
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2020

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/W/19/3238828

Flat 1, 9 Selborne Road, Hove BN3 3AJ

- 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 Mrs Hellen Barlow against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2019/01515, dated 22 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at Flat 1, 9 Selborne Road, Hove BN3 3AJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BH2019/01515, dated 22 May 2019, 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 accordance with the approved plans: 001 (Existing) received 22 May 2019, 002 (Proposed) received 22 May 2019, 004 (Existing Site and Location Plan) received 22 May 2019.
 - 3) Access to the flat roof over the extension hereby permitted shall be for maintenance or emergency purposes only and the flat roof shall not be used as a roof garden, terrace, patio or similar amenity area.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the Willett Estate Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a basement flat in a large traditional two-storey building, which has subdivided into flats, situated within a predominantly residential area and the Willett Estate Conservation Area (CA). The neighbouring properties comprise of a dense mix of generally two and three-storey detached and semi-detached properties set in narrow plots built predominantly from yellow/cream gault brick and slate roofs. The significance of the buildings is derived from their substantial scale and traditional design with large bay frontages with sash windows and decorative detailing.

4. I observed on my site visit that some of the properties, with bay windows on the rear elevations within the surrounding area, had single storey extensions projecting out from the rear of the buildings. As a result the original rhythm and harmony of the rear elevation of the properties has been eroded. The rear of the appeal property is dominated by a modern UPVC conservatory and a part single storey extension with roof terrace/part two storey extension at the rear of the adjacent property at No. 7 Selborne Road, which provides a varied context of buildings and palette of materials in the immediate surroundings.
5. The proposed work to the rear would result in a single storey addition to replace the existing conservatory that would project out across the full width of the rear elevation of the property and be set back from the boundary walls behind a small garden. The extension would project out broadly in line with the single storey extension at the rear of the adjacent property. The proposed extension with a flat roof and rendered walls would be seen in the context of the current varied architectural styles at the rear of the host building.
6. Against this backdrop, the scale, form and siting of the proposed extension would not look out of place or excessive in relation to the built form of the host property and the adjacent properties. The modest overall scale and proportions of the extension, set back, together with use of materials and fenestrations would ensure the proposal would sit relatively unobtrusively against the two storey form of the host property. This would allow the proposal to achieve an appropriate degree of subordination and as such would not detract from the architectural integrity of the host property and the adjacent properties.
7. Given the location of the appeal property within the CA, special attention has to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area. I consider that the appeal scheme, by virtue of its scale, siting and design would have a neutral material impact and would preserve the character and appearance of the CA.
8. Consequently, I conclude that the development would not adversely harm the character and appearance of the host building and CA. It would be consistent with the overall design and conservation aims of Saved Policies Q14 and HE6 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan 2015 and the Policies CP12 and CP15 of the Brighton and Hove City Plan Part One 2016. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development proposals for extensions or alterations of buildings will be of a high standard of design in relation to property to be extended, adjoining properties and the character of the surrounding area; and preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation areas.
9. I have had regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular paragraph 55. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have specified the approved plan as this provides certainty. In order to protect the amenities of neighbouring properties, I have also imposed a condition restricting the use of the flat roof over the extension.
10. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR