



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 September 2017

by **N A Holdsworth MCD MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 2 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/17/3175600
24 Hollingbury Road, Brighton, BN1 7JA

- 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 Tony Toska against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2017/00716, dated 24 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 24 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is room in roof with rear dormer and front rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site forms part of a terrace of three storey buildings. A pitched roof spans the entirety of the terrace, interspersed with parapet walls and chimney stacks; and rising in steps with the topography of the land. Like most of the other properties that form part of the terrace, the appeal property has not been significantly altered at roof level, and retains its pitched roof form. The proposed roof extension would span almost the full width of the rear elevation of property, rising close to the ridge of the roof.
4. Because of its overall bulk and scale, together with the substantial areas of cladding and supporting structure surrounding the window, the proposed extension would not appear as a subservient addition to the roof of the host property. Very little of the original roof would remain. It would also break the prevailing uniformity of the existing roofline of the terrace, when viewed from the surrounding area. In consequence, the extension would dominate the rear roof slope of this property, appearing incongruous with the form of the existing property and those that immediately surround it.
5. The proposed development would conflict with guidance set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 12 "*Design guide for extensions and alterations*" adopted June 2013 ("SPD12"). This specifically prohibits box dormers that give the appearance of an extra storey on top of the building, as would be the case here. It also states that the supporting structure for a

dormer window should be kept to a minimum as far as possible, with no areas of cladding either side of the window or below. The proposal would fail to achieve this objective.

6. The neighbouring property and parapet wall step up with the topography of the land. Whilst this provides some screening of the dormer in views from the north, the proposed extension would still be clearly visible from other places in the surrounding area.
7. A small number of similar extensions have been constructed along other parts of the terrace, however these have not, in my view, compromised its overall integrity or uniformity when viewed from the surrounding area. Furthermore, I have no evidence to suggest that these extensions were granted planning permission recently. The appellant contends that many of the surrounding buildings are single family dwellings and considers that similar roof extensions could be constructed on these properties under permitted development rights. However, I have no convincing evidence before me that this is likely to occur. The general existence of such rights, which apply nationally, has no bearing on my consideration of the issues in this appeal which relate to a specific location and planning policy context.
8. Consequently, the proposed rear extension conflicts with saved policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan 2005 and the relevant parts of SPD12 which require that roof extensions are well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended, adjoining properties and the surrounding area. The harm relates to the overall bulk, scale and mass of the proposal and could not be overcome by the use of cladding that is a similar colour to the surrounding adjacent roof slopes. There are no material considerations that indicate an exception to these policies would be justified. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Neil Holdsworth

INSPECTOR