

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 February 2017

**by Kenneth Stone BSc Hons DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 21 February 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/17/3166416**  
**33 Roedean Road, Brighton BN2 5RA**

- 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 Yuri Gupta against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
  - The application Ref BH2016/05112, dated 25 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 November 2016.
  - The development proposed is described as 'Rear extension with terrace at ground floor level and balconies at the first and second floors, excavation in the rear garden to enlarge existing garage, hip to gable roof extension with insertion of front rooflights and creation of rear dormer, alterations to fenestration and associated works'.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural matter

2. The description of development is taken from the application form. This varies from that used by the Council in its decision notice in form but not in substance. The description of development adequately describes the proposed development.

### Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

### Reasons

4. The appeal property is a large detached two storey house with a hipped roof. It is located on Roedean Road, but the rear garden has access onto The Cliff, a small cul-de-sac to the rear. The land rises steeply from south to north such that the garage which is at the street level of The Cliff is below the ground level for the house. The surrounding area incorporates a variety of house styles and designs including two substantial Art Deco style houses.
  5. The proposed rear extensions would include additional space in an area excavated between the existing garage and the house. This would be primarily below ground level, a small projection for the music room projecting above the existing ground level, and would not be readily visible in the surrounding area or the street of The Cliff. This would have no discernible impact on the character and appearance of the property or the wider area.
-

6. The above ground extensions at ground and first floor level would result in modest additions to the rear of the property, 2.8m at ground floor level and enclosing existing glazed areas at first floor level. These would not substantially add to the bulk and mass of the property and be in-keeping with the scale of the existing house. The introduction of glazed screens and balcony features accessed from these areas would be visible from the surrounding area but balconies are a feature of many of the properties in the surrounding area and in my view they would not appear out of keeping. The proposals would result in a more ordered and plain elevation however this is not unattractive and would not materially harm the character and appearance of the existing property or the wider area. Moreover, any elevational detail that would be removed as a result of the proposals is not of such merit as to warrant the refusal of the appeal.
7. The proposed roof alterations change the profile of the roof from a hipped roof to one with a single ridge and gable ends. The Council do not object to this and I agree that the change in the roof shape is not of such significance given the variation in roof forms and styles in the area. The proposed rear dormer structure is however a large, bulky and dominant feature on the rear roof slope of the property. Whilst there are insets from the side of the extended roof these are narrow in comparison to the width of the proposed dormer feature. The height of the proposed dormer would accommodate the majority of the height of the roof; there would be little set down from the ridge or practical set up from the eaves. The dormer would be excessively heavy in appearance given the wide areas of solid structure to the sides of the window areas. In these regards the proposal conflicts with the advice in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 12 Design Guide for extensions and alterations (SPD 12), in respect of dormer windows. The proposed dormer would therefore appear out of keeping and materially harm the appearance of the existing property and the wider area.
8. I did note that there were other dormer structures in the locality however none were of the scale and dimensions as that proposed in the context of this appeal. The house sits at one of the highest points in the road and whilst balconies are a feature of many of the properties in the area these are primarily located below roof level. The balcony element proposed at roof level would add to the incongruous appearance of the dormer and to its appearance as an additional storey rather than a subservient feature set within the roof slope, further compounding the alien appearance of this part of the proposals.
9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposed development would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. Consequently it would conflict with policy QD14 in the Brighton and Hove Local Plan (retained Policies March 2016) and the guidance in SPD12 which collectively seek to ensure extensions and alterations are well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended.

### **Conclusions**

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

*Kenneth Stone*

INSPECTOR