

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2016

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/16/3154514
9 Reynolds Road, Hove, Brighton BN3 5RJ

- 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 M Randell against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application, Ref. BH2016/0067, dated 18 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as '*internal wall removal and garage conversion to habitable room*'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the replacement of the existing detached garage with a single storey side and rear extension and associated alterations at 9 Reynolds Road, Hove, Brighton in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. BH2016/0067, dated 18 February 2016, 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 shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: OS based Block / Site Plan; Proposed ground floor plan (Drawing No. 201); Un-numbered plan showing proposed front and rear elevations; Proposed cross section CC (Drawing No. 206); Un-numbered plan showing proposed side (north) elevation; Proposed cross section AA (Drawing No. 204);
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the walls and roof of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matter

2. The application description does not accurately reflect the form of the proposal and I therefore consider it necessary to use the Council's description in my formal Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the appearance of the host building and the street scene of Reynolds Road.
-

Reasons

4. In its appraisal of the appeal application the Council refers to guidance in its Supplementary Planning Document No. 12 'Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations' 2012 ('the SPD') that rear extensions should not normally extend beyond the main side walls of the host building and should normally be no deeper than half the depth of the main body of the original building.
5. On the latter point I note that the illustration in the SPD shows an extension across the full width of the existing house and I agree that an extension of the depth proposed at the appeal property would be inappropriate if it followed that example. However, the main body of the proposed extension would overlap the rear wall of the existing house by less than 2m of its 7m width and with the apex of its shallow pitched roof well below the eaves line of the existing building I consider that it would read comfortably as a subordinate and well designed addition.
6. On the first point in the SPD, existing views of the front of the property are of an essentially flat roofed garage of no design merit positioned slightly to the rear of the house and extending across to the boundary with No. 7. In fact much of this is hidden by the side gate / fence in its more forward position, but if this were to be removed at any time the extension would be seen from the road.
7. However, although the proposal would bring the existing built form both forward and across to link with the dwelling, because of its pitched tiled roof and front wall including a side door and window it would be far superior in appearance to the existing garage door. Furthermore, although the extension would have a depth of about 8m this is essentially the same as the existing garage and shed and a further 18m of garden boundary to No. 7 would remain.
8. Overall, I consider the form of the appeal scheme combined with the on-site characteristics is such as to outweigh the guidance of the SPD. I therefore conclude that the proposal would improve the appearance of the host building and the street scene of Reynolds Road. There would therefore be no conflict with Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan (retained policies March 2016) or Section 7: 'Requiring Good Design' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
9. I shall therefore allow the appeal. A condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans is good practice and allows certainty. A condition requiring matching external materials will safeguard the appearance of the existing dwelling.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR