



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 July 2015

by Susan A F Simpson LLB Solicitor (N-P)

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

Decision date: 23/07/2015

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/15/3022083

2 Perry Hill, Saltdean, Brighton BN2 8FT

- 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 and Mrs Izzard against the decision of the Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2015/00111 dated 15 January 2015 was refused by a notice dated 12 March 2015.
 - The proposed development is described in the application as an infill extension to the front elevation of existing garage. Incorporating a window and dummy pitched roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal was submitted in the sole name of Mr Dale Izzard. However, as the right of appeal vests in the names of the original applicants, the appeal will proceed in the joint names of Mr and Mrs Izzard.
3. The Council's decision notice refers to the Supplementary Planning Document: Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations (SPD12) but no further information has been given as to the specific paragraphs of the document that apply in this case.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The prevailing uniformity of the development found along Perry Hill can be attributed to the single storey appearance of the bungalows; their hipped roofs; the linked flat roof garages; the contiguous gated side passages and a common building line. As a result, these recurrent design features provide a definite rhythm of regular spacing between buildings and a consistency of the built form that creates an attractive and harmonious street scene.
6. No 2 is situated in a prominent corner plot at the entrance to Perry Hill and on the eastern side of the road where dwellings are situated at a lower level than their neighbours opposite. The proposal involves the conversion and a forward extension of the existing garage to provide an enlarged living room. Even

allowing for the set back from the existing front elevation of this part of the dwelling, the development would project forward from, and introduce a dummy pitched roof that would be higher than, the flat roof of next door's attached garage.

7. Whilst I agree with the appellants' submission that, the creation of a gable end roof to accommodate a loft conversion, has "unbalanced" the appearance of their dwelling, it, also, has reduced the visual degree of separation at first floor level between Nos 2 and 4. The increased height and forward projection of the proposed development would only serve to further unbalance the existing pair of properties and accentuate the reduction in space, and the visual tension and differences, between the appeal premises and its immediate neighbour. Thus, the development would harmfully disrupt and detract from the prevailing harmonious and coherent appearance of the dwellings found along Perry Hill.
8. It is argued that other properties on the opposite side of Perry Hill have carried out similar extensions and alterations to their linked garages but, according to the Council, these do not benefit from planning permission. Nor are the site specifics the same as in this case. In any event, the existence of such development is no reason to permit further harmful proposals.
9. I conclude that the development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, it would be contrary to policies QD2 and QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005. These policies state, amongst other things, that: all new developments should be designed to emphasise and enhance the positive qualities of the local neighbourhood by taking into account such matters as the height, scale, bulk and design of existing buildings; require extensions and alterations to buildings to be well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended, adjoining properties and to the surrounding area.
10. The proposal, also, would be contrary to Government policy in the National Planning Policy Framework which states that developments should: respond to local character and history and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials; be refused where they are of a poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

Other Matters and Conclusion

11. Having considered these matters and all others raised, I find that, either individually or cumulatively, none would outweigh the harm I have described in terms of the main issue in this appeal. Thus, for the reasons given above, the appeal must fail.

S A F Simpson

INSPECTOR