



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 March 2025

by **JJ Packman MPlan MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/25/3359139

76 Eldred Avenue, Brighton, BN1 5EH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Allen-Reynolds against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council
 - The application Ref is BH2024/02095.
 - The development proposed is New roof over 76 Eldred Avenue, including hip to gable front and back, raised ridgeline and new side dormer. New porch roof at ground floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue(s)

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the adjoining property, and the wider streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached dwelling situated on Eldred Avenue. The dwelling forms one of a joint pair of dwellings constructed at different levels to account for the gradient of the road. The level difference between the two properties is pronounced and has necessitated a split-level roof design, giving the houses a quirky but charismatic appearance. The appeal property is the higher of the pair and appears slightly more prominent within the streetscene.
4. The design of the appeal dwelling is not unique; a number of similar dwellings can be found on both sides of Eldred Avenue, both up and down the road. The properties that flank either side of the appeal property are of differing designs.
5. Whilst many of the surrounding properties appear to have been subject to changes over time, there remains a general uniformity to the character of the houses on this part of Eldred Avenue. Properties situated between the parade of shops at the bottom of the hill and where the hill begins to level out share some general characteristics in terms of age, massing, style and materials. Where properties have been altered, the changes have been mostly sympathetic. I noted at the site visit that there are a number of properties that have received 'hip to gable' roof conversions with rear dormer windows. The conversions I saw had the gable end perpendicular to the road.
6. The appeal scheme proposes the conversion of the current hipped roof arrangement to a gable end roof. In this case, it is proposed that the gable ends will

face the front and rear of the property, with a new dormer projecting from the side elevation. The proposal will also involve raising the ridge height of the property and the installation of an array of PV panels.

7. The combination of both raising the ridge height and introducing gable ends to the front and rear of the property will result in a highly conspicuous addition. Whilst the host dwelling already appears slightly 'unbalanced' as a result of it being situated at a higher level, the proposed changes will further accentuate the level differences in a harmful way. The gable frontage will appear jarring in its own right, and overbearing and un-neighbourly in the context of the adjoining lower dwelling. The adverse impact of the proposal will also be apparent in the wider streetscene, where it will disrupt the general uniformity present on this part of Eldred Avenue.
8. I find that the proposal is poorly scaled and designed in relation to the adjoining property and the surrounding area, and that it does not demonstrate a high standard of design overall. For these reasons, the proposal is contrary to Policies DM18 and DM21, as well as SPD12 Design guide for extensions and alternations.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

JJ Packman

INSPECTOR