



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 January 2017

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

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

Decision date: 09 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/16/3162704

30 Chorley Avenue, Brighton, East Sussex, BN2 8AQ.

- 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 Naeem Khalid against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2016/02023, dated 2 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as a single storey flat roof rear and single storey side extension (part retrospective).
-

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 property.

Reasons

3. The property the subject of this appeal, number 30 Chorley Avenue, is a detached dwelling located on a site that falls from front to rear. Due to the topography, the house appears as part single/part two-storey dwelling when viewed from the street and three-storey from the rear garden. It has a single storey flat roofed outshot to the rear that provides accommodation at the existing ground floor level.
4. Due to the three-storey form of the rear of the existing house, previous alterations, and the design, spacing and alignment of the windows, the rear elevation has a poorly proportioned pattern of fenestration. This, together with the mix of cladding materials used, including face brickwork, painted render and plastic-cladding panels, has resulted in a visually incoherent and somewhat cluttered and unattractive existing rear elevation.
5. The appellant proposes the construction of a single storey rear extension at lower ground floor level. It would be served by a covered link from the ground floor back door of the house. The link, built on the line of the dwelling's boundary to number 28, would have a partly sloping roof to reflect the change in ground level. The roof of the single storey rear addition would be set lower than that of the existing outshot so that the existing ground floor windows to bedroom 1, bedroom 3 and the adjacent bathroom could be retained.

6. In my judgement, despite the difference in the roof levels of the two single storey rear extensions and the sloping roof of the link, the three dimensional form and massing of the house as extended would be acceptable. Further, the designer's proposed use of painted render for the new extension would help to bring some simplification and clarity to the overall appearance of the rear elevation. Accordingly, in this case, I am not persuaded that the proposed layout, which would result in the extension projecting around to the side elevation and along the southern boundary, would necessarily relate poorly to the host building as suggested by the Council.
7. However, the introduction of additional randomly sized, placed and unaligned windows in an existing already cluttered and badly proportioned rear elevation would serve to cause further harm to the architectural integrity of the host property. In my judgement, on balance, this harm is a compelling objection to the proposal.
8. I therefore conclude, in respect of the main issue, that the extension, as designed, would cause harm to the architectural integrity of the host property. It would therefore not accord with Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan 2005 and the guidance within Supplementary Planning Document spd 12-*design guide for extensions and alterations* (adopted 20 June 2013) as they relate to the quality of development.

Conclusions

9. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposal is not in accordance with the development plan, when read as a whole, and that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR