



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 November 2014

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

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

Decision date: 28 November 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/14/2227231

46 Elizabeth Avenue, Hove, Sussex, BN3 6WG.

- 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 Shaun Manley against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2014/01924, dated 10 June 2014, was refused by notice dated 13 August 2014.
 - The development proposed is for a single storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side and rear extension at 46 Elizabeth Avenue, Hove, Sussex, BN3 6WG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BH2014/01924, dated 10 June 2014, and the plans submitted with it, 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: drawings numbered EAV1/01, EAV2/01, EAV3/01, EAV4/01, EAV5/01 and EAV6/01.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed extension on the architectural integrity of the host building and the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The property the subject of this appeal, number 46 Elizabeth Avenue, is a two-storey semi-detached house with a detached garage and driveway to one side. The suburban area in which it is located is characterised by a variety of dwelling types, forms and designs.
 4. The appellant proposes the removal of the garage together with a small side porch and the construction of a single storey rear and side extension. The proposed side extension, that would not extend to the common boundary and would be set well
-

back from the front of the house, would have a pitched tile fascia projected forward and supported on brackets. The side addition, as designed, would reflect the style and character of the host building and therefore when viewed from the street it would appear as a well-mannered subservient addition.

5. The proposed rear addition would be more contemporary in appearance by reason of the proposed flat roof, wide expanse of fully glazed patio doors and roof mounted lantern lights. It would extend across the full width of the house to meet the flank wall of the side addition. However, due to the simple strong modern architectural style adopted by the designer for this addition it would not, in my judgement, cause harm to the architectural integrity of the host building.
6. As I saw elsewhere in the street, where a flat roof and pitched tiled fascia are used in combination the transition of one to another may be visually uncomfortable if not handled sensitively. In this case the change from one roof form to another would coincide with the rear wall of the existing house and also be at a point far enough back from the street to not appear awkward or particularly prominent.
7. The Council has drawn my attention to its Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document spd 12: *Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations* adopted June 2013 (SPD 12) having particular regard to wrap around extensions. I understand from the SPD 12 that this advice is given in respect of the design of infill extensions to terraced and semi-detached houses with a traditional 'L' shaped plan form. Under the section 'Design Principles' it states that: *infill extensions should not normally extend beyond the rear wall of the outrigger or wrap around to the rear elevation in order to preserve the original plan of the building and avoid excessive amenity harm to adjacent residents.* As, in my view, neither the existing house is of a traditional 'L' shaped plan form referred to, nor the proposed side extension an infill, I do not believe that this advice is directly relevant in this case. I do, however, accept that the footprint of the house as extended would be larger, but in my opinion not so large as to be proportionately overly dominant, when compared to the existing floor plan.
8. I conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed additions, by reason of their design and overall footprint, would not cause harm to the architectural integrity of the host building and thereby the character and appearance of the surrounding area. They would therefore accord with the objectives of Brighton and Hove Local Plan (2005) Policy QD14 and the guidance in SPD12 as they relate to the quality of design and its impact on the surrounding area.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time limit condition I agree with the Council's suggestion that a condition relating to external materials is necessary. Further, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, I shall also impose a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusions

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR