



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2015

by Louise Phillips MA (Cantab) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 29 January 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/14/2229445

13 Colebrook Road, Brighton BN1 5JH

- 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 Gary Turner against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2014/03053, dated 11 September 2014, was refused by notice dated 17 November 2014.
 - The development proposed is a detached double garage and two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of both aspects of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the existing building and wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached, chalet style house at the corner of Colebrook Road and Hillbrow Road. It has a steep hipped roof with a shallower projecting canopy at the front; a single pitched roof dormer in the centre of the front roof slope; and two similar dormers to the rear. Whilst the chalet is set at an angle to the Colebrook Road frontage, the other properties on the western side follow an established building line parallel to, and set back from, the carriageway. The properties on the eastern side also follow a relatively straight building line, but they are set back further behind larger front gardens.
4. The proposed development would consist of an extension to the north-east side of the chalet near to the junction; and a single storey, flat roofed garage in the south east corner of the plot adjacent to the boundary with Colebrook Road. Starting with the extension, this would be flush with the front elevation of the existing house, the main part of the existing roof would continue across it and an additional dormer would be inserted between the old and new sections of roof. The development would add mass to one side of the building, but it would not be so wide as to fundamentally unbalance it, particularly as the roof would end in a hip to reflect the current pitch. Whilst the rearmost part of the extension would breach the building line in Hillbrow Road, the back of the main house already does so, and the latter would remain the prominent feature.

5. However, whereas the existing front roofslope is symmetrical, the extended roof would have a lower ridge than that of the main house, it would have no canopy below the eaves and the two dormers (existing and proposed) would be offset from the centre of the building to the south. Taken together, these design features would give rise to an awkward relationship between the old and new parts of the building, particularly at roof level. Whilst the lowered ridge seeks to make the extension subordinate to the existing dwelling in line with Council guidance, in this case it would contribute to a discordant development detrimental to the host property and wider street scene.
6. Turning to the garage, its proposed position at the edge of the footway would be entirely at odds with the established pattern of development on both sides of Colebrook Road. Whilst it would be screened to some extent in views from the south by a boundary fence, it would be clearly visible from the front of the site and from the north across the junction with Hillbrow Road. The flat roof would jar with the roof design of the host dwelling and with the pitched roofs of the other houses in the area, but the low height of the building would not compensate for its unfortunate siting. Overall the garage would be a prominent and incongruous feature in the street scene.
7. For the reasons above, I conclude that both aspects of the proposed development would be significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the existing building and wider area. Thus it would conflict with the provisions of Policies QD2 and QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan in respect of good design. In reaching my decision, I have taken account of the broadly supportive pre-application advice given to the appellant by the Council, but this does not change my view.

Conclusion

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

Louise Phillips

INSPECTOR