



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 June 2011

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 7 July 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/A/11/2150958

100a St Georges Road, Brighton, East Sussex, BN2 1EA.

- 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 M Burnard-Epstien against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2010/03547, dated 12 November 2010, was refused by notice dated 25 February 2011.
 - The development proposed is described as replacement of existing front window with double doors to create access to flat roof incorporating installation of steel railings to form roof terrace at first floor level (retrospective).
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the scheme on the host building and whether the scheme preserves or enhances the character or appearance of East Cliff Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The East Cliff Conservation Area is characterised by Regency and early Victorian developments arranged around a strong grid street pattern. The Appeal property occupies a prominent position within the street scene adjacent to the junction of St Georges Road, College Place and Bloomsbury Place. The proposed railings which have already been erected are particularly prominent when viewed from College Place and from the east within St Georges Road. Similarly the proposed doors have already been provided and are clearly visible from College Place.
 4. Neither the railings nor the doors respect the simple form and architectural integrity of this early Victorian property. The timber door frames fail to respect or reflect the character or appearance of the existing lightweight sash window frames and the railings add to the scale and prominence of the modest single storey side wing.
-

5. Together the railings and doors give the property an uncharacteristic cluttered appearance. The situation is exacerbated by the advertisement board on the west side of the terrace and the varied heights and means of enclosure of the adjacent roof terraces. This ignores the additional clutter that could result from the use of the terrace. Whilst the repainting of the building in a cream colour with white painted windows and black railings would improve its current appearance, it would not satisfactorily overcome the cluttered appearance resulting from the proposed development.
6. From the evidence submitted it would appear that the roof terraces to the west do not have planning permission. Notwithstanding this, due to their siting away from the road junction they are not as prominent within the street scene as the proposed railings and doors. For these reasons they do not set a precedent for allowing the proposed development.
7. Finally, whilst the proposal would benefit the occupiers of the first floor of the premises by providing outside amenity space and an emergency exit, these benefits would not outweigh the clear harm that would be caused by the proposal, both to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
8. I conclude on the main issue that the proposed railings and doors seriously and unacceptably detract from the appearance of the host building and fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of East Cliff Conservation Area. Accordingly the proposal conflicts with policies QD1, QD2, QD14 and HE6 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005. Collectively these policies seek to ensure that new additions are well designed and detailed in relation to the host property and make a positive contribution to the visual quality of the area. At the same time proposals should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area they are located within.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR