



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 September 2018

**by AJ Steen BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 1 October 2018**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/18/3204632**  
**18 Overdown Rise, Portslade BN41 2YG**

- 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 Andy Ferroni against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
  - The application Ref BH2018/00493, dated 13 February 2018, was refused by notice dated 9 May 2018.
  - The development proposed is ground floor rear extensions (3.6mtrs from existing rear wall) with flat roof construction and extension of existing rear dormer.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposed rear extensions on the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area.

### Reasons

3. 18 Overdown Rise is a semi-detached chalet bungalow in an area of Portslade comprised of properties with a similar character and appearance. The chalet bungalows in the area either have dormer windows at the rear like no. 18 or with the windows in the rear elevation but with the eaves slightly below the top of the windows resulting in a half dormer. Nevertheless, there is a consistent character and appearance to the area.
4. The proposal would result in a large ground floor extension, with the existing rear dormer window extended further to the rear and toward the side of the property away from the attached neighbour, with a flat roof above. Although inset slightly from the side wall with a small section of roof between the proposed first floor and original side of the property, it would present a deeper two storey side wall with flat roof above. This would be visible to some extent through the gap between properties on Overdown Rise and between properties fronting Thornhill Rise to the rear. The combination of this additional two storey side wall with a substantial flat roof above would result in an unattractive appearance to the proposed extension in these views.
5. I note that a number of other properties in the area have similar extensions. A number of these appear on the houses with a higher eaves line where it appears slightly less incongruous, and a number of others have pitched roofs.

Some similar extensions are on more prominent properties, such as that close to the junction of Thornhill Rise and Overdown Rise and those on Broomfield Drive that back onto the park. Nevertheless, these are not typical of the character of the area and I need to assess the proposed development on its individual merits.

6. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed two storey rear extension would harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. For this reason, the proposal is contrary to Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan that seeks extensions to properties to be well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended and to the surrounding area.
7. The extension would be located close to the boundary with the attached neighbouring property at 20 Overdown Rise and over two floors. However, it would not extend so far to the rear at first floor that it would materially affect the amount of sunlight and daylight to windows of that property. As a result, it would not result in harm to the living conditions of occupiers of that property by reason of loss of light.
8. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed development would not accord with the development plan. Thus, having had regard to all other matters raised the appeal should be dismissed.

*AJ Steen*

INSPECTOR