



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2018

by Patrick Whelan BA(Hons) Dip Arch MA MSc ARB RIBA RTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 July 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/W/18/3197724
132 Upper Lewes Road, Brighton BN2 3FD

- 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 Tim Squire against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2017/02505, dated 24 July 2017, was refused by notice dated 19 December 2017.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor extension at 132 Upper Lewes Road, Brighton BN2 3FD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BH2017/02505, dated 24 July 2017, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:-
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan A3 Drawing Size 1:500 and 1:1250 scale; Existing Detail A1 drawing size Scale 1:50 August 2016; Proposed Detail A1 drawing size Scale 1:50 August 2016.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the building and the rear of the terrace.

Reasons

3. The space between the long, tall terrace which contains the appeal site and the rear of the terrace opposite is short and enclosed. It has a still and intimate character, where the townscape of the back of the buildings is conspicuous, in which context the consistency and quality of its townscape is especially important.
 4. While most outriggers in this section of the street block enclosure are only one or two storeys high, there is sufficient number reaching close to the eaves of the terraces that the proposed upward extension would not appear out of place. In terms of the surrounding pattern of development, the extended outrigger would not be out of character.
-

5. In terms of its appearance, the upward extension of this outrigger would terminate well below the eaves of the terrace, maintaining the prominence and continuity of this distinctive line along the terrace. Its window proportions, materials and detailing would reflect the townscape of the surrounding elevations. The slot window opening in the main wall would be sufficiently discrete not to disrupt the fenestration across the terrace.
6. I appreciate that the Council's design guidance¹ says that roofs should respect the design of the host building and that flat roofs are generally unacceptable. However, the roofs of the outriggers within sight of this one are both flat and pitched, including those over the taller examples. Moreover, the number of full-width, flat-roofed dormer extensions on the main roofs of these terraces also have a bearing on the character of the roofscape. In the context of the surrounding roofs, which includes tall outriggers and high-level flat roofs, I can see no harm from the proposed flat roof, at this height.
7. I note the Council's point that many of the surrounding outriggers may not have planning permission. However, this does not change the bearing they now have on the character of the terrace. The outrigger is sufficiently tall and slim, and distant from the lower outrigger to one side, not to cause a harmful imbalance in the rear elevation.
8. I can identify no harm from the proposed development to the character and appearance of the building and the rear of the terrace, and no conflict with policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan which requires extensions to take account of the character of the area, and to be well designed, sited, and detailed in relation to the property, adjoining properties and the surrounding area.

Other matters

9. I have considered the effect of the extension on the adjoining openings, the closest of which is described as serving a stairway. Given the height and projection of the existing outrigger, I can see no harm from the proposed uplift to the living conditions of surrounding occupiers.

Conditions and conclusion

10. I have imposed the statutory time condition as well as conditions listing the approved drawings and requiring materials to match the existing building to provide certainty and to safeguard the appearance of the area. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Patrick Whelan

INSPECTOR

¹ Supplementary Planning Document 12, design guide for extensions and alterations, 2013