



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 January 2015

by **S J Papworth DipArch(Glos) RIBA**

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

Decision date: 15 January 2015

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/14/2228813**  
**58 Beatty Avenue, Brighton BN1 9EP**

- 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 P Blee against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
  - The application Ref BH2014/01483, dated 7 May 2014, was refused by the Council by notice dated 16 September 2014.
  - The development proposed is first floor side extension.
- 

### Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

### Reasons

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the streetscene. The Brighton & Hove Local Plan Policy QD2 concerns design generally and Policy QD14 on extensions and alterations requires proposals to be well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property, adjoining properties and the surrounding area. Supplementary Planning Document 12, '*Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations*', gives guidance on two storey extensions and side extensions, the latter if poorly designed can harm the appearance of the streetscene by excessive infilling of the rhythm of spaces between buildings, or by over-extending buildings in a disproportionate and unbalanced manner.
3. The appeal property is one of a pair of semi-detached two storey houses, and the other, number 56, already has a two storey side extension, although the roof design of that addition is not well integrated with that of the original building due to the use of false pitches and their truncation at the outer end. The original building displays symmetry in window arrangements, but this effect is substantially reduced by the difference in slab levels and the roof arrangement, so that the asymmetry introduced by number 56 having a two storey side extension and number 58 only a single storey one does not cause visual harm.
4. This asymmetrical arrangement, and particularly that caused by the differing roof arrangements, could allow for a successful side extension that exceeds the Design Guide principle of not being more than half the width of number 58, as the building that could be referred to in this case appears as numbers 56 and 58 combined. In addition, the appellant's view is concurred with that it would not be desirable to demolish part of the existing ground floor extension just to meet this requirement. In principle, and taking account of the separation

distance to number 60 and the forward location of the appeal property, a two storey side extension of the width proposed would not appear out of place or to overwhelm the proportions of the existing building, 56 and 58 as a whole.

5. However, the roof of the proposed extension has three unacceptable aspects to its design. Firstly, the false pitch resembles that used at number 56 and although it does not have the particularly unattractive truncated end, the perimeter pitches with a flat roofed centre area would appear poorly proportioned and out of place when seen from higher viewpoints to the north and west, and the fact of something similar being in place next door is not justification for this device being used on the appeal property.
6. Secondly, it appears to be the case from the floor plans and roof plan that the front part of the extension would be set back from that of the original house, and that the roof eaves would be similarly set back. Whilst such a device would be a welcome way of signalling the addition in plan and elevation as far as the masonry wall is concerned, and this follows the line of the existing ground floor addition, the set-back in the eaves would introduce a small area of slope remaining to the original side roof, as indicated on the elevation drawings but not as shown on the roof plan. This would appear fussy and poorly integrated with the design and layout of the original roof, where the step down on number 56 relative to 58 results in a larger slope and an attractive layout. Such a small area would risk appearing poorly detailed, needing to accommodate the ridge and valley gutter in too close a proximity.
7. Lastly, to the rear there would be a step forward of the new roof slope relative to the original roof and there is some ambiguity and uncertainty in the drawings as to how this would be resolved. This junction would be plainly seen in public views from Kenwards and risks introducing a further area of poor detailing and clashes of architectural and weathering materials.
8. In conclusion, the existing side extension to number 56 does not provide justification for a too-similar treatment at the appeal property and the resulting arrangement of roof slopes and weathering details would cause visual harm to the character and appearance of the area contrary to the aims of Development Plan policies and Design Guidance previously referred to. The proposal would not be of the standard of design sought in section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development which is indivisible from good planning and should contribute positively to making places better for people. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

*S J Papworth*

INSPECTOR