



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 November 2010

by Sue Glover BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 25 November 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/10/2138396
8 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 Mrs Hilary Pavitt against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2010/02125, dated 8 July 2010, was refused by notice dated 6 September 2010.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of part of the existing ground floor to form a kitchen extension with the existing roof extended over with enhanced dormer provision. The existing dormers to be retained and re-clad in painted horizontal timber boarding.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The street is characterised by predominantly detached dwellings with a mix of designs in a suburban and spacious setting. From the street no. 8 appears as a modest sized bungalow with roof dormers at the front and sides. The dwelling has been extended in the past in a piecemeal fashion with the addition of dormers and single-storey extensions.
 4. The proposal is a substantial roof addition extending the main roof ridge at the rear by some 4.5m with a flat roofed rear dormer wrapping around the hip ridge at the side, which would not be contained within the existing roof profile. The existing side dormer on the south elevation would be enlarged. The roof extension and wrap around dormer would be clearly visible from the street at the front of the adjoining dwelling at no. 6.
 5. Whilst dormers already exist on the appeal dwelling, the introduction of the wrap around dormer and the large roof extension would compound the harmful effect of the existing piecemeal extensions. The extensions would appear
-

- oversized and unsympathetic, relating poorly to the design of the existing building.
6. The proposed 2-storey flat roof element on the opposite rear side would not be readily apparent from public viewpoints. However, this element would project above the eaves level and introduce a further incongruous aspect out of keeping with the original dwelling.
 7. The proposals are substantial and unsympathetic additions that do not relate well to the character of the dwelling and would dominate the building. They would not enhance the dwelling as previously extended. Nor would the proposed timber finish to the dormers mitigate the overall scale and incongruous design of the appeal proposal.
 8. Taking all these matters into account, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. In this respect, it is contrary to Policy QD14 of the *Brighton and Hove Local Plan 2005* and to the guidance in *Roof Alterations and Extensions SPG note 1*.
 9. There is a substantial separation distance from the dwelling at the rear, no. 7 Eldred Avenue, which is at a much lower level. There would therefore be no significant additional overlooking sufficient to harm residents' privacy, and no material loss of sunlight.
 10. There is some overlooking from the existing side dormer towards the adjoining house at no. 6. Although there would be new clear glazed dormer windows at the side and rear, there would be no significant additional overlooking sufficient to cause material harm to the residents of no. 6.
 11. Notwithstanding other extensions nearby and the new build at no. 8a, I have judged this proposal on its own individual merits. The appeal dwelling requires some renovation and the appellant would like a modern dwelling with suitable family space and bedroom. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm that I have identified to the character and appearance of the area.

Sue Glover

INSPECTOR

