



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 December 2012

by P Jarvis Bsc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 December 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/12/2185104

41 Chailey Avenue, Rottingdean, Brighton, BN2 7GH

- 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 G Edmunds against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2012/01405 was refused by notice dated 31 July 2012.
 - The development proposed is the removal of the existing conservatory to facilitate the erection of a ground and first floor rear extension and alterations to fenestration at the rear.
-

Procedural matter

1. The above description differs from that on the original application but the change was agreed prior to determination and in my opinion more accurately describes the proposed works.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site occupies a prominent and open location on the corner of Chailey Avenue and Steyning Road. Steyning Road slopes down from Chailey Avenue such that, in views from it, the property sits in an elevated position and the rear elevation of the dwelling, particularly the upper level, is in full view.
5. The existing dwelling is a large detached two-storey dwelling with rear addition sited towards the Steyning Road frontage giving the dwelling an 'L' shape. The proposed extensions would 'infill' the area to the side of this extension across the remaining width of the original dwelling, to the same depth and in place of an existing conservatory.
6. Whilst the proposed extension would be of the same overall height as the existing extension, which is slightly below that of the main dwelling, it would nevertheless add considerably to its bulk. The first floor element in particular, would, by reason of its width across the whole of the remaining rear elevation, add a noticeably large and prominent element to the rear elevation.

7. The dimensions of the extension are such that, in order to maintain the same height as the existing extension, the roof would incorporate a central flat section. Whilst this would ensure that the extension would have a subservient height, I consider that it would fail to disguise the overall bulk of the extension, which would detract from the design and proportions of the original dwelling. Furthermore, when taken together with the existing rear extension, the overall effect would be to overwhelm the original dwelling. Overall, the proposal would fail to complement the host dwelling and, due to the prominent and open location of the site, it would also detract from the streetscene.
8. The appellant argues that the proposed extension would not be any more prominent than the existing rear extension and I have noted that it would be the same depth and height. However, the proposed first floor element would, in my view, considerably add to the width and overall bulk of the rear elevation of the dwelling which would be readily seen within the streetscene of Steyning Road, and emphasised by its elevated position relative to it.
9. The appellant has also referred to other nearby roof extensions, particularly the large flat roofed dormers on the property located on the corner of Steyning Road and Newlands Road near to the appeal site. I agree that these large additions have added to the bulk of the roof of this property in what is a similarly prominent location. However, they 'sit' within the roofslope of the existing building and proportionately are smaller extensions.
10. I therefore find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area. It would conflict with Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan (2005) which seeks to ensure that extensions are well designed in relation to the host property, adjoining dwellings and the surrounding area. These policies are generally consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and therefore in accordance with paragraph 215, significant weight can be afforded to them.
11. In respect of the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance *Roof Alterations and Extensions*, which can be given some weight as a material consideration, whilst I agree that some aspects of this guidance are satisfied, for the reasons set out above, it would fail to complement the design of the host dwelling.

Conclusion

12. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR