

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/16/3164221

17 Green Ridge, Brighton, BN1 5LT

- 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 James Booth against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2016/02611, dated 6 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is '*Proposed new loft conversion providing first floor accommodation and new porch extension to the ground floor – resubmission of application BN2016/00913.*'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for roof alterations including a hip to barn end roof extension with gable extension to rear, rooflights to front, rear and side elevations and creation of an enclosed front porch at 17 Green Ridge, Brighton, BN1 5LT, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref BH2016/02611, dated 6 July 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 hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. L-100, L-101 Rev A, L-102, L-103 Rev C and L-104 Rev C.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Issues

2. I have altered the proposal's description to that shown on the Council's decision notice as this wording more closely focusses on the development involved.
 3. The Council has only raised objections in relation to the proposed roof extension and does not take issue with the intended enclosed front porch. I see no reason to disagree and, as such, I have limited my assessment to the planning merits, or otherwise, of the roof extension, the principle element of the proposal.
-

4. Following my site visit, in accordance with a prior request, I viewed the application site from the rear garden of No 19 Green Ridge. However, it has not affected my conclusions. I also called at No 15 but there was no response.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and its surrounding area; and ii) the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to Nos 15 and 19 (the immediate neighbours).

Reasons

Character and appearance

6. The appeal dwelling is a semi-detached bungalow which has already been extended to both the side and rear by way of separate flat-roofed additions. The rear extension is of particular prominence given its significant depth and width. The proposal seeks to raise and widen the bungalow's main roof and create a chamfered effect at the sides. The extended roof would project rearwards and a shallow first floor balcony would be created on the rear elevation.
7. 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 indicates that additional storeys or raised roofs may be permitted on detached properties where they respect the scale, continuity, roofline and general appearance of the streetscene, including its topography. In this instance the land slopes downwards significantly to the east and the bungalow at No 19 sits on higher ground than the appeal property. In contrast No 15, although at a lower level, has had its roof heightened to allow for first floor accommodation. To the front this is lit by a series of rooflights whilst to the rear is a wide, dormer roof extension.
8. At my site visit I noticed that a number of bungalows in the street have been altered and extended whilst there are also examples of two-storey dwellings. In this general context, whilst the street's original design pattern is evident I found that it now exhibits something of a mixed character. The extension will add significant bulk to the flanks, particularly that facing No 19 but, given that the proposed design appears to have been satisfactorily conceived, both in terms of the bungalow itself and its contextual setting, also roughly reflecting the frontal changes carried out at No 15, I consider that the proposal represents an appropriate form of development.
9. On the first main issue I conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of either the host dwelling or its surrounding area. Further, I find that there would be no material conflict with the aims of LP Policy QD14 or SPD12.

Living conditions

10. The Council has raised concerns with respect to a considered impact on both Nos 15 and 19 in terms of the bungalow's increased bulk and its considered

overbearing effect. I have also had regard to the representations made by the occupier of the latter property regarding considered resultant overlooking and a loss of light to her kitchen. Such consequential impacts are discouraged by both LP Policies QD14 and QD27, and also advice within SPD12. In this particular instance I consider that No 19's higher ground level would mitigate against the proposal whilst I also witnessed obscured glazing to its flank wall window. Given the proximity of the properties the extension would obviously alter the physical relationship. However, in terms of the outlook from facing windows or the resultant visual effect when viewed from No 19's rear patio I am not convinced that the proposal would cause significant harm.

11. No 15's facing flank wall is set further from the common boundary than on the opposite side and, although the flat-roofed side extension would be built over, I am satisfied that neither this nor the extent of the proposed first floor addition to the existing rear extension would be so overbearing as to be harmful to the existing outlook from No 15's ground floor side windows. No facing windows exist at first floor level. The Council does not consider that the proposed creation of the small balcony to the rear would give rise to undue overlooking and loss of privacy and I agree with this approach.
12. On this main issue I conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to the living conditions of surrounding occupiers and the relevant aims of LP Policies QD14 and QD27 and SPD12 would not be compromised.

Conclusion and Conditions

13. I have found the proposal acceptable on both main issues. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal therefore succeeds. In terms of conditions, to ensure a satisfactory appearance I impose a requirement that the extensions be built using external materials to match that of the bungalow. Also, in the interests of certainty, I impose a condition requiring that the development be built in accordance with the approved plans.

Timothy C King

INSPECTOR