



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 March 2015

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

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

Decision date: 21/04/2015

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/15/3003248

21 Gladstone Road, Portslade, Brighton, East Sussex, BN41 1LJ.

- 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 Suzana Rucaj against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2014/03540, dated 21 October 2014, was refused by notice dated 16 December 2014.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey extension and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey extension and loft conversion at 21 Gladstone Road, Portslade, Brighton, East Sussex, BN41 1LJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BH2014/03540, dated 21 October 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: 100 Rev. P, 101 Rev. P, 102 Rev. P, 103 Rev. P, 104. Rev. P, 105 Rev. P and the 45 *Degrees Rule Study* dated 21 October 2014.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue in this appeal to be the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the existing property, the street and the wider surrounding area by virtue of its scale, design, roof form, mass and height.

Reasons

3. The property the subject of this appeal, 21 Gladstone Road, is a two-storey terraced dwelling on the north side of the road. It is one of a short terrace of four houses and has a small enclosed rear garden that backs on to the railway embankment. The street in the immediate surrounding area generally comprises other similar short residential terraces. As I observed, a number have had roof alterations that manifest themselves with roof windows in the front roof slope and there is at least one example, albeit not in this short terrace, of a two-storey rear addition.
-

4. The appellant proposes a two-storey rear extension that would be about 2.8 metres deep and set in some 0.6 metres from the party wall line with the neighbouring dwellings on either side. It would have a hipped roof, the ridge height of which would be lower than that of the main roof. The new roof void to be formed and the existing loft space would be converted to provide a bedroom with en-suite shower room. Two roof windows are proposed to the front roof slope. The Council considers that the two rooflights would be acceptable and from what I have seen and read I would not disagree with its findings on this matter.
5. The extension would be of a modest depth in comparison to that of both the existing house and back garden, such that the private garden retained would have a depth of about 10.5 metres or so. The proposed addition would sit well within and not replace either side boundaries. Its roof form and pitch would reflect that of the host building with its ridgeline set below that of the main roof of the terrace. The materials proposed for the external envelope of the addition are shown to match those of the host property.
6. As I observed the proportions and styles of the rear windows of the houses in this terrace are not uniform. I therefore consider the introduction of the simple and more contemporary casement windows proposed would be acceptable here. Although it would be two-storey in height and consequently would be of some visual prominence, I nevertheless consider that in all respects the proposed development would appear as a well mannered addition that would play a subordinate 'supporting role', respecting the design, scale and proportions of the host building as well as the terrace of which it is part.
7. Furthermore, as illustrated on the application drawings, the extension would comply with the '45 degree rule' which the Council states in its Supplementary Planning Document spd12: *Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations* (adopted June 2013) (SPD12) is required to avoid harming neighbouring amenity. I therefore agree with the Council that the proposed addition would not cause significant harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers in terms of overshadowing, loss of light, loss of privacy or overbearing impact.
8. I therefore conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed two-storey extension would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the existing property, the street or the wider surrounding area by virtue of its scale, design, roof form, mass and height. Accordingly, it would comply with the objectives of Policy QD14 of the *Brighton and Hove Local Plan 2005* and the guidance set out in SPD12 as they relate to the quality of design.

Conclusions and Conditions

9. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed and planning permission granted.
10. Notwithstanding the Council's suggestion, I see no need to attach a condition about materials as these are shown on the appellant's plans. However, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, I shall impose a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR