



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: 12 February 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/12/2189248

1 Glen Rise, Brighton, East Sussex BN1 5LN

- 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 & Mrs S Dixon against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application (Ref BH2012/02903) was refused by notice dated 8 November 2012.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single-storey rear extension, the construction of roof extensions and the replacement of the rear dormer windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. No 1 Glen Rise is a detached bungalow with dormer windows in its front and rear roof slopes. It lies in a prominent, corner position at the junction of Glen Rise and Glen Ridge within a built-up residential area of Brighton consisting of a variety of house types, ages and styles including bungalows and substantial two-storey houses. From the rear of the property the land rises steeply away towards the west. The proposal is to alter and extend the building with a single-storey rear addition and a reconstructed roof. This would provide additional habitable accommodation and would take the form of a hipped and gable-ended 'barn-type' configuration with large rear dormers.
3. The Council states that in principle it has no objections to the rear extension at ground floor level or the general form and design of the proposed roof construction. There would be no harmful effects on the amenities of the occupants of the surrounding properties attributable to the development. Having inspected the site and its surroundings I agree with these conclusions and I note that the proposal is a re-submission of a previous scheme in an attempt to overcome the Council's objections to the proposals concerning the visual impact of the proposed development on the streetscene.
4. The proposed rear dormers would appear as four distinct elements of fenestration occupying a substantial proportion of the roof's width and form. They would be large in scale and visually dominant and overpowering in the context of the rear elevation of the property. As the land rises in Glen Ridge, the dormers would be readily visible in the streetscene when viewed from the west. In effect the extended dwelling would take on the appearance of a substantial two-storey house. Whilst the general form of the roof as altered

and re-constructed would be acceptable it is the incongruity, bulk and prominence of the dormer windows which would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area for these reasons. I realise that the proposals have been modified to reduce the previous criticisms of the development but in my conclusion the changes that have been made do not alleviate the harm that would be caused to an acceptable extent.

5. Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan states that alterations and extensions to existing buildings, including the formation of rooms in the roof should be well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance concerning roof alterations and extensions (SPG) specifically states that due to the hilly nature of Brighton works affecting many rear elevations may also impact on the wider streetscene. Dormers must respect the particular character of the building at issue and be carefully related to it. The proportions, style, design and materials of new dormers should complement the existing building and should have a form and detail appropriate to it. Excessively bulky or poorly designed additions can seriously harm the appearance of a property.¹
6. For the reasons I have given, in my conclusion the proposals put forward for the alterations and extension of the property in relation to the proposed rear dormers would conflict with the provisions of both policy QD14 of the local plan and the SPG. I have taken into account all the points put forward in support of the development including the ways in which the scheme has been modified in comparison to the previous submission but nothing outweighs my conclusions above and the reasons for them.

David Harmston

Inspector

¹ Supplementary Planning Guidance – *Roof Alterations and Extensions* – pages 3, 8 and 9