



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 January 2015

by Louise Phillips MA (Cantab) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 January 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/14/2228769
76 Barcombe Road, Brighton BN1 9JR

- 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 Simon Timpson against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2014/00924, dated 12 March 2014, was refused by notice dated 20 August 2014.
 - The development comprises a two storey pitched roof extension to the rear of the property. Ground floor to increase size of kitchen and provide dining area. First floor to increase size of bedroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The construction of the extension is largely complete, but the exterior requires decoration and finishing. There is a window in the third floor gable which is not shown on the proposed plans, but I am required to determine the appeal on the basis of the development applied for rather than that which has been built.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the host building.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is at the northern end of a two-storey terraced block in a road composed of similar semi-detached and terraced houses. It has a gabled, two storey projection to the front with eaves at the same height as those of the main house and a ridgeline set below that of the main roof. This design feature is common in the area.
5. The development comprises a rear extension adjacent to the boundary with No 75 to provide more kitchen/dining space beneath a larger first floor bedroom. Like the front projection, it has a gable-end design. However, the ridge is at the same height as that of the main roof and the eaves are higher, abutting the roofslope at about a metre up. This results in an awkward relationship with the roof of the existing terrace and makes the extension appear a full three storeys tall against a two-storey building. Whilst the

window openings align horizontally with those in the main rear elevation, they do not match them in terms of style. Nor indeed do they match each other.

6. Overall the extension represents an incongruous addition to the appeal property which takes no account of its scale or design, or of that of the wider terrace. I therefore conclude that it is significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the host building, contrary to Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan. Amongst other things, this requires extensions to be well designed, styled and detailed in relation to the property to be extended. I acknowledge the appellant's concern that enforcement action would be excessive now that the extension is occupied, but this is a matter for the Council which has no bearing upon my decision.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Louise Phillips

INSPECTOR