
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2017

by Kevin Gleeson BA MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 14th November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/17/3184956
8 Benfield Crescent, Portslade BN41 2DB

- 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 Seb Smythe against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2017/00010, dated 27 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 4 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as removal of existing roof and provision of new roof with higher ridge, rear dormer and front rooflights (resubmission of BH2015/03258).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached house which has been extended to the rear at ground floor level across the full width of the property. The main roof is hipped and the property has a two storey front projection with a hipped roof and a single storey front projection with a hipped roof.
 4. The proposal is to replace the existing roof with a re-pitched gable roof and to add a rear dormer to provide two additional bedrooms. Two rooflights would be inserted into the front roofslope.
 5. Benfield Crescent has a variety of different residential properties including detached and semi-detached two storey houses as well as bungalows. In spite of the variety, the majority of the properties have hipped roofs. Whilst the neighbouring two storey property, no. 6 has a gable extension this is located to the rear and the main elevation to the front has a hipped roof.
 6. Although the increase in ridge height would be limited, when considered along with the gable roof, the additional bulk would have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the host property. The proposal would also not be in keeping with the character of neighbouring properties or the surrounding area and would be detrimental to the appearance of the street. Whilst in neighbouring
-

roads there are more properties with gable roofs these roads do not provide the appropriate context in which to assess the proposed development.

7. The rear dormer would extend in width across the majority of the roof. Its flat roof would be in line with the raised ridge and it would extend almost as far down the roof as the eaves. The proposed windows would fail to respect the fenestration at first floor level and would appear dominant. In occupying the majority of the rear roofslope the proposed dormer would appear as a bulky addition to the dwelling and would not be a subordinate addition to the building.
8. I therefore find that the proposal would be contrary to Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan, 2016 which requires extensions or alterations to existing buildings to be well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended, and to the surrounding area.
9. I also find that the proposals would not be in line with the advice in the Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), 2013 which indicates that dormers should be kept as small as possible and a subordinate addition to the roof, set appropriately in the roof space and below the ridge of the roof. It would also fail to adhere to the SPD guidance that raised roofs on detached properties should respect the general appearance of the streetscene and that dormer windows should normally align with the windows below.
10. In addition the proposal would be contrary to section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to achieve good design.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has sought to address the matters of loss of outlook and light which led to the previous scheme being refused planning permission and dismissed on appeal¹. However, these matters do not address the effect of the scheme on the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, and having taken into account all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Kevin Gleeson

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/Q1445/D/16/3147716