



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 April 2009

by **Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI**

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 May 2009

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/A/09/2094181/WF
82 Wilmington Way, Brighton, East Sussex, BN1 8JG.

- 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 Stephen Pert against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
- The application (Ref BH2008/01842), dated 21 May 2008, was refused by notice dated 8 August 2008.
- The development proposed is described as a single storey side extension.

Preliminary matters

1. The Appellant has submitted drawings showing 2 alternative roof designs, although they did not form part of the application determined by the Council. As such I am unable to take them into account in my consideration of this appeal, which is based purely upon the merits of the Appeal scheme.

Decision

2. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene.

Reasons

4. Whilst the site is located on a prominent corner within the street scene, the tall boundary fences and hedges give a strong sense of enclosure to the property. In addition, due to its single storey nature and the elevated positions of the 2 storey dwellings to the north, south and east, the property itself is not prominent in the street scene. Visually the property relates to the bungalows to the west rather than the dwellings in Highfield Crescent .
5. Due to its height and size the proposed flat roof would appear bulky and out of keeping with both the host property and the street scene, where it would project above the boundary hedge. It would be particularly prominent in views from the south and northeast because of the rising ground levels and would appear incongruous when viewed from the north, where it would upset the symmetry and proportions of the pair of bungalows. The situation would be exacerbated by the extension's continuation of the front building line because it would similarly upset the proportions of the host building.
6. I conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the existing building and the street scene. As such it would be contrary to policies QD1, QD2 and QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005. Amongst other things these policies seek to ensure that new development makes a positive contribution to the visual quality of the environment and that extensions are well designed in relation to the property being extended.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR

