

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 August 2017

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 5th September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/17/3175314

28 Elrington Road, Hove, BN3 6LG

- 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 & Mrs G Docherty against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2016/05434, dated 26 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as revised planning application for the construction of the proposed extensions and alterations.
-

Preliminary matter

1. The Council's decision letter does not include a reason for refusing the planning application the subject of this Appeal. This appears to be an administrative error rather than deliberate. Notwithstanding this, the Council's report clearly sets out various concerns relating to the scheme.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of the proposed extensions and alterations at 28 Elrington Road, Hove, BN3 6LG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BH2016/05434, dated 26 September 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: 511/024/00 and 511/024/20 U.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those of the host dwelling and will include the smooth white render of the external walls of the resultant dwelling.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the scheme on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Elrington Road is characterised by a diverse range of two storey detached family dwellings, with a mixture of uniform and staggered front and rear building lines. The
-

dwellings are set back from the street scene behind varied sized front gardens that are typically enclosed by a combination of low walls and hedges. These hedges, together with the soft landscaping in the front and rear gardens and the trees within the highway verges partially screen the dwellings and contribute to the verdant, suburban character and appearance of Elrington Road.

5. The Appeal dwelling is consistent with the above pattern of development. It comprises an asymmetrical two storey family dwelling with a fully hipped roof and a catslide roof feature to the front. It is set behind a soft landscaped front garden that is enclosed by a hedge and has a spacious rear garden. The Appeal dwelling is located close to the northern boundary of the site, where it sits alongside the dwelling at 34 The Droveaway (No.34), which projects both to the front and rear of the Appeal dwelling. Currently there is an open gap between the Appeal dwelling and the dwelling to the south at 26 Elrington Road (No.26), which also projects beyond the rear building line of the Appeal dwelling.
6. Amongst other things policy CP12 of the Brighton and Hove City Plan Part One (City Plan) expects all new development to raise the standard of architecture and design in the city and to respect the diverse character and urban grain. Policies QD14 & QD27 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan 2005 (Local Plan) require extensions to be well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the host and nearby properties. They should take account of the spacing around buildings, the character of the area and should not have a materially adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby dwellings.
7. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). It states that new development should respond to local character and history, reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials and provide a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.
8. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document 12: *Design Guidance on Extensions and Alterations* (SPD) advises that greater care should be taken in designing two storey side extensions. This is because they can upset the rhythm of spaces between dwellings and can over-extend buildings in a disproportionate and unbalanced manner. Such extensions should be subservient to the host dwelling and generally set back from the front building line and ridge line. It goes on to advise that the roof form and pitch of extensions should respect that of the host dwelling.
9. Planning permission has already been granted for the proposed side extension and dormer extension above the existing garage. Both of these extensions respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and a reasonable sized gap would be retained between the side extension and the dwelling at 26 Elrington Road (No.26). As such they would respect the character and appearance of street scene and the spatial characteristics of the locality.
10. Having regard to the mixture of building materials found within Elrington Road, the replacement of the existing rough rendered walls with smooth render would be readily assimilated into the street scene. Similarly, due to its modest form and siting, the proposed open front porch would be visually subservient and would respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
11. To the rear the proposed first floor extension would be very modest in depth and the proposed windows would reflect the existing first floor windows. Its flat roof would be set behind a low pitched roof whose pitch and materials would match those of the existing dwelling. The roof of this extension would be visually discrete due to its modest depth and siting between the projecting hipped roof of the bedroom to the south and the flank wall of the dwelling at No.34.

12. The proposed single storey rear extension would be some 5.2 metres deep and would range between 4.2 and 6.83 metres in width. Whilst it would exceed half the width and depth of the original dwelling, it would be located on the northern side of the dwelling and partially alongside the rear projecting flank wall of No.34. Its tapered shape would ensure that the extension respected the proportions of the host dwelling and was not dominant in views from the south and east. Its materials and overall detailing would respect that of the host dwelling.
13. For these reasons, whilst the rear extensions would cover a significant proportion of the rear elevation of the original dwelling, together with the proposed side extension, they would nonetheless respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its setting.
14. The Council has suggested the imposition of conditions relating to the use of matching materials and adherence to the submitted drawings. These conditions are necessary to ensure that the extension blends in appropriately with the host dwelling and in the interests of certainty.
15. I conclude on the main issue that the proposal would blend in appropriately with the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the locality. It would therefore comply with policy CP12 of the City Plan policies QD14 and QD27 of the Local Plan, the SPD and the NPPF.

Other matters

16. The front and rear building lines of the dwellings at No.34 and No.26 would project beyond the building lines of the proposed upper floor extensions. In addition, the proposed rear ground floor extension would be partially screened from the dwellings at No.34 by boundary fencing and planting. Accordingly the proposed extensions would not have a materially adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 34 and No.26 due to visual impact or loss of daylight or sunlight.

Conclusion

17. Having regard to the conclusion on the main issue and other matters the Appeal is allowed.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR