

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 February 2016

**by Mr Kim Bennett BSc DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 13 February 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: Q1445/D/15/3137207**  
**146 Hartington Road, Brighton BN2 3PB**

- 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 Richard White against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
  - The application Ref BH2015/02082, dated 7 June 2015, was refused by notice dated 19 October 2015.
  - The development proposed is a two storey extension to a corner plot.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises an end of terrace two storey house located on the southern side of Hartington Road and on the corner of its junction with Carisbrooke Road. Hartington Road slopes up steeply from west to east at this point, resulting in a stepped roof form to the terrace. Although there are semi-detached houses opposite, there are further terraced houses on either side of Carisbrooke Road.
4. The appellant argues that the road does not have a distinctive character in this part and that there are designs of different styles in the area. However I disagree in that the terrace of which the appeal site forms part, has a distinctive character because of the regular width of property and the manner in which the buildings are stepped in height to take account of changing road levels. Such an arrangement creates a pleasing and regular rhythm in the street scene. That rhythm would be disrupted by a much larger width frontage to the property than its neighbours, and the stepping down in height of the extension roof. The design approach to extend the existing bay window feature would not overcome that concern in my view.
5. The lower height roof would be caused by the limited depth of the proposed extension and the irregular building footprint, the side boundary of which would be hard against the side boundary of the site. This would lead a visually

awkward arrangement of built form particularly when viewed from Carisbrooke Road where the rear of the property is clearly visible. Furthermore, the extension would also be clearly visible when approaching from the east, and the combination of discordant elements would be at odds with the regular rhythm of the terrace and cause visual harm in the street scene.

6. Whilst I acknowledge that there is no requirement for a regimented roofline, the proposed arrangement would, in my view, detract from the pleasing and stepped character of the existing terrace. The fact that the side area is relatively unused space is not a good reason to allow a development that would be unacceptable in other respects. Similarly, the reference to the development to the east of the site at No 53 Carisbrooke Road, clearly illustrates the disruptive harm to the architectural rhythm of the street that has been caused in that instance and is not therefore a good reason to allow a proposal which would create further visual harm.
7. I note that the Council raise no objections from an amenity point of view and I see no reason to come to a different view.
8. For the above reasons, the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove City Plan 2005 and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document – design guide for extensions and alterations, in that it would not be well designed in relation to the property to be extended or to adjoining properties, and the roof form would not complement the main building. Accordingly the appeal should be dismissed.

*Kim Bennett*

INSPECTOR