



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 August 2019

by Tim Crouch DipUD MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Thursday, 12 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/3230059

54 Brittany Road, Hove BN3 4PB

- 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 Adam and Monica Edgar against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2018/03762, dated 5 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 8 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is two storey rear and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. On my site visit I saw that the property already has a single storey side and rear extension to the floor dimensions as proposed within this appeal, although I note the height is less than before me, and different rear fenestration. I do not have the details that lead to the construction of this. In any event I have considered the appeal proposal as before me.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on;
 - The character and appearance of the building and wider area; and
 - The living conditions of occupiers of 52 Brittany Road with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The property is a semi-detached, two storey building with side dormer window, following the main roof hipped design and side attached single storey extension. This is characterful of Brittany Road which mainly consists of pairs of matching semi-detached properties, with minor variations as a result of mostly subservient extensions, well integrated into the properties.
5. The proposal seeks to introduce a wrap-around single storey extension, increasing in height to the rear, and with a first floor projection to side and rear. The single storey extension would be set back from the front elevation, with flat roof and front garage style doors to appear subservient and distinct from the main dwellinghouse. However, the height proposed, whilst seeking to

match the extent of the brickwork design on the front elevation, would appear tall and out of proportion, accentuating the single storey element and failing to appear subservient within the overall frontage.

6. The height of the single storey side extension would increase to the rear and have differing roof heights across the rear elevation. The side projection, whilst mirroring the depth of outshoots and detached rear garages elsewhere in the street, would have a height only just below that of the first floor window cills of the existing building. This height would compete with the existing rear elevation and appear dominant. The stepping down would also raise the prominence of this height, which would appear harmful to the existing building.
7. The first floor element would wrap around the corner of the building, extending a flat roof under the eaves around the corner of the building. This design and positioning would fail to respect the established hipped roof design of the property, and area, adding a box-like addition harmfully out of character with the existing building, despite the matching materials. I recognise that the existing side dormer makes a design solution difficult for a first floor extension and the flat roof design would provide a 'clean' solution between elements. However, the design proposed is not sympathetic to the existing building. This would be further incongruous on the rear elevation with the single window positioned to one side, not of the design or proportions of other windows on the rear elevation, nor aligned with their positioning.
8. Whilst set back from the front façade, and with limited wider visibility, the first floor extension would be visible when passing and this harm to the appearance of the dwelling would also be appreciated within the streetscene, appearing out of character with the general symmetry and subservient other additions well integrated into the properties.
9. I recognise that the streetscene includes various additions, including those to properties to the east on Roman Road, and Derek Avenue to the west. However, the majority of these are subservient and assimilate into the appearance of the existing building. The proposal would fail to do this, as set out above.
10. Therefore, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing house due to the height of the single storey extension to the side, and the design and positioning of the proposed addition to the first floor, which would also be visible, and harmful, within the streetscene. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan (2005) (LP). This requires extensions to be well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended and to the surrounding area.

Neighbouring occupiers

11. The rear single storey extension would have a side parapet wall above the height of the flat roof of the proposed extension. This would be the height to the window cill of the first floor windows and result in a significant blank feature on the boundary with No 52 Brittany Road. Whilst this neighbouring property has a canopy within its garden, its rear outdoor living area is also narrowed by an existing outshoot on its other boundary, narrowing the garden area. This height and proximity would have a significant overbearing impact on the occupiers of No 52, significantly restricting the outlook and causing harm to the living conditions.

12. Whilst permitted development may allow an extension of a similar height and position but I must assess the proposals before me. The scale of the proposal overall appears to exceed what may be possible under permitted development, and as I saw on my site visit, a reduced height scheme appears to have already been implemented. Therefore, I am not convinced that an extension under permitted development of a similar height represents a 'realistic and viable' alternative as suggested by the appellant.
13. Therefore, the proposal would result in a harmful effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at No 52 Brittany Road. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to Policy QD27 of the LP which states that permission will not be granted where it would cause material loss of amenity to adjacent occupiers.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Tim Crouch

INSPECTOR