



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2013

by **David Harmston FRICS DipTP MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 7 February 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/12/2188536

14 The Rotyngs, Rottingdean, Brighton, East Sussex BN2 7DX

- 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 Peter Chesterman against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application (Ref BH2012/02972) was refused by notice dated 19 November 2012.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of the existing garage with a new window to replace the existing garage door. The erection of a side extension to the garage to create an outdoor store and a new front porch with a new pitched roof to replace the existing flat roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. I have modified the description of the development from that given on the application form and the Council's decision notice for reasons of clarity. The appeal property is a modern, detached, two-storey dwellinghouse located within a cul-de-sac of similarly-designed properties with access from Falmer Road, to the north of the centre of Rottingdean. The property is set comparatively well back from the road, slightly behind the building line established by the adjoining houses situated to the east. A number of mature trees and other forms of vegetation provide some screening of the building. Nevertheless open views of the front of the dwelling and its forward projecting garage are possible from various positions in the road and the neighbouring houses, to the south and east.
3. It is proposed to convert the existing garage into habitable accommodation as an extension to the existing study together with the erection of a small extension to its western side to be used as a garden store with a new porch to the front. An asymmetrical pitched roof with a gable end to the front is proposed to span the converted garage, the new porch and the side extension. With its shallow pitch, the roof would rise to a point whereby its ridge would be just beneath the bathroom window at first floor level.
4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area. Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan (2005) states that extensions or alterations to buildings should be well-designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended, the

adjoining properties and the surrounding area. Account should be taken of the existing spaces around buildings and the character of the area. Policy QD1 of the local plan advises that new developments should demonstrate a high standard of design and make a positive contribution to the quality of the environment. There is no objection to the development concerning its impact on the neighbouring properties and its effects on the amenities of the adjoining residents and there is therefore no conflict with the terms of policy QD27 of the local plan.

5. The proposal is for the modest enlargement and alteration of the existing property and whilst this would be to its front, bearing in mind the siting and design of the property and its relationship to the adjoining and nearby houses, in principle the development would cause no material harm to the character and appearance of the area. It is the design of the roof which is the stumbling block in this proposal. I understand and have taken into account the reasons for the appellant electing for this form of construction. However, the introduction of a pitched roof form of this design and appearance into this prominent location would appear as an unsympathetic, incongruous and visually damaging feature in the streetscene.
6. The predominant design of the houses in The Rotyngs which incorporate elements of the buildings at their front is one of single-storey projections with flat roofs. An exception exists at No 25 but in that case the pitched roof is smaller than is proposed at the appeal site and is not of an asymmetrical form of construction but is of a balanced appearance with hipped ends. The construction of the pitched roof in the form proposed at the appeal site would conflict with the provisions of policies QD1 and QD14 of the local plan in that it would fail to respect the character of the area in an adequate way; neither would it make a positive contribution to the quality of the environment.
7. I have taken into account and afforded weight to all the matters put forward in support of the proposal including the personal circumstances of the appellant. Nothing, however, outweighs the harm that I consider the development would create in the ways I have described and I dismiss the appeal accordingly.

David Harmston

Inspector