



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2010

by **Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA**

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:
28 January 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/A/09/2110647 12 Princes Terrace, Brighton, East Sussex, BN2 5JS.

- 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 Keith Winsper against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
- The application Ref BH2009/00521, dated 2 March 2009, was refused by notice dated 7 July 2009.
- The development proposed is described as "demolition of existing garage. Erection of two storey side extension."

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issue

2. I consider that there is one main issue and that is the effect of the proposed extension on the host building and thereby the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Princes Terrace is characterised by single fronted terraced houses, mainly two storeys but some with basements. However, in direct contrast, number 12 is a detached cottage style property, which previously had a detached garage that although now removed has been recorded on record photographs provided.
4. The house, although very different in its form and appearance from its neighbours is nevertheless of a high quality well mannered design which makes a positive, interesting and valuable contribution to the streetscene. The appellant, having demolished the garage, which from the photographs appeared also as an interesting and equally well designed adjunct, proposes the erection of a two storey side extension incorporating an integral garage.
5. In respect of the front façade, the design proposes a further gable projection with a short section of linking roof. The composition, because of the second gable and the design and proportions of the new front bedroom window, suggests that the designer sought a symmetrical design solution. However, from the drawings I see that the width of the gable projection would be narrower than the existing and the ridge and eaves higher. Further, the ridge of the small linking roof would be lower than that of the host property. Even if the design approach adopted were appropriate here, which I do not consider that it is, the differences that I have identified would result in a visually jarring,

inappropriate and incompatible extension, detrimental to the architectural integrity of the host building.

6. The addition would extend through to the rear as a further gable thereby creating a relentless, bland and un-modulated side elevation. The designer has abandoned the attractive and well proportioned windows of the existing house in favour of an unrelated assortment of openings, semi-circular arch headed, semi-circular and porthole, which rather than ameliorate the visual manifestation of the side elevation would serve to reinforce its utilitarian and unattractive nature.
7. The three dimensional form of the rear elevation would appear generally appropriate, save for the higher eaves line chosen for the extension and the uncharacteristic assortment of window types and proportions proposed. Nevertheless, an extension of the size proposed would deprive the original property of its distinctive form and appearance.
8. I conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed addition would be an incongruous feature detrimental to the attractive design and form of the host property, and would appear as an unwelcome addition in the Princes Terrace streetscene.
9. Policies QD1, QD2 and QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan, in line with Government advice, require all proposals for new development, including extensions and alterations, not only to be of a high standard of design but also to make a positive contribution to the visual quality of the environment. In my judgement the proposed extension, by reason of its design, would not achieve these objectives.

Other considerations

10. The proposed extension is intended to accommodate an aged relative. Whilst I am sympathetic to the personal circumstances of the appellant, the extension and its continuing impact on the architectural integrity of the host building, as well as the character and appearance of the surrounding area, would remain long after the personal circumstances referred to have ceased to be material.
11. The appellant has drawn my attention to concerns relating to difficulties encountered in contacting the Council during what he also found to be an extended planning application phase. These considerations are not, however, relevant to my consideration of the planning merits of this appeal.

Conclusions

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including local support for the proposal, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer
INSPECTOR