



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 February 2015

by Timothy C King BA(Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 March 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/A/14/2229139

30C Gordon Road, Brighton, BN1 6PD

- 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 Graham Pratt, against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2014/02153, dated 30 June 2014, was refused by notice dated 2 October 2014.
 - The development proposed is a '*Second floor rear extension.*'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a second floor rear extension at 30C Gordon Road, Brighton, BN1 6PD in accordance with the terms of the application Ref BH2014/02153, dated 30 June 2014, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: Drawing Nos. 01 (Rev A), 02, 03, 04, 05, 06 (rev A) and 07.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the main building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. No 30 Gordon Road, a mid-terraced residential building, is sub-divided into flat units and No 30C, the address of the appeal site, represents the flat at second floor level. At my site visit, when standing in the back garden, I noted that along the terrace are a variety of rear additions; some properties share centrally ridged tunnel-backs, some have flat-roofed two-storey extensions and there were two examples visible of three-storey extensions with roofs pitching into the respective main roof slopes. No 30 currently has a flat-roofed two – storey addition and it is proposed that this be heightened by an additional
-

storey and overlain by a pitched roof projecting the main roof slope at an identical angle.

4. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'design guide for extensions and alterations' (SPD) advises against extensions dominating or detracting from the original building or the character of an area and should play a subordinate and supporting role that respects the design, scale and proportions of the host building. In terms of two (or more) storey rear extensions the SPD primarily serves to guard against impacting on neighbouring properties, but I have had regard to the Council's assessment that neither Nos 28 or 32 Gordon Road would be significantly affected by the proposal. Indeed, having viewed the existing physical relationship at my site visit, I see no reason to disagree with this approach. As regards design, the SPD advises that the proposed roof form and pitch should reflect that of the host building which, in this case, it would. I have had regard to the Council's view that the proposed roof arrangement would, in this instance, appear awkward but I am satisfied that the extended pitch would be acceptable in its context. Only rooflights are proposed at second floor level.
5. Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan (LP) requires, amongst other things, that rear extensions are appropriately sited and well designed, should not lead to a significant loss of outlook, privacy, or daylight to neighbouring properties, should not lead to a terracing effect and should take account of the prevailing character of the area. The other full height extensions, at No 34 and one positioned along the terrace, westwards, appear to integrate satisfactorily and, although the Council mentions that No 34's addition is not as deep as that proposed, I am mindful that a two-storey addition already exists and that the neighbouring occupiers would not be impacted upon from its heightening. I consider the appeal proposal would not be to an unsympathetic design, would be well proportioned and with an acceptable roof treatment. In the prevailing circumstances it would be appropriate in its contextual setting.
6. I thereby conclude that the proposal would neither be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property nor the surrounding area. Accordingly, the requirements of LP Policy QD14 would be met, along with the objectives of the SPD. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.
7. In terms of conditions apart from the statutory time limit requirement, I am imposing a condition requiring for matching external materials to be used in the extension's construction. Also, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning I am imposing a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Timothy C King

INSPECTOR