

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2016

**by AJ Steen BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 5 December 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/16/3160646**

**26 Bishops Road, Hove, East Sussex BN3 6PN**

- 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 Richard Curd against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
  - The application Ref BH2016/01461, dated 19 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 July 2016.
  - The development proposed is a single storey side extension and a first floor extension over the garage.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side extension and a first floor extension over the garage at 26 Bishops Road, Hove, East Sussex BN3 6PN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BH2016/01461, dated 19 April 2016, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: drawing numbers RFA 16/358/OS, RFA 16/358/01, RFA 16/358/02A and RFA 16/358/03A.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed first floor extension over the garage on the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area.

### Reasons

3. Bishops Road comprises predominantly detached houses in close proximity to the boundaries, of a mix of designs that result in a varied character to the area. No. 26 is of simple design and appearance, with a projecting single storey garage to the front. Given the design of the house and location further from the road than neighbouring properties, it is not prominent within the street scene.
-

4. The proposal would convert the garage into an additional living room, with bedroom above. The ridge of the roof of the proposed extension has been reduced during the course of the planning application, which results in a lower pitch to the proposed roof. I note that it would be taller than the small projection to the front of the closest neighbouring dwelling and may be visible over that. However, given the limited additional height, with the ridge below the level of the main roof that would be visible behind the proposed extension, it would be subservient to the remainder of the building.
5. As a result, I conclude that the proposed first floor extension over the garage would not harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or the surrounding area. As such, it would not be contrary to Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan or Supplementary Planning Document 12 (SPD): design guide for extensions and alterations that seek to ensure extensions and alterations to existing buildings are well designed in relation to the property to be extended and the surrounding area.
6. The proposed single storey side extension would comprise an en-suite to the new ground floor room and would be located to the rear of the converted garage, such that it would not be visible from the road. Consequently, it would not affect the character or appearance of the area.
7. I note the planning history supplied, including planning permission for a similar extension that was attached to other proposed extensions. That included an additional substantial extension to the front of the remainder of the dwelling and pre-dated advice contained within the SPD. I consider that the effect of the development would have been different given the extent of the proposed front extension in that case, so have considered the present scheme on its individual merits.

### **Conditions**

8. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. A condition is necessary for materials to match those used on the existing house to maintain the character and appearance of the area.

### **Conclusion**

9. On the basis of the above considerations, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

*AJ Steen*

INSPECTOR