



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 September 2013

by Ms T L Dow BA, Dip TP, Dip UD, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 September 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/13/2203332

Pineglade, Bazehill Road, Rottingdean, Brighton, East Sussex, BN2 7DB

- 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 Richard Byrne against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2013/01717 dated 28 May 2013, was refused by notice dated 30 July 2013.
 - The development proposed is; Replacement Garage, Carport, Store and Workspace.
-

Application for Costs

1. An application for costs was made by Mr Richard Byrne against Brighton and Hove City Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Rottingdean Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located towards the end of a private driveway within the Rottingdean Conservation Area. The land around part of the site slopes quite steeply away so that the main house and buildings beyond are on considerably lower ground. The site currently houses a single storey, 'Marley' type garage and attached car port. In views from the wider conservation area, the traditional roof patterns of buildings close to the site, are a particularly noticeable and dominant feature. In views from the end of the driveway, the site is seen within the context of a more modern dwelling, No. 2 Bazehill Road, constructed in a vernacular style, and is framed by the high-walled, tree-lined drive which leads to Pineglade beyond.
5. The proposed structure would have a relatively simple design, reflecting the style of a fairly uncomplicated, agricultural building. However, it would be a very substantial building for its setting with a large footprint which would be considerably wider and longer than the existing buildings. Its increased length would bring its siting closer to the road. Despite the distance to the road, its height and scale would be very apparent in these views. The span of the front of

the building, which would be the main public view, would look overly wide and large. The pitch of the roof would appear too shallow in relation to the span. Although the half-hips would help reduce its impact, it would nonetheless appear bulky, with the base of the structure appearing disproportionately wide. Overall, the size and scale of the building would have a considerable dominating impact when viewed from the road at the end of the drive.

6. I have noted the appellant's photographs of buildings locally which show buildings with lower pitched roofs. I am not persuaded by these, however, because the overriding character in the conservation area is of buildings with a narrower span and a steeper roof pitch. The scale and proportions of the proposed structure would not therefore be in keeping with that character. Neither would the impact be sufficiently ameliorated by the sensitive choice of materials proposed.
7. The proposed building would not be prominent in views from within the conservation area more widely, although it would be seen in distance views from Beacon Hill. As such, the harm caused to the conservation area's significance as a heritage asset would be 'less than substantial', as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework. I have noted that the existing buildings are not in keeping with the character of the conservation area but they are low-key and not prominent in the public views. I have also noted the appellant's wish to enhance his storage and workspace accommodation and replace the buildings. However, neither of these points would be of such public benefit to outweigh the harm to the conservation area I have identified.
8. I conclude that the proposed building would harm the character and appearance of the Rottingdean Conservation Area. As such it would conflict with Policies HE6 and QD2 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan, 2005. Amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that all development enhances local characteristics and that proposals affecting the setting of a conservation area show a consistently high standard of design and detailing, reflecting the scale and character or appearance of the area, including building forms.

Other Matters

9. I have had regard to the fact that there is no objection to the proposal on the grounds of its effect on the nearby listed building, or on trees. The appellant has also pointed out that the refusal of planning permission goes against the comments of the Council's Heritage team who considered the proposal acceptable. However, these points do not affect my overall conclusion.
10. Local residents have also raised a number of concerns regarding the impact of the development on living conditions, the effect of the development on trees and possible future uses of the building but I have no reason to disagree with the Council's conclusions on these matters.

Conclusion

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

T L Dow

INSPECTOR