

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2017

by Timothy C King (BA Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 9 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/16/3161872

5 Braemore Road, Hove, BN3 4HA

- 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 Damien Burke against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2016/02729, dated 21 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 28 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is '*Two storey side extension and single-storey rear extension.*'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Although not mentioned in the appellant's description of the proposal on the original application form the Council's decision notice picks up that there are, in fact, three separate elements to the intended development. Although the Council has raised objections to the two-storey side extension, it does not take issue with the single-storey rear addition nor the front porch. I agree with this approach and, in the circumstances, I have limited my assessment to the planning merits, or otherwise, of the proposed two-storey side extension.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the proposal's effect on the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and its surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse. Originally built with hip-ended roofs, No 7, in common with several other dwellings in the immediate vicinity has undergone roof alterations to create a gabled-end. The appeal dwelling is as built and the proposal would extend the dwelling at full height up to its boundary, requiring the removal of a single width detached garage.
 5. The side boundary is common with the Braemore Court site which fronts Kingsway, beyond. This adjacent site comprises a substantial eight-storey block of flats with associated garage terraces behind; the rear terrace abutting
-

the common boundary with the appeal site. Given the arrangement I consider that this appeal turns on the effect of the proposal on the dwelling itself, and also the changing relationship with No 7.

6. Policy QD14 of the Council's Local Plan (LP) requires, amongst other things, that extensions are of good design, relating well to the host dwelling. More specific advice is provided by the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations' (SPD12) which, for two-storey side extension proposals, advises that these should be subservient to the host building and generally set back from the frontage and main ridge line by at least 0.5m with a width no greater than half the frontage width of the main building. Whilst the latter proviso, relating to the extension's width, would be satisfied, there would be no set back from the dwelling's frontage nor any drop down from the roof's ridge-line. Explaining this approach the appellant comments that introducing a stepped down ridge with a recessed frontage would be incongruous to the pair of houses and also the streetscene. I disagree with this assertion and take the view that the proposed increased width, although resulting in a gabled-end to accord with No 7, would adversely affect the relationship with No 7 as a significant imbalance would result along with a consequential terracing effect.
7. SPD12 also indicates that a minimum 1m gap should be left between the site boundary and the extension. However, in this instance, due to the proximity of Braemore Court the main purpose of this criterion, that being to ensure a satisfactory physical relationship between adjacent dwellings, is of little relevance and, as such, I have less concern as to the projected flank wall's proximity to the side boundary. Instead, it is the absence of any subordination to the host dwelling – a general requirement for domestic extensions – that I find issue with. The appellant comments that the proposed design would give rise to a symmetrical aesthetic appearance but, on the contrary, I consider that the proposal's effect on both the host dwelling and No 7 would be deleterious.
8. I thereby conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the host dwelling and its surrounding area and this would also materially conflict with the aims of LP Policy QD14 and relevant advice within SPD12.
9. Given the considered acceptability of the proposed single-storey rear extension and also the front porch I have considered the possibility of allowing these elements by way of a split decision. However, it would not appear that these features are easily severable from the proposal as a whole and I am unable, therefore, to take this approach.
10. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal does not succeed.

Timothy C King

INSPECTOR