



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 July 2017

**by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 28 July 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/W/17/3169671**

**45 Glen Rise, Brighton BN1 5LN**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Robin Lloyd against Brighton & Hove City Council.
  - The application Ref BH2016/03032, is dated 23 July 2015.
  - The development proposed is the conversion of single storey bungalow into a two storey house.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission for the conversion of single storey bungalow into two storey house is refused.

### Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of the proposed development from the planning application form but I note that the appellant has replaced this with a fuller version on the appeal form. The revised description describes the proposed development as the remodelling of the existing bungalow incorporating roof extension and raised ridge height to enable creation of first floor level, erection of single storey rear and side extensions and associated works. These are reflected on the submitted plans. I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.

### Main Issue

3. This appeal has been lodged following the Council's failure to determine the application. The Council in its appeal statement indicate that the proposed development fails to respond to the character and appearance of the adjacent properties and surrounding streetscene and considers the proposal to be contrary to Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan (the Local Plan) and Policy CP12 of the City Plan Part One.
4. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

5. The appeal property is located at the junction of Glen Rise and Millcroft and has a splayed position to the junction. The existing development in the locality comprises hipped or gabled roofed detached bungalows, although there are two-storey dwellings to the opposite side of Glen Rise and in the wider area.

Whilst many of the bungalows have converted their roof space to living accommodation by creating dormers or roof extensions, the dwellings are low rise with low eaves and ridge heights and retain their pitched roofs. The dwellings maintain the characteristics of modestly sized bungalows and this forms the prevailing character of the existing development in the area and the appearance of the streetscene in which the appeal property is located.

6. The proposed extension would add a full first storey raising the height of the eaves and ridge substantially above that of the dwellings either side and those in the street. The increased depth of the dwelling would add considerable bulk to the building at first floor and to the roof. In addition, the flat roof design of part of the proposed roof would not reflect the roofscapes in this area.
7. Despite the property's non-linear positioning in relation to neighbouring properties, the extension to this dwelling would be markedly out of keeping within this streetscene and, as a result, would be harmful to the visual appearance of the area. It would also create an overdeveloped appearance due to the substantial increase in size of the building compared to that of the bungalows in the area. The increased height and mass of the extended dwelling would be extremely prevalent in views from the surrounding public highways and to adjoining neighbouring occupiers. Furthermore, given the substantial increase in height and size of the dwelling to the rear, this harm would be notable in the outlook from the adjoining neighbours' properties and their back gardens. Although existing landscaping within the appeal site would lessen the visual impact to some adjoining occupiers, the development would be particularly noticeable to the occupiers directly to the rear of the site.
8. The Council is also concerned that the multiple extensions at ground floor set independently of one another would result in a disconnected overdeveloped appearance. However, the proposed garage would be a modest addition to the side and the property and the existing side extension and proposed single storey rear extension would be set within the existing boundaries of the site. These would not be appreciably apparent in public views or in the outlook of adjoining occupiers. However, given my concerns set out in the preceding paragraph I consider the proposal remains unacceptable.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would be in conflict with Policy QD14 of the Local Plan and Policy CP12 of the City Plan Part One, which seek extensions and alterations to existing buildings to be well designed in relation to the property to be extended and to take into account the character of the area, amongst other matters.
10. A number of nearby residents raise a series of other concerns about the proposal but in view of my conclusions on the main issue there is no need for me to address these in the current decision.

## **Conclusions**

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Nicola Davies*

INSPECTOR