



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2017

by **S J Papworth DipArch(Glos) RIBA**

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

Decision date: 24th July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/17/3173607

26 Newlands Road, Rottingdean, Brighton BN2 7GD

- 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 D Harding against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2017/00340, dated 1 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 7 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is proposed minor amendments to BH2016/03024, including alterations to northern gable, driveway and fenestration.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the Newlands Road area of Rottingdean.

Reasons

Preliminary

3. The description of development set out in the bullet point above is that provided by the appellant. Permission was granted on 21 October 2016 for alterations and extensions to the existing dwelling including removal of existing detached store room and conservatory, erection of two storey front extension, erection of part single, part two storey rear extension and insertion of 8no rooflights and raising the roof, and that is the permission reference BH2016/03024 listed above.
4. The Council states that this permission resulted from pre-application advice to remove certain aspects of the then proposal, and they further state that it is the re-introduction of some of these items that, together with the approved development, forms the basis of the current proposal. The Council describe the proposal as '*Alterations and extensions to existing dwelling including removal of existing detached store room and conservatory, erection of two storey front extension, erection of part single, part two storey rear and side extension, raising of roof ridge height and alterations to northern gable, creation of 1no front balcony, 2no Juliet balconies and insertion of 8no rooflights, widening of existing driveway and associated landscaping with revised fenestration and other associated works*'. Nothing turns on the difference in description

employed as the difference in the proposed development is clear from the submitted drawings.

Policy

5. Policy CP12 of the Brighton and Hove City Plan Part One on urban design sets out criteria that all new developments are to follow. Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan requires extensions and alterations to be well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended, adjoining properties and to the surrounding area; to not result in significant noise disturbance or loss of privacy, outlook, daylight/sunlight or amenity to neighbouring properties; to take account of the existing space around buildings and the character of the area and ensure that an appropriate gap is retained between the extension and the joint boundary to prevent a terracing effect where this would be detrimental to the character of the area; and to use materials sympathetic to the parent building.
6. Paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment; good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people. Paragraph 60 states that planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.

Character and Appearance

7. Newlands Road is mainly developed as a line of dwellings along the east side, facing open land and across the valley in which the older parts of Rottingdean are situated, to the rising ground and the downs towards Brighton. There is considerable variety along the road and that continues on the coast road to the south and with the older dwellings on Steyning Road to the north. With the exception of the large care home on the corner with the latter road, dwellings are on reasonably regular plot sizes and occupy much of the plot width, but the variety in roof slopes and front wall lines prevents any terracing effect or feeling of over-development.
8. Planning approval BH2016/03024 provided for a significant increase in the size of the 'original' house, evident by comparison of drawings 06B and 07A of the pre-existing house with the submitted drawing 15H as being the approved front and south-side elevations, and the red dotted line on proposed plans 10M and 11K. That line shows the approval as being for a north projection set in from that approved to the south and the approved front elevation contains a south gable while the set-back north projection would have a flat roof.
9. That arrangement would give a pleasant articulation of the front elevation when seen from oblique angles along the road from either direction and would relate well to the arrangement at number 28 where the building line at the ground floor front steps back at the side of a first floor balcony with the roof line further to the rear.
10. The appeal proposal would bring the front north projection forward to the line of the approved south one and add a gable end and window identical to that on

the south projection. The recessed area between would have a flat roof and balustrade accessible from the 'loft' rooms either side, replacing the approved double-height void and flat roof only at a more recessed location. This accessible balcony does not in itself cause harm with regards to privacy, due to the open land in front, but without the north projecting gable, would risk appearing intrusive on the roofline with the possibility of domestic paraphernalia being left there.

11. The second gable at the same front line as the approved one would introduce a symmetrical arrangement about the entrance door, a feature that does not appear to a great extent along the road and one that would emphasise the bulk of the proposed building. There are two gables adjoining each other at number 24 to the south, but here there is also the 'catslide' roof to take away the symmetry and to introduce an attractive articulation of planes and heights. Similar devices to break up the bulk of built form have been employed elsewhere. The north gable would not relate well to the neighbouring dwelling at number 28, appearing to dominate its south-west corner in views along the road from the south, particularly above the flank wall to the balcony of that adjoining dwelling, which steps back.
12. To conclude, the arrangement along the front as presently permitted would retain the articulation and variety of the 'original' house shown on drawing 07A and would address similar variety along the road in a successful way, whilst allowing a significant increase in the accommodation provided. The further projection, floor level, pitched gable roof and balcony would provide additional accommodation but this does not justify the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the Newlands Road area of Rottingdean.
13. The proposed further works would be contrary to the requirements of Policy QD14 in relation to the property to be extended, adjoining properties and the surrounding area, and would not result in urban design of the standard sought in Policy CP12 or the Framework. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

S J Papworth

INSPECTOR

