



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2022

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: **31 JANUARY 2022**

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/21/3288335

3 Woodland Close, Hove, BN3 6BP

- 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 Ms Tina Korup against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2021/02802, dated 28 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is alterations and extensions to roof line to front of property, construction of new dormer to east elevation, insertion of rooflights, cladding of front and rear of building in timber and revised fenestration with double hip-to-gable roof extensions on garage, new dormer to door head, insertion of rooflights and cladding of building in timber.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations and extensions to roof line to front of property, construction of new dormer to east elevation, insertion of rooflights, cladding of front and rear of building in timber and revised fenestration with double hip-to-gable roof extensions on garage, new dormer to door head, insertion of rooflights and cladding of building in timber at 3 Woodland Close, Hove, BN3 6BP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BH2021/02802, dated 28 July 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2762 – 00, 05, 06, 07, 08 & 09.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the locality.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached home at the end of a short cul de sac of six dwellings with a variety of forms, generally pleasant but unremarkable in appearance, and seeming to stem from around the 1960s. The appeal
-

property is at a lower level than some surrounds and lies alongside a footpath beyond the road which has a well vegetated almost semi-rural ambiance. The cul de sac is an inset in a wider locality of older and more homogenous and attractive traditional semi-decorative suburban housing. The area as a whole is of established residential character and pleasing appearance. The proposal is as described above.

4. The Council is concerned the roof extensions, cladding and revised fenestration would result in an incongruous form out of keeping with the dwelling and the prevailing character of the street and wider area. The case is made that the proposal would result in a property that forms an anomaly within the area and which would have no relation to its setting. It is also put that the proposed timber cladding of the detached garage would appear at odds streetscene and not respect the wider character.
5. The scheme is a remodelling of the existing dwelling and to my mind that is a valid approach in this instance in principle. I say this because the starting point is a dwelling with no great architectural merit and one which sits discreetly within the varied streetscene of the cul de sac and is certainly not read in the wider more traditional and repetitive suburban context where marked change would appear unduly alien. To this extent I would argue that the architect here has something of a free hand provided any scheme emerging is clearly of reasonable design and would not overly impose itself visually beyond its immediate bounds. Similarly, I see no need for a straight jacket on the materials which might be used; I disagree with the Council on the question of suitability of timber cladding.
6. Taking all these factors I find the appeal scheme, judged on its merits on this site, would be inoffensive; it would appear as a new approach to dwelling design here but to my eye that would not make it unacceptable. I am satisfied that the overall characterful and attractive situation in the wider locality will continue and the planned development would be relatively innocuous in this context and, indeed, add some immediate interest visual.
7. Policies QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan, CP12 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One, and DM21 in the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part Two are relevant; the latter is not fully adopted but the stage reached gives it a degree of weight. Taken together and amongst other matters they seek well designed extensions and alterations that should protect the character and appearance of a locality, utilise suitable materials, and generally have design merit. I conclude that the proposal would not conflict with these policies; it would not be inappropriate or harmful to the wider scene.

Conditions

8. The Council suggests that in addition to the standard commencement condition there should be a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans; this would be necessary to provide certainty. The suggestion that materials should match the existing property is not appropriate because planned changes are significant and the intended materials are set out on the application form and on approved plans.

Overall conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond
INSPECTOR