



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2008

by **David Green** MRICS DipTP MRTPI

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

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
4 September 2008

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/A/08/2073040 27 Selhurst Road, Woodingdean, BN2 6WE

- 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 D Herriott against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
- The application Ref BH2007/03213, dated 20 August 2007, was refused by notice dated 22 October 2007.
- The development proposed is rear extension to replace conservatory and raise roof to bungalow including dormer to side.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

2. I consider the main issue arising in this case to be the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. I noted during my site visit that this part of the steeply rising Selhurst Road is characterised by mainly detached bungalows of generally similar proportions. Although it is evident that some roof alterations have taken place here and there, such alterations have been confined largely to the rear of dwellings. However, side and front roof additions, such as those at Nos 23, 24 and 26, are more noticeable. Nevertheless, the bungalows on the western side of this section of the road exhibit a pleasing rhythm of similar hipped roof profiles as they step up the hill from south to north.
4. In my judgement, the proposed rear extension to replace an existing conservatory would have no adverse impact on the character or appearance of the area. Its design would respect that of the bungalow and it would occupy a relatively screened position at the rear of the dwelling. Although I regard it as acceptable, it has been designed as a component of the overall development, such that it could not be erected in the form shown in isolation.
5. However, the proposed increase in height of the bungalow's roof and the formation of a dormer addition in its southern slope would, in my opinion, disrupt the characteristic rhythm of roof lines along the western side of the road. The raised ridge would sit uncomfortably with its neighbours on either

- side and the dormer extension would constitute an unduly obtrusive feature in the street scene.
6. I have taken into account the appellant's submission that the increase in ridge height would be 0.85m rather than the figure of 1.8m referred to by the Council at the planning application stage. This submission has not been disputed by the Council. Nevertheless, I am of the view that the proposed height increase, which is clearly shown on the appellant's drawings, would be inappropriate in this setting.
 7. I have given careful consideration to the appellant's argument that the proposed dormer window would not be located on a prominent elevation. However, it was clear to me at my site visit that the raised position of No 27 in relation to its southern neighbour renders its flank elevation prominent in the street scene. I am in no doubt that the proposed dormer addition would be both clearly visible and visually harmful.
 8. The appellant has drawn my attention to the existence of other roof additions and alterations that have taken place in this area and I have taken due note of them. Indeed, I took time during my site visit to view those apparent from the public realm in Selhurst Road and neighbouring streets. However, little evidence has been provided as to the planning status of those additions and alterations and, in any event, I consider that their existence does not justify allowing an unacceptable form of development at the appeal site.
 9. I have therefore concluded that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and I find it contrary to policies QD1, QD2 and QD14 of the *Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005*. Those policies combine to seek a high standard of design for new development and they are supported by Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) entitled *Roof Alterations and Extensions*. That SPG has been the subject of public consultation prior to its adoption by the Council, although the appellant has challenged the extent of that consultation. Nevertheless, it constitutes a material planning consideration and I have afforded it appropriate weight. In my judgement, the scale and design of the proposed roof alterations and their prominence in the street scene, would not accord with the relevant SPG advice.
 10. I have had regard to all other matters arising in this case, including representations received from the occupier of No 28 Selhurst Road. Whilst that resident has stated no objection to the principle of the appeal development, he has commented that the extension of dwellings in this area has given rise to increased kerb-side parking. Although the appeal development would result in an increase in the number of bedrooms from two to three, I do not consider that this would necessarily lead to increased parking demand.

David Green

Inspector