



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 November 2018

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th December 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/18/3211155

12 Wolverstone Drive, Brighton, East Sussex, BN1 7FB.

- 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 Petley against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2018/01232, dated 29 March 2018, was refused by notice dated 27 July 2018.
 - The development proposed is described as *extension to the front of a domestic property. A single storey extension with a lean-to style roof. The extension is to create a porch/entrance area on the front of the property.*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the host property, the terrace and thereby the street scene.

Reasons

3. The property the subject of this appeal, 12 Wolverstone Drive, is a two-storey terraced dwelling. It is the last but one in the terrace. Due to the topography of the area the terrace of seven houses is located below road level.
4. Number 2, the first dwelling in the terrace, is faced in brick, set slightly forward of numbers 4 to 14 and is gable end on to the road. Numbers 4 to 14, in contrast, are finished in painted render and set face on to the road. The properties in the terrace are characterized by the proportion of void to solid, shallow first floor windows set tight up to the eaves and the flat concrete projecting canopies over the front doors that are grouped in pairs. In addition, due to the lack of projections to the street elevation, the terrace maintains a characteristically strong defined uninterrupted building line.
5. I noted on the occasion of my visit that the principal facades of the houses in the terrace, although painted in different colours, have not been altered to any significant extent.
6. The appellant proposes building a 3.750 metre wide x 1.500 metre deep enclosed porch with a lean-to roof. In itself the proposed porch would be of a simple well mannered design and would be constructed of matching materials

to reflect those of the host property. However, it would result here in the loss of the symmetry of the pairs of front doors, serving this and the neighbouring dwelling, as well as the projecting canopy to the host property, both features of the design of the original terrace. Accordingly, it would compete with the other architectural features of the terrace.

7. Further, by reason of the size of the porch and the design of the terrace that has very limited modelling to the street facades, the porch, despite being set below road level, would disrupt the continuity of the terrace and therefore appear as a prominent discordant feature in the street scene. In these respects the proposal would be contrary to the guidance at paragraph 3.3 of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document –*spd 12-design guidance for extensions and alterations* (Adopted 20 June 2013) (SPD12).
8. I appreciate there may be examples of similar developments elsewhere locally. Whatever the background to those other extensions, I have considered this proposal in the context of the development before me. Further, I accept that in time the dwellings may be altered, possibly through the permitted development regime. However, there is no guarantee that this would be the case and at this time the terrace remains largely as originally designed and built.
9. In reaching my conclusion I have been mindful of the fact that a porch of the size proposed would enhance the appellant's home to meet the needs of his growing family. However, I do not consider that, in this case this consideration outweighs the harm to the dwelling and the terrace that I have identified that would result if the proposal were to go ahead.
10. I therefore conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed development would cause harm to the host property, the terrace and the street scene. It would therefore be contrary to saved Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan 2005 (Adopted July 2005), Policy CP12 of the Brighton and Hove City Council's Development Plan-*Brighton and Hove City Plan Part One* (Adopted March 2016) and SPD12 as they seek well designed, sited and detailed extensions and alterations in relation to the host property and the surrounding area.

Conclusions

11. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR