



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2017

by N A Holdsworth MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 6th November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/17/3180220

60 Hangleton Way, Hove, BN3 8EQ

- 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 and Mrs Bennett against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2017/01483, dated 2 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 4 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is double storey rear extension and extended terrace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building.

Reasons

3. The existing building is characterised by steep pitched roofs, with prominent gable walls facing the front and side elevations. I consider that these roof structures, which enclose the first floor of the building, define its appearance in relation to its surroundings. The footprint of the building is intrinsically linked to its roof, as the roof structures rise above its eaves which sit immediately above ground floor level. As such, the existing building appears as a complete composition, which is clearly apparent in views from both the front and rear of the property.
4. The full width ground floor rear extension would project significantly beyond the main rear elevation and would rise above the existing eaves. In combination with the first floor extension situated on top of it, it would have the effect of isolating the original steep pitched roofs within a complex of flat roof structures, above a significantly enlarged building footprint. In my view this would fundamentally compromise the role of the steep pitched roofs and gable walls in defining the appearance of the building; leading to the creation of an extended building with a sprawling appearance and no unifying design concept.
5. There is an existing first floor extension found to the front of the building, projecting forward from the roofline and comprising two separate areas of flat roof. Whilst this may have departed from the original architectural form of the

building, the areas of flat roof are comparatively small, and the structure appears visually subservient to the pitched roofs that surround it. The existing dormer window to the rear of the building is also of a scale that appears subservient to the form of the main roof. The projecting bay to the lounge on the ground floor rear elevation and its associated area of flat roof does not have any significant effect on the architectural form of the building. These existing elements of the building have not significantly changed the footprint of the property or compromised its overall appearance, to the same extent that would cumulatively occur under the proposed development.

6. The appellant contends that the proposal complies with the design principles set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 12 "*Design guide for extensions and alterations*" ("SPD12") and I have taken into account the points raised in this regard. However, the guidance provided within this document cannot foresee every possible scenario where a building may be extended. Any proposal to alter or extend a building must also take account of the original design of the building and its setting. For the reasons set out above, I consider that the proposed extensions would fail to have a satisfactory relationship with the host building. As such, compliance with design principles set out in SPD12 does not provide a justification for the proposed development.
7. I accept that the extensions would be located to the rear of the property and would be of limited visibility from the surrounding area. However saved policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan 2005 ("Local Plan") is clear that extensions must have an acceptable relationship with the host building. As such, the limited visibility of the alterations does not provide a justification for proposed development. Whilst the appellant contends that extensions have also occurred to other buildings in the surrounding area, including other examples of extensions with flat roofs, I have no evidence before me to indicate that the circumstances are directly comparable to the building that is the subject of this appeal.
8. I therefore conclude that the extensions would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host building. The development conflicts with saved policy QD14 of the Local Plan and the design principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework ("the Framework") which require extensions to be well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended. There are no material considerations that would justify a departure from the development plan policy.

Other matters

9. The appellant considers that the arrangement of space to the rear of the building is poor and austere, and would be improved by the proposed development. I accept that the proposal would considerably improve the quality of the living accommodation within the building. The green sedum roof, which would be located on one of the areas of flat roof within the extended building would increase biodiversity and surface water run off, and would be a welcome environmentally friendly element of the scheme. These considerations weigh in favour of the development. However they do not, even cumulatively, indicate that planning permission should be granted given the clear conflict with the development plan on the main issue in this appeal.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Neil Holdsworth

INSPECTOR

