



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 August 2014

by **Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA**

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

Decision date: 2 September 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/14/2220966

11 St Helen's Drive, Hove, East Sussex, BN3 8EA.

- 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 M Mckernan against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2014/00413, dated 7 February 2014, was refused by notice dated 4 April 2014.
 - The development proposed is described as *construction of a single storey side extension to form open plan kitchen dining room.*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host building and thereby the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The property the subject of this appeal, 11 St Helen's Drive, is a two-storey house positioned on the corner of St Helen's Drive and St Helen's Crescent. The house, which is located in a built up suburban area and developed as part of a planned estate with generous gardens, faces onto St Helen's Park a large open green space.
 4. Due to the topography of the area, its corner siting giving it two street frontages and this part of St Helen's Drive being characterised by bungalows, the house appears prominent in the street scene and the wider area.
 5. The appellant proposes a single storey extension to the north façade of the dwelling. It would be set back some distance behind the front of the house and well inside the side boundary. The proposed addition would be faced in brick to match the main house but, in contrast to the parent property, it would have a flat roof with a shallow pitched tiled fascia to both its front and rear elevations.
-

Although it is proposed to retain the boundary wall to St Helen's Crescent, the proposed extension would nevertheless be open to view from the crescent.

6. In principle I do not consider that, subject to its design and having a three-dimensional form that addressed the building's important corner plot location, a single storey extension here, even if it protruded in front of a building line projected from the properties in the crescent, would necessarily cause harm to either the host building or the surrounding area. However, due to the horizontal emphasis of the proposed design, accentuated by the width of the extension that would be greater than that of the main facade of the house, and the shallow roof form proposed, the addition would appear poorly balanced and proportioned when considered in the context of the existing house.
7. The introduction of dummy pitched fascias to either end of the addition, as designed, would, in contrast to the hipped form of the roof to the host building, result in cropped gable ends to the front and rear elevations. The triangular up-stands thus formed to the side elevation would appear as incongruous alien features exacerbated by the limited depth of the tiled fascias. The appellant has suggested that the roof design could be altered so that there was a pitched fascia to all three elevations. While it would be for the Council to consider this change in the first instance, it would not address my concerns about the three dimensional form of the addition.
8. Furthermore, in my judgement, the design has little regard to the proportions of the window openings, the ratio of void to solid or the style of the proposed windows in the context of the existing dwelling. All of these, although minor in themselves, in my opinion further serve to detract from the quality of the design of the extension and thereby its impact on the architectural integrity of the host building, the street scene and the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
9. I therefore conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed addition, due to its poor design, would cause significant visual harm to the architectural character and appearance of the host building and, by virtue of its prominent location, the street scene and wider surrounding area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the objectives of saved Policies QD1, QD2 and QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan 2005 and Brighton and Hove City Council Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document spd 12- *Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations* (Adopted 20 June 2013) as they relate to the quality of development and its impact on the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusions

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including the lack of objections from third parties identified by the appellant, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR