



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 April 2011

**by Sheila Holden** BSc MSc CEng TPP MICE MRTPI FCIHT

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

**Decision date: 27 April 2011**

---

**Appeal Ref: Q1445/D/11/2148450**  
**67 Valley Drive, Brighton BN1 5FF**

- 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 Glenn Jones against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
  - The application Ref BH2010/03187, dated 7 October 2010, was refused by notice dated 19 January 2011.
  - The development proposed is a side extension.
- 

### Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

### Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

3. Valley Drive is characterised by two-storey detached houses set in well-proportioned plots. No 67 is situated at the junction with Hillside Way and has a steeply sloping garden which rises in a series of terraces from its rear elevation. It has a pitched roof garage on its eastern side, which it is proposed to replace with a two-storey extension. The adjoining property in Hillside Way, No 2, is a three-storey house built on slightly higher ground. Its flank wall faces the shared boundary with No 67. Both properties are therefore in prominent positions.
  4. The side and rear garden area of No 67 can be clearly seen from the north side of Valley Drive. Views extend to the trees on the higher ground to the rear. The proposed extension would reduce the gap between No 67 and No 2 to some extent but views to the rear would still be possible. The height and bulk of the building would be increased but the proposed design would integrate satisfactorily with the host building. It would not look incongruous adjacent to the flank wall of No 2, which would still appear taller than the enlarged No 67. The additional width of the house would not look out of place in a street where there are other substantial detached dwellings. In any event it would be partially screened by mature trees, which would further reduce its visibility. Longer views up and down Valley Drive would not be affected by the proposal.
-

5. At present the side elevation of No 67 is highly visible from Hillside Way, as is the pitched roof of its garage. They can be seen on the downward approach to the junction with Valley Drive over a significant section of the street. This elevation is an attractive feature of the house, which includes windows within the tile hanging at first floor level, below which is the diminutive pitched roof of the garage. As the junction is approached the wooden garage doors, which include small windows, are also visible. These distinctive and distinguishing features contribute to the property's attractive appearance; one that makes the most of its location on a corner plot. The proposed extension would bring this elevation closer to the road, which would increase its prominence. It would also fundamentally change its appearance, which would be dominated by tile hanging and divided by the proposed new chimney. I consider the loss of the windows at first floor level, combined with the introduction of a bulky and tall brick chimney would result in the creation of a bland façade, which would be detrimental to views from the wider street scene within Hillside Way.
6. For this reason I conclude that the proposed extension would be harmful the character and appearance of the area, contrary to saved Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan, which seeks high quality design that respects its setting.
7. I appreciate that the appellant wishes to enlarge his home and has proposed an extension that, in some respects, would comply with the Council's guidance on extensions. The proposal incorporates some features that would ensure that it would integrate with and appear subservient to the host property. It would not appear cramped on its plot or in relation to the adjoining house. It would not adversely affect the street scene in Valley Drive or the amenity of neighbouring properties. However, none of these positive attributes are sufficient to set aside my concerns about the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of Hillside Way.
8. For this reason, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Sheila Holden*

INSPECTOR