



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2022

by Robin Buchanan BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/22/3306483

14A Petworth Road, Brighton BN1 8LQ

- 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 Chinchin against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2022/01894, dated 10 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 5 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is ground floor front / first floor side extension and alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council adopted the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part Two (CPP2) on 22 October 2022. It replaced Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005 listed in the Council's reason for refusal. The main parties were invited to comment on the relevant CPP2 Policy DM21. I have taken comments received into account in my decision and give full weight to this policy.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed first floor side extension on the character and appearance of No.14A Petworth Road and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. No.14A Petworth Road is a modest sized end-of-terrace house. It was originally built as side extensions to No.14 Petworth Road, which was a semi-detached house and is now a mid-terrace house. The two-storey part of No.14A has a hipped roof and to the side it is single-storey with a flat roof. It is similar in these respects to all bar one¹ of the other similar semi-detached houses in a row along one side of this road. This stepped sequence in the height of alternating built form and high level gaps between is locally distinctive.
5. The first floor side extension (extension) would stretch across almost the entire width of the single-storey part of No.14A, on the same plane as the two-storey part of this house. The eave and ridge heights would match the existing hipped roof. This would obliterate any semblance of the lower flat roofed part of No.14A and manifestly alter the intrinsic form of this house, rendering it out of keeping in these regards with itself and this row of houses.

¹ No.6 Petworth Road

6. There is some variation in the separation distances between some of these houses and the resulting gap at first floor level between No.14A and the opposing two-storey part of No.12 Petworth Road would be comparable to the narrowest of these. However, the significant additional bulk and massing of built form projecting to the side of No.14A at first floor level, taken with the previous sideways enlargement of No.14, would have an undesirable terracing effect at odds with the generally more open arrangement between these houses. This would be conspicuous in public views from both directions in Petworth Road and incongruous in this streetscene.
7. External materials would match No.14A but this would not overcome the unsympathetic change to its design or the disruption to the continuity and rhythm of built form and spatial separation at first floor level along this part of the road. Even if building over the flat roof part of No.14A resulted in a more cohesive house design, it would not be appropriate in this particular case.
8. The first floor part of a side extension at No.6 Petworth Road appears to be similar in width to the extension. However, it is set back behind the front elevation of that house, is narrow in depth and the roof is well below the main ridge. Its restricted bulk and massing has a subservient presence and a single-storey flat roofed part on the side maintains a counterbalance with the opposing single-storey part of No.4 Petworth Road. As such, it is not comparable to the extension and this solitary exception does not set a welcome precedent.
9. Accordingly, there would be significant harm to the character and appearance of No.14A Petworth Road and to the surrounding area. Consequently, the extension would conflict with Policy CP12 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One and with CPP2 Policy DM21. These policies require extensions and alterations to be well designed and scaled in relation to the host property, adjoining properties and the existing character of the area.

Other Matters

10. Enlargement of No.14A to provide additional living accommodation would be aligned with objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework to meet housing needs. The proposal would also resolve some internal impracticalities in the use of No.14A as a house arising from how it was established. However, the Framework also refers to well-designed and distinctive places to live as a key objective of sustainable development.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

11. The proposed development would not accord with the development plan. There are no other material considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons given above the appeal does not succeed.

Robin Buchanan

INSPECTOR