



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 June 2014

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 June 2014

---

### Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/A/14/2216460

### Flat 4, 191 Eastern Road, Brighton, BN2 5BB

- 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 Stimpson against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
  - The application Ref BH2013/03818, dated 8 November 2013, was refused by notice dated 27 February 2014.
  - The development proposed is the erection of single storey rear extension to second floor level and creation of dormer and rooflight to the rear and 2no rooflights to the front.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the locality.

### Reasons

3. The appeal property is a mid terrace, 3 storey plus basement, building split into flats, it has a two storey outrigger to the rear which in part shares a pitch roof with the adjoining property. The property is pleasingly proportioned and with attractive elevations and these are reflected along the frontage of this terrace which stands prominently on Eastern Road. The locality is a mixed one of established attractive residential property generally to the south and large predominantly hospital related development to the north. The proposal is described above and would enable an appreciable increase in accommodation for the upper level flat.
4. The Eastern Road streetscene is enhanced by the generally unaltered frontage of this terrace and care needs to be taken to ensure that any change would not be a retrograde step in visual terms. Unfortunately the planned 'velux' windows would interrupt the harmony and would look awkwardly, almost randomly, positioned on the roof slope not placed relating to each other or sufficiently to the fenestration below. They would detract from the elevational qualities of the host property and the wider terrace. This would be exacerbated because the appeal property stands facing the end of the rising Eaton Place thoroughfare and so the degree of visual impact and scope of public vantage points is greater than might usually be found along the normal run of a street.

5. Turning to the rear the picture is a more mixed one. Of the five outriggers 3 have been altered over the years and the Appellant seeks to match, and attach to, the adjoining flat roofed tile hung projection which projects above and forward for about half of the outriggers length. The argument is put that this would add balance and symmetry and be beneficial to the look of the terrace as a whole. However for my part I see it as replicating and compounding a somewhat regrettable and historic extension to No. 189 and I could not condone this exacerbation in design terms and given present planning policy on this matter. The extension would bear little relationship to what lies below it, would awkwardly obscure part of the attractive pattern of rear windows found on the appeal property and would display a bulky appearance and profile quite unrelated to the upper level of this set of flats. The scheme would represent an unsatisfactory way to extend a building and there would be considerable scope from public vantage points along the rising Bristol Gate to the north west to appreciate the disfigurement.
6. The Brighton & Hove Local Plan includes Saved Policy QD14 which, amongst other matters, and in common with the Council's Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations, seeks to ensure extensions are well designed; being sympathetic to the scale, proportion and character of the original building and respectful of its setting. Given the nature of the appeal scheme, I conclude that the proposal would run contrary to these objectives.
7. I sympathise with the Appellant's wish to increase the accommodation of this property and I can see that to a considerable degree design has been led by seeking to replicate what has gone before. I note the difficulty of meeting the Means of Escape requirements for Building Control and appreciate that the Appellant would consider more conservation style rooflights. I recognise the scale of 'commercial' development which lies to the north. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
8. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered. A key objective of the Framework is to protect and enhance the qualities of the built environment and the development plan policy which I cite mirrors this.

*Overall conclusion*

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the locality. Accordingly the appeal is dismissed.

*D Cramond*

INSPECTOR