the host property.

Effect on living conditions of occupiers of No. 11 Glebe Villas

8. The dwelling on the appeal site lies directly to the south of No. 11 and the proposed extension would be right on the common boundary. Whilst such a relationship is not uncommon, it seems to me that by reason of the overall height of the proposal, particularly where it would be adjacent to the rear wall of the dwelling, it would be unacceptably overbearing and result in overshadowing. A significant amount of the proposal would be visible above the existing boundary feature resulting in the introduction of a bulky and intrusive form of development.
9. There are French windows in the rear elevation of No. 11 with a patio area immediately outside with pergola over. Due to the orientation of the dwellings, these areas only receive sun light in the first part of the day with the dwelling at No. 9 blocking out afternoon sunlight. The proposed extension would therefore have a significant impact on what is already a limited amount of sunlight to these areas.
10. I consider that this would result in a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 11 Glebe Villas and would be contrary to LP policy QD27 which seeks to prevent development that causes loss of amenity to occupiers of adjoining properties.

Other Matters

11. I have noted the other nearby sites referred to by the appellant and the details provided of the various extensions that have been permitted. I was only able to obtain limited views from the road of these sites but having regard to the information that was available, it seems to me that none are directly comparable to the appeal site before me being of different designs and relationships with neighbouring properties. I have also noted that the proposed extension would not be readily visible in the public realm and that it would enhance the internal space of the existing dwelling. However, none of these factors outweighs the harm that I have identified.
12. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR