

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2016

by AJ Steen BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 5 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/16/3160023

42 Tongdean Road, Hove BN3 6QE

- 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 Matthew Simpkin against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2016/02473, dated 1 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is rooms in the roof, raise the roof and extend the ridge to form gable with glazed Juliet balcony. Single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed roof extension on the character and appearance of the existing building.

Reasons

3. Tongdean Road rises steeply up the hill and comprises detached houses of similar character, although a variety of designs. These houses are of similar size with similar pitches to their roofs such that the ridges of the hipped roofs step in a gradual, if not wholly uniform, progression up the hill.
 4. The proposal would provide a steeper pitch to the roof, with a higher ridge and greater depth over the existing flat roofed section and to the proposed gable end at the rear which results in a much greater bulk to the roof of the house. That greater bulk would be visible in the approach up the hill as well as from surrounding properties and gardens. In addition, the height of the proposed roof would affect the rhythm of the ridges as they step up the slope of the hill and increase the prominence of the proposed development. The proposed extensions to the roof would alter the proportion of roof to the remainder of the dwelling, which presently reflects that of surrounding houses. As a result, the proposed increase in height, depth and bulk of the proposed roof would appear incongruous and dominate the existing dwelling.
 5. I note that other houses in the street have significant areas of roof, including feature gable ends and large roof planes that extend down to the ground floor facades, similar to the steep pitched roof above the garage of 42 Tongdean
-

- Road. However, these are not as prominent as they have a similar pitch that ensures they retain the gradual progression up the hill.
6. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed roof extension would harm the character and appearance of the existing building, contrary to Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan that seek to ensure that extensions and alterations to existing building, including the formation of rooms in the roof, are well designed in relation to the property to be extended.
 7. I understand that the proposed development follows an earlier refusal for roof extensions comprising dormer windows to either side of the dwelling and the present scheme seeks to overcome the earlier reasons for refusal. I have been provided with limited details of that scheme and, in any event, I need to consider the current proposal on its individual merits.
 8. The Council have not identified any harm from the proposed single storey extension to the side of the property and I see no reason to disagree with their conclusions on this matter.
 9. On the basis of the above considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

AJ Steen

INSPECTOR