



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 July 2019 by Mariam Noorgat BSc (Hons)

Decision by Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/19/3227906
145 Surrenden Road, Brighton BN1 6ZA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr M Still against the Brighton and Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2018/03869, is dated 17 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 8 February 2019.
 - The development was originally described as loft conversion incorporating front dormer, hip to gable conversion and installation of rooflights. Rear extension and side extension at ground floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion incorporating front dormer, hip to gable conversion and the installation of rooflights, additional windows to the side elevation, a single storey rear and side extension, and associated works. Landscaping of the front garden would see the creation of an extra car parking space at 145 Surrenden Road, Brighton BN1 6ZA, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: BH2018/03869, dated 17 December 2018, and the plans numbered 17644 E 202, 17644 E 203, 17644 E 204, 17644 P 202, 17644 P 203, 17644 P 204, 17644 P 200 and 17644 E 200.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. The description of the development used in the decision above reflects that used in the Council's Decision Notice and the appeal forms as that is more accurate than that description originally used on the application form.

Main Issue

4. The Council's refusal of the planning application only relates to the front dormer and the colour of the windows. The main issue therefore is the effect of these aspects on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two-storey detached property, as are majority of the properties on Surrenden Road. The properties that line this street vary in

design and scale and there is no particular uniformity that flows through the street. The fenestration arrangement along Surrenden Road also varies in design, scale and colour. My site visit established that whilst the majority of window frames in the area were white, I also saw brown, light grey and black frames.

6. The previously approved front dormer had a flat roof. However, the front dormer in situ at the appeal site has a hipped roof which respects the design of the original dwelling and surrounding area. The fenestration arrangement is also of similar design to the ground and first floor and is positioned in a way to give a stepped effect which is visually appealing. The size is considered proportionate to the roofscape and does not look bulky. It also does not look incongruous in the context of the surrounding area by reason of its setback from the eaves and the similarity of scale to the gable fronted roofs to No.143.
7. The grey window frames, of which some were in-situ at the time of my site visit, regardless of material, are not out of character due to the various colours witnessed along Surrenden Road. The grey frames are more subdued than the white and they provide a sense of modernism, which reflects the developments on site. They also contrast well with the white render to the front elevation which is also common along the street scene. The windows also respect the neighbouring property at No.143 in that the grey vertical lines of the frames are akin to the black Tudor style detailing present at this property, which is also not uncommon along the street scene. As such, the grey window frames preserve and enhance the appearance of the building and surrounding area.
8. Based on the reasoning above, the front dormer and the use of grey frames for the windows does not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. It therefore does not conflict with Saved Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan (2005) which seeks to ensure developments are well designed.

Other Matters

9. I note some local concerns regarding the hip to gable roof aspect of the development, and the impact of the single storey extensions on the outlook from neighbouring properties. However on both counts, the Council consider they reflect what could be built without the need for a further planning permission, and I have no reason to disagree.
10. The comments from the neighbours at No.143 refers to conditions attached to previous planning permissions regarding the windows, however I do not have the details of the permission this refers to. Notwithstanding this, the windows to the east and west sides would face the flanks of the neighbouring houses at Nos 143 and 147 which have no side windows themselves. As such I do not consider there to be any detrimental form of overlooking from them. There would also be no loss of privacy resulting from the rear facing rooflight.
11. I note the comments from the neighbours referring to some procedural matters regarding the development process, but these do not affect my considerations of the planning merits of the case.
12. The widening of the hardstanding for the provision of an additional car parking space would remove some unkempt vegetation, and a small tree, which are not considered to be of significant quality. These works would not harm the

character and appearance of the area or affect the living conditions of neighbouring residents, and indeed the Council raised no objection to them.

Conditions

13. As the development has already commenced there is no need to regulate the commencement of the development through a planning condition as suggested by the Council. Furthermore, as the materials used are acceptable there is no need to control these by condition either. I have however phrased the terms of the decision so that it includes specific reference to the plans in the interests of certainty.

Recommendation and Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Mariam Noorgat

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR