



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 June 2019

by Martin Small, BA (Hons), BPI, DipCM, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/19/3224815

3 Goldstone Street, Hove, BN3 3RJ

- 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 Ian Curtis against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref: BH2018/02565 dated 14 August 2018, was refused by notice dated 30 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is extension to accommodate Kitchen Garden Room for family use, connecting better with the garden and a separate part for Utility use The First floor to be extended to form a new Master suite.
-

Preliminary Matter

1. I have used the description of the proposal from the appeal form which matches that on the Council's decision notice. It adequately and simply describes the proposed development.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of shed and erection of part one part two-storey extension to rear elevation at 3 Goldstone Street, Hove, BN3 3RJ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: BH2018/02565 dated 14 August 2018, 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 strict accordance with the following approved plans: 180306/P0 REV A (Block Plan), 180306/P10 (Site/Roof Plan Proposed), 180306/P11 (First Floor Plan Proposed), 180306/P12 (Ground Floor Plan Proposed), 180306/P13 (Elevations 1/2 Proposed), 180306/P14 (Elevations 2/2 Proposed) and 180306/P15 (Sections Proposed).
 - 3) Notwithstanding the description of the materials on the approved plans, no development above ground works shall commence until details / samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host building, with particular regard to scale and design.

Reasons

4. Goldstone Street connects a number of streets with terraced dwellings, but itself has a variety of dwelling and other building forms. The appeal property is a detached L-shaped dwelling with a part two-storey and part single-storey rear extension (outrigger) along its northern boundary.
5. The proposed extension would, at ground floor level, be constructed in the area between the rear wall of the main dwelling and the side elevation of the outrigger. At first floor level, the proposed development would extend the existing 2 storey element to the side. The proposed extension would not extend at ground floor level beyond the existing side boundary of the property nor the rear wall of the existing single storey element of the outrigger. At first floor level it would not extend beyond the rear wall of the existing 2-storey element of the outrigger.
6. Accordingly, it would substantially respect the proportions of the appeal property and not be an excessive addition to dwelling's overall floor area and bulk, thus neither over-extending it nor being over-dominant. Although there would be no gap between the proposed extension and the southern boundary, this reflects the extent of the existing dwelling and so would not be detrimental to the character of the area.
7. The extension would have clean, simple lines. The elements of the extension would relate well to each other and would improve the integration of the existing single-storey element of the outrigger into the expanded living area. It would be a well-designed modern addition to the appeal property.
8. The Council adopted Supplementary Planning Document 12 - Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations in 2013 (SPD12). The Document was subject to public consultation and accords with the National Planning Policy Framework. I have therefore given it significant weight in my decision. The proposed flat roof to the 2-storey element would not accord with the design principle for 2-storey extensions set out in SPD12 that the roof form and pitch should reflect that of the host building and that flat roofs are generally unacceptable.
9. However, the area of roof of the 2-storey element would be small and the flat roof would both minimise bulk and allow an appreciation of the original roof form of the appeal property. There are existing flat roofs in the vicinity. The SPD provides guidance but, in this instance, given the site-specific circumstances, I consider that the flat roof of the 2-storey element would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal property.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development complies with Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan (2005), which requires extensions to be well-designed in relation to the property to be extended.

Conditions

11. I attach conditions in respect of carrying out the proposed development in accordance with the approved drawings and materials as suggested by the Council. These are necessary in the interests of certainty and safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, and planning permission granted subject to conditions.

Martin Small

INSPECTOR