



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2019

by S J Papworth DipArch(Glos) RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/19/3238295

9 Hawthorn Close, Saltdean, Brighton BN2 8HX

- 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 Peter Bishop against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2019/01730, dated 10 June 2019, was refused by the Council by notice dated 7 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey extension to front elevation incorporating conversion of existing integral garage into habitable space, revised fenestration and associated works.
-

Decision

1. I allow the appeal and grant planning permission for erection of single storey extension to front elevation incorporating conversion of existing integral garage into habitable space, revised fenestration and associated works at 9 Hawthorn Close, Saltdean, Brighton BN2 8HX in accordance with the terms of the application Ref BH2019/01730, dated 10 June 2019 and subject to the following conditions;
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings. 9HC/PELVS/01 and 9HC/PPLAN/01
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Reasons

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the street-scene. Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan on extensions and alterations states that permission will only be granted if the proposal is well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended, adjoining properties and the surrounding area, with further requirements detailed. Paragraph 124 of the 2019 National Planning Policy Framework states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.

3. The Council has published the Supplementary Planning Document '*SPD12 Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations*' which in a section on front extensions and porches states that on detached properties, extensions should respect the building line to the street and should normally be of a subservient scale that does not dominate the building; the roof pitch should be at the same pitch as the original building so that the extension blends with the character of the building.
4. The host property is a detached dwelling at the end of the entry leg of a *cul-de-sac* and hence is highly visible among other similar properties. There is some variety in design within the adjoining dwellings in this part of the road, seen at the roof and front elevation. Number 9 and its neighbour has a garage that is in part integral and in part projecting in front of the main two storey house, and with an adjoining open porch, both having flat roofs. Houses either side of this pair have a recess in the two-storey front elevation containing a similar flat roofed garage, but this time not projecting in front of the house elevation.
5. The proposal would extend the flat roof and front building line of the garage to line with the further side elevation and would bring the garage into use as a habitable room with a front window. The extension would have a new front door location and a window to its other side, in place of a blank wall at present.
6. Looking at the requirements of the Supplementary Planning Document for the front extension of detached houses, the proposal would respect the building line set by the garage, and that would line with the front of number 10. Number 8 is set back already, so there is no 'common building line to the street' referred to in the diagram on page 14. Being single storey against a two-storey property it would be of a subservient scale that does not dominate the building, and the roof would be of a flat pitch that would be the same as the projecting garage and would hence blend with the character of the building.
7. The proposal would not upset the already irregular building line along this part of the close, number 6 having a successful front addition despite its forward building line. It would not cause harm to the wider area having a variety of house designs within a similar palette of materials and detailing. As such it accords with the requirements of Policy QD14 and the Framework on the standard of design and its relationship with the surrounding properties.
8. The appellant has drawn attention to a similar addition in Saltdean Vale, and whilst that comparison is not required to justify an appeal scheme that complies with the Development Plan and the Supplementary Planning Document, it does indicate that the proposal can be achieved satisfactorily.
9. To conclude, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the street-scene or the design of the host building and its neighbours, and would comply with the relevant Development Plan policy, the Supplementary Planning Document and the aims of the Framework on good design. With a condition naming the 'as-proposed' drawings for the avoidance of doubt and another to ensure that the materials match those of the existing dwelling, it is concluded for the reasons given above, that the appeal should be allowed.

S J Papworth

INSPECTOR