



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 February 2009

By David J Rose BScEcon MA HonMRTPI

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

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

**Decision date:
11 March 2009**

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/A/08/2090808

281 Old Shoreham Road, Portslade, Brighton BN41 1XS

- 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 Glen Doney against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
- The application Ref BH2008/02144, dated 17 June 2008, was refused by notice dated 12 November 2008.
- The development proposed is a two storey extension at the side.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

2. This is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached house fronting to Old Shoreham Road, on the junction with the A293 and with a flank elevation to Links Road. To the front, the property has a symmetrical appearance with the main entrance door to its centre. It is a prominent building, particularly when approached from the A293.
4. The proposal is to erect a two storey extension on the east elevation towards Links Road. The extension would be just over 3m wide and of the same depth as the host property and not set back from the front elevation. The existing pitched roof would be extended with tiles to match.
5. I consider that the dwelling would lose its sense of symmetry with the front door no longer being centrally positioned, as there would be one set of windows on each floor to the right (west) when viewed from the front and two sets to the left (east). Additionally, it is proposed to remove the chimney on the Links Road elevation whilst retaining that to the west. In my view, the proposals would unbalance the look of the property from the front and the effects on the character and appearance of the street scene would be highly visible.
6. To the rear, the property does not currently have the symmetry that it has to the front, and it faces towards the side gardens of properties in Links Road. I am therefore content that the effects of the proposal to the rear are limited. However on the east side elevation, towards Links Road, the proposal would lead to the loss of some of the side garden. The front elevations of the houses on that side of Links

Road are set back further from the street than is the existing side elevation of the appeal property. The proposal would therefore result in the appeal property being closer to Links Road and so more prominent on that street, particularly when viewed approaching towards Old Shoreham Road.

7. I conclude that the proposal would result in this prominent building losing the distinctive symmetry which is a key feature of the local street scene and lead to a building that had an over-extended appearance. The adverse effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the streetscene would be contrary to the high standard of design sought by Policy QD1 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005 (the Local Plan) and the proposal also fails to take into account the local characteristics sought by Local Plan Policy QD2.

Other matters

8. I have noted that the roof and fenestration proposed are of the same design and materials as the host property. Furthermore, there would be no adverse effects upon the daylight/sunlight received or the privacy and outlook enjoyed by the occupiers of the adjoining property, 279 Old Shoreham Road. There would also be no such adverse impacts to the adjoining property in Links Road. Additionally, the impacts to 289 Old Shoreham Road, on the opposite side of Links Road, would also be minimal. Nevertheless, the proposal fails to meet the test of being well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended, as sought by Local Plan Policy QD14.

Conclusion

9. I therefore conclude for the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised that the appeal should be dismissed.

David J Rose
INSPECTOR