



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 May 2013

**by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 23 May 2013**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/13/2195443**  
**49 Glebe Villas, Hove, East Sussex BN3 5SL**

- 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 & Mrs Cottrell against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
  - The application Ref BH2012/03150, dated 25 September 2012, was refused by notice dated 22 February 2013.
  - The development proposed is single-storey rear extension, first floor side extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

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

## Reasons

3. The proposed side extension would replace an existing single-storey lean-to projection. The appellants argue that the existing gap of around 0.6m between the appeal property and No 51 would be appropriately maintained. However, in my view the existing separation at first floor level plays an important role for providing an individual detached setting for both neighbouring properties, which are clearly distinct from each other in terms of their architecture and appearance.
4. Despite the proposed side extension's recessed position and lower ridge in relation to the main part of the dwelling, it would fill the majority of the space between the properties at first floor level. As a result, both buildings would sit uncomfortably close to each other such that, regardless of the extension's hipped roof, I find that their relationship would appear awkward and incongruous within the street scene. In addition, whilst the properties would not be physically attached and regardless of their different styles, their close proximity would create the impression of a terracing effect when viewed along Glebe Villas with the nominal gap between them only evident when seen directly 'head-on'.

5. I recognise that there is a variety of gap sizes between properties along Glebe Villas. However, these largely reflect the different groups of property types that exist along its length. Furthermore, in the vast majority of cases I saw that adjoining dwellings, regardless of their form, sat comfortably next to each other, maintaining an appropriate rhythm to the street scene with only the odd exception where, in the past, 2-storey side extensions had been constructed uncharacteristically close to their neighbour.
6. I have noted that planning permission had been given for a similar side extension to the appeal property in 2002 (Ref BH2002/02837/FP) although it was never implemented and has now lapsed. The appellants have argued that the Council's past policy for house extensions was similar. Be that as it may, for the reasons I have given it is clear that the proposal would conflict with part c. to Policy QD14 *Extensions and alterations* of the currently adopted Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005 by failing to take proper account of the existing space around the building or by maintaining an appropriate gap between the extension and the joint boundary to No 51. In this regard it would also fail to display the high quality of design that is required by one of the core planning principles of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
7. Overall therefore I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene. Accordingly, and having regard to all other matters raised, including the absence of objections from any local residents, the appeal is dismissed.

*John D Allan*

INSPECTOR