



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 September 2017

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 2nd October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/17/3178331

44 North Road, Preston, Brighton, BN1 6SP

- 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 D Green against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2017/00589, dated 20 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 12 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side extension at 44 North Road, Preston, Brighton, BN1 6SP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BH2017/00589, dated 20 February 2017, and the plans submitted with it, 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 following approved plans: D1618-100, D1618-150, D1618-250 and D1618-350.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details of the materials and a sample panel of flintwork to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and sample.

Main issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey white rendered house at the end of a terrace of four houses which share some similarities of style and detailing. It is located on the corner with Home Road to which its side elevation presents a blank wall. There is a low brick wall forming the boundary with Home Road which is set at an angle to the house, leaving a narrow triangular area of land.

4. The site lies just within the Preston Village Conservation Area, most of which encompasses Preston Manor and the open areas of sports grounds and Preston Park. In the vicinity of the appeal site the boundary runs between the properties in North Road and Lauriston Road. It includes a small section of Home Road between the site and South Road. This part of the conservation area is residential in character and quite mixed. North Road has a variety of house forms and materials including houses of flint with brick detailing and flint/brick boundary walls, white rendered houses and houses of a mix of brick and render. Most are located on or close to the footpath.
5. Home Road has no cohesive building style, partly because the properties on the east side to the north of North Road have their side elevations rather than their principal elevations facing the street and partly because of the heavy vegetation screening the railway line to the west. Low brick walls are a common feature along the boundaries, together with timber fences and hedges. The properties fronting Home Road immediately to the south are modern semi-detached houses which have little in keeping with the character and style of the properties in North Road and Middle Road apart from the use of brick and render.
6. The proposed single storey extension would fill in the triangular gap at the side of the house. It would involve the demolition of the existing low brick boundary wall and its replacement with the new side wall of the extension constructed of flint with brick quoins.
7. The policies relevant in this case include Policies QD14 and HE6 of the Brighton and Hove City Plan Part One 2016 (the City Plan). QD14 allows for extensions to buildings provided they are, among other things, well designed and sited in relation to the existing building and the surrounding area. HE6 requires development in conservation areas to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area and, among other things, to be of a high standard of design and detailing, and use materials sympathetic to the area.
8. Also relevant are Supplementary Planning Documents 12 and 09 (the SPDs) which offer design guidance for extensions and the use of architectural features.
9. I consider that the size and height of the proposed extension is modest in proportion to the existing house. It would present a simple profile in the street scene, being slightly lower than the existing lean-to shed which is attached to the building and appears as something of an anomaly. SPD12 advises that the use of flat roofs is normally unacceptable unless the host building has one, especially where it affects the street scene. In my opinion, the use of a flat roof and parapet in this instance would present a low profile which would be relatively easily assimilated into the street scene, while the side wall would be more likely to appear as a substantial garden wall rather than part of the house. The rooflight would not be readily visible from the street because of its low profile and the parapet wall.
10. Low brick boundary walls are a common theme along much of Home Road near the appeal site. However, many of them are obscured or otherwise dominated by fences or vegetation. The plans submitted with the application indicate that the proposed flint wall would be constructed on top of a low brick base diminishing in height as it rises up the hill, in a similar manner to that of the Old Forge in North Road.

11. In this context, I consider that although flint is not as prominent a material in Home Road as it is in North Road and parts of Middle Road it would not be wholly out of keeping with either the immediate surroundings or the rest of this part of the conservation area. This is particularly so since there is no cohesive pattern of building along Home Road.
12. The appeal property is a small house with a modest level of accommodation, and in my view, making use of the small area of land to the side would improve the living accommodation. Although the extension would not be consistent with the guidance in the SPDs in all respects, I consider that, overall, the proposal would result in an acceptable form of development in accordance with City Plan policies.
13. I conclude that the proposed extension would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area and that it would be consistent with City Plan policies QD14 and HE6 and the advice in SPD12 and SPD09.
14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

15. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council, having regard to the tests set out in the Framework. A condition detailing the plans is necessary to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and for the avoidance of doubt.
16. The Council has suggested one condition requiring the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces to match those in the existing building and another to submit a sample of flintwork. As the existing building is white painted render and the materials indicated on the plans for the external surfaces are brick and flint, these conditions are contradictory. I shall therefore impose a condition requiring details and a sample of the external materials to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Such a condition is necessary in order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR

