

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 January 2017

by **Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 16 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/16/3165261 8 Sefton Road, Portslade BN41 2RH

- 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 Mark Pulling against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2016/05268, dated 9 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as "Extension with dormer rooms in roof and associated alterations to existing dwelling".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for extension with dormer rooms in roof and associated alterations to existing dwelling at 8 Sefton Road, Portslade BN41 2RH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BH2016/05268, dated 9 September 2016, 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 2320/16/BP1, 2320/16/01 and 2320/16/02.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development herein permitted shall match those of the existing property.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Mark Pulling against Brighton & Hove City Council. That application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling, being one half of a pair of semi-detached single-storey dwellings, is typical of this type of property that characterises this part of Sefton Road and Beechers Road, although there is a mix of types and styles of residential properties in the wider area. I observed that many of the roofs of the properties in these streets have been extended at both front and rear with
-

- box dormers of varying sizes and some roofs have been altered from side hip to gables.
5. The Council's Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 12 seeks extensions to have a subordinate appearance to retain the integrity of the original building. This SPD advocates a set back of a minimum of 0.5m from the main frontage to achieve this. It also resists changes in roof shape from hip to gabled end on semi-detached houses where it would imbalance the pair.
 6. The building line of the extension would reflect that part of the existing frontage that is set back from the existing pitched roof front projection. I consider the proposed extension's set back from the front projection would give the appearance of a subordinate addition. Whilst the side extension would incorporate a ground floor bay window and box roof dormer, I consider the step back from the front projection to be sufficient to maintain the integrity of the original dwelling.
 7. The ridgeline would continue at the same height as the existing roof ridge and create a gabled roof to one side of this pair. The gable roof would reflect those of other side gables in the locality, notably those of the properties on the opposite side of the junction. The design of the extension is in keeping with that of the host dwelling but, I accept, it would unbalance the symmetry of this pair of semi-detached properties, both by extending to the side and by incorporating a full gable with box dormers to the front and rear. Whilst this would change the appearance of the host dwelling and the semi-detached pair, the proposal would not be significantly different to other extensions and alterations that have taken place in the area and would, therefore, not appear out of keeping in the context of the Sefton Road and Beechers Road streetscapes.
 8. SPD12 seeks dormer windows to be as small as possible and be subordinate additions to the roof and avoid large areas of cladding. Whilst the proposed rear box dormer would incorporate a wide window and external cladding, I observed that many of the properties in the surrounding area have larger rear box dormers with elements of cladding. As noted above, there are other properties that also host front box roof dormers. I therefore cannot conclude that such features within the roof slope would be out of keeping in this particular area.
 9. This pair of semi-detached properties is positioned at a splayed angle to the junction. The northern corner of the appeal property sits in line with 4 and 6 Sefton Road. The front corner of the proposed extension would project a short distance forward of this building line. Although the proposed extension would create built development to the side of this property that would be visible in the street, I do not consider that this limited projection would be overly prominent or conspicuous within this streetscene.
 10. Policy QD14 of the Lewes District Local Plan (the Local Plan) requires extensions and alteration to be well designed and sited in relation to the property to be extended and to take into account the character of the area, amongst other matters. I am not convinced, given the other examples of side roof gables and box dormers to both the front and rear of properties in the area, that the locality retains a strong sense of the original coherence of the streetscene. Whilst the side extension would differ to that of other semi-

detached properties in the area, I do not conclude that it would be an incongruous addition or that it would be substantially out of keeping with the prevailing pattern of development in the area or the character and appearance of the streetscene. Taking all relevant matters into consideration I find the proposed development acceptable in this particular case.

11. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area and, for the reasons given, would not materially conflict with Policy QD14 of the Local Plan and SPD 12.

Conditions

12. I have considered the planning conditions suggested by the Council in light of paragraph 206 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard time limit condition and in the interests of certainty it is appropriate that there is a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. A condition relating to matching materials is appropriate in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusions

13. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR

