



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2014

by Mr Kim Bennett BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16 December 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/14/2227804
16 Mill Rise, Brighton, BN1 5GD

- 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 Michael Jordan against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2014/02688, dated was refused by notice dated 26 September 2014.
 - The development proposed is erection of roof extension including new front dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

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

Reasons

3. No 16 Mill Rise comprises a semi-detached bungalow located on the south west side of the road, and almost opposite its junction with Bramble Rise. It has been extended in the past by means of a roof conversion which has a large rear facing dormer and altered roof profile. The area has a mixed character from a design point of view, with a variety of bungalows and houses and I observed a number of front dormer windows within roof spaces. However, No 16 forms part of a row of similar designed bungalows on the south west side of this section of the road with relatively few alterations to the front roof slopes. Mill Rise rises steeply towards the north west and consequently there are a variety of roof lines as a result of the changing topography.
4. The appellant suggests that the pair of bungalows of which No 16 forms part, is not symmetrical because of the previous additions. The proposal is also considered to be consistent with advice in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document SPD12 – Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations 2013 (SPD) in that the dormer would not be higher than the ridge and would be no wider than the ground floor window below.
5. I acknowledge the latter point in terms of the height of the dormer, and agree that the property is already somewhat unbalanced as a result of the previous extension. However, the design of the original main roof for both properties is still very much in evidence and the main hipped feature on No 16, which sits

slightly forward of the main hipped roof of No 18, is a distinctive roof form on this part of the road and similar in style to those bungalows to the south east. The loss of that feature and its replacement with a largely gable end, together with a large dormer window, would in my view unbalance the pair of bungalows still further. The result would be a top heavy roof form, out of proportion with the modest scale nature of the pair of semi-detached bungalows, which would appear over dominant and out of place in the street scene and cause visual harm as a result.

6. As noted above, I acknowledge that other front dormers are prevalent in the area, but these generally respond better to the roof forms of which they form part in terms of size and proportion. Even where that is not the case, it is not a good reason to allow a further proposal which in itself causes visual harm, and I note that the SPD says that inappropriate extensions should not necessarily act as a precedent.
7. In the light of the above, I consider that the proposal would be contrary to Saved Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005 in that it would not be well designed in relation to the property. It would also be contrary to the SPD in that it would unbalance the semi-detached pair of bungalows and the dormer would not be kept as small as possible or would be set appropriately in the roof slope.
8. Accordingly, for the above reasons and policy guidance referred to, the appeal should be dismissed.

K Bennett

INSPECTOR