



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2014

by D Fleming BA (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 14 October 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/14/2224481

15 The Beeches, Brighton BN1 5LS

- 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 Mrs Olivia Olorenshaw against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application, Ref BH2014/01226, was refused by notice dated 11 June 2014.
 - The development proposed is rear single storey extension to increase the utility/kitchen area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a rear single storey extension to increase the utility/kitchen area at 15 The Beeches, Brighton BN1 5LS in accordance with the terms of application, Ref BH2014/01226, dated 16 April 2014, 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: site location plan, block plan and dwg No 2609/14 Rev A.
 - 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. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a detached bungalow situated within a cul-de-sac of similar designed properties, many of which have been extended. Plot sizes are generous and planning permission has already been given for an extension to the side of the main building which would adjoin the existing garage sited in the rear garden. The garage would become the new kitchen for the property but to date this permission has not been implemented.
4. The proposed scheme is now to extend the garage, marginally, to the rear by adding a utility room. This single storey rear extension would be about

2m x 4.5m and would continue the approved part pitched roof/part flat roof design for the converted garage.

5. There would be no public views of this extension as the rear of the site is flanked on all sides by gardens. Furthermore views from neighbouring properties would be limited by a mature tree line at the rear of the site and high boundary fencing on either side of the garden. The proposed height of the extension would only be just over 3m; however on the side boundary it would be just over 2m to eaves level which would be similar to the fence height. I therefore find the proposed development would be modest given its size and location.
6. With regard to its scale I find its diminutive form would not detract from the predominance of the original building with its wide gable roof overlooking the garden. Furthermore the proposed siting would also preserve the integrity of the original bungalow as the depth of the extension would be so limited.
7. The Council are concerned that the proposed addition together with the converted garage, would result in an 8m depth extension. This would be more than half the depth of the original bungalow and more than half the depth of the garden. However the garage already exists and I consider the proposed modest extension takes account of the existing space around the bungalow. None of the gardens in the immediate area of bungalows are particularly deep but they are generous in size due to their width. Whilst the overall depth of the converted garage and proposed extension would be significant, it would not detract from the overall width of the garden.
8. In addition it has been brought to my attention that with some adjustments to the height of the proposal the extension could be carried out without the need for formal planning permission. I am satisfied that if the appeal were to be dismissed there is every likelihood that a slightly modified version of the extension would be built. In my opinion such an extension would not have any greater impact on the character and appearance of the area than the appeal proposal. Whilst the height reduction would mean the extension would not relate as well as the proposed scheme to the existing garage, its siting and modest footprint would be the same.
9. For these reasons I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would accord with Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan 2005 (saved 2007) which requires extensions to be well designed and sited amongst other matters. The proposed extension would also not conflict with the general objectives of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations 2012. This is in so far as they relate to the extension of a bungalow in the manner proposed.

Conclusion and Conditions

10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.
11. The appeal being allowed in addition to the standard time limit on commencement of development, a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is imposed. This is for the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning. The Council has also suggested a condition requiring the external materials to be used in the construction of the extension to match those of the existing building. This is an

appropriate condition in the interests of the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

D Fleming

INSPECTOR