



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2017

**by Timothy C King (BA Hons) MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 9 February 2017**

---

### **Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/16/3163954**

#### **11 Beechers Road, Portslade, BN41 2RG**

- 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 Mike Byford against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
  - The application Ref BH2016/03018, dated 10 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 November 2016.
  - The development proposed is '*ground and first floor rear extension.*'
- 

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a ground and first floor rear extension at 11 Beechers Road, Portslade, BN41 2RG in accordance with the terms of the application Ref BH2016/03018, dated 10 August 2016, 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: Drawing Nos. PL 01, PL 02, PL 03, PL 06 and PL 07.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

### **Main Issue**

2. The main issue is the proposal's effect on the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and its surrounding area.

### **Reasons**

3. The appeal dwelling is a semi-detached bungalow with dormer windows to the front and rear. A ground floor extension of only partial width also exists along with a modest conservatory-type addition running along the common boundary with No 9, the immediate neighbour. The smaller conservatory is also partial width and the proposal would effectively square-off what is currently a disjointed rear elevation, involving the creation of an extension with a centrally ridged-roof that would peak at the ridge height of the bungalow itself. Providing the bungalow with additional floorspace at both ground and first floor
-

levels its two roof planes would, respectively, part obscure the rear dormer structure and also follow the angle of pitch, projecting the hip-line of the bungalow's existing flank roof. The extension would not be readily visible from the street.

4. Policy QD14 of the Council's Local Plan (LP) requires, amongst other things, that extensions are of good design, relating well to the host dwelling. More specific advice is provided by the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations' (SPD12) which, for developments such as this, stipulates that the roof's form and pitch should match that of the building being extended. As mentioned, the latter proviso is satisfied whilst, of particular importance, the proposal would serve to provide some cohesion to the piecemeal, add-on extensions that exist to the rear of the bungalow. As such, it would perform an integrating function.
5. As a consequence of the proposal the current prominence of the rear dormer extension would be lessened and the conservatory's width would also be reduced. Further, I consider that the proposed extension's design would be pleasing to the eye and, whilst it would add bulk to the bungalow's depth, its form and positioning would not aggravate the already significant imbalance between the appeal dwelling and No 9, its semi-detached neighbour. On the contrary, to my mind, the proposal would represent a visual improvement and, given that neither the existing bungalow nor the surrounding character would be adversely affected, I consider that it would constitute an appropriate form of development in the circumstances.
6. I conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of either the host dwelling or its surrounding area, and there would be no material conflict with the aims of LP Policy QD14 nor relevant advice within SPD12.
7. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal succeeds. In terms of conditions, to ensure a satisfactory appearance I impose a requirement that the extension be built using external materials to match that of the bungalow. Also, in the interests of certainty, I impose a condition requiring that the development be built in accordance with the approved plans.

*Timothy C King*

INSPECTOR