



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 March 2015

by **Ray Wright** BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21 March 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/14/2222189

28 Elrington Road, Hove, East Sussex BN3 6LG

- 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 G Docherty against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2014/00746 was refused by notice dated 2 May 2014.
 - The development proposed is '....for the construction of the Proposed Extension and Alterations'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The application relates to a detached two storey building with rendered elevations and a tiled roof. The appeal property is set back from the road frontage and overall, due to this siting, it is not particularly prominent in the street scene. The proposals involve various additions and alterations which the appellants indicate would increase the floor area of the house by around 23%.
4. The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) indicates that there should be a presumption in favour of sustainable development, but confirms that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Policies QD1, QD2 and QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan 2005 (LP) have similar high quality design requirements.
5. The proposals include the erection of a two storey side extension. This extension would align with the main front and rear walls of the existing house and rise to the same ridge line of the roof. While this would reduce its subservience, its hipped form and 'catslide' roof design would suitably relate to the existing property. These elements, together with matching materials would suitably integrate it with the existing dwelling. From the road, the existing gap between the house and the southern boundary fence is not seen until nearly opposite the property and this spacing is not a uniform characteristic within the immediate group of properties or along the road. Following the development the retained gap, of around 2 metres, would ensure this element would not

result in any terracing effect or create a cramped appearance within the street scene. While the prominence of the building would be increased by the side addition, the property, as extended, would not form an overly dominant feature in the road.

6. As part of the works two new front dormer windows are proposed. These would match an existing front dormer in terms of their size, form and materials. They would be located within the roof space equidistant from the sides of the extended building, above the eaves line and well below the ridge of the roof. Overall, to my mind, they would balance the proposed roof appearance and generally conform to the requirements set out in The Council's 'spd 12 – design guide for extensions and alterations' (SPD). At the rear of the property it is proposed to extend the existing roof over the kitchen and playroom, and form additional floor space at first floor level by the introduction of two rectangular dormer additions. This alteration would not be seen from the public realm, nor would it be unduly prominent from the rear, with views of this part of the appeal property limited to those from immediately adjoining gardens.
7. The property currently has a garage addition which projects in front of the main building line on its northern boundary. It appears as a later addition and represents a relatively incongruous feature. However, its current visual impact is partially reduced as its frontage generally aligns with the nearest section of the adjoining 24 The Droveaway.
8. The proposals would involve the rebuilding of this garage which would include an additional forward projection towards the road of around 1 metre and an increase in its width by around 1.2 metres. The new, enlarged garage would further unbalance the appearance of the main frontage of this house and provide a far more awkward visual relationship with the adjoining property. As such, it would represent a far more dominant and discordant feature which would be to the detriment of the street scene.
9. As highlighted by the appellants, no 24 Elrington Road has a front projecting garage. However, this has a narrow form, which together with its siting immediately adjoining no 22, reduce its visual effect. It also appears very longstanding. While I have had regard to this building I have considered this scheme solely on its individual merits.
10. In conclusion, while I find a number of the proposed alterations would not be inappropriate, the proposals overall, by reason of the garage extension, would be unduly harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As such, the development would be contrary to the Framework, Policies QD1, QD2, QD14 of the LP and SPD.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ray Wright

INSPECTOR