



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 April 2017

by **Clive Tokley MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 12<sup>th</sup> April 2017

---

### **Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/17/3169337**

### **86 Downland Road, Brighton, BN2 6DJ.**

- 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 Shazia Quisar against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
  - The application Ref BH/2016/05638 dated 30 September 2016 was refused by notice dated 5 December 2016.
  - The development proposed is rooms in roof with side dormers and front and rear gable windows.
- 

### **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 host dwelling and the area.

### **Reasons**

3. Downland Road runs roughly west to east within a residential area on rising land at the western end of Woodingdean. The appeal property lies at the right-angle junction between Downland Road and Seaview Road which slopes down to Warren Road to the south.
  4. The north side of Downland Road is fronted mainly by bungalows of a similar design and contrasts with the south side where there is a variety of houses and bungalows resulting in a varied frontage. An exception to this occurs at the junction with Seaview Road which is flanked by three similarly-designed detached houses to the west and two to the east. The appellant points out that the dwellings on each side of the Seaview Road junction are no longer identical; however their original form and proportions are retained.
  5. No 86 Downland Road lies at the apex of the junction which results in its east side elevation, which is parallel to Seaview Road, being clearly in view from the east. Seaview Road is fronted by a range of bungalows, chalets and two-storey houses. The slope of the land to the south of the appeal property, together with
-

the bungalow on the neighbouring plot, result in the rear elevation of No 86 being prominently in view up the hill from Seaview Road.

6. The proposed increase in pitch and height of the roof would increase the prominence of the appeal property. From Downland Road it would appear out-of-place within the group of similarly proportioned houses on its southern frontage. The east-facing dormer window would be a bulky addition that would dominate the roof. Its hipped roof design would be alien to the form of the host dwelling and it would pay no regard to the design and fenestration of the house. From Seaview Road the proposal would appear as a poorly-proportioned and bulky addition that would intrude into the skyline at the top of the hill.
7. The proposal would fail to have regard to the guidance in the Council's *Supplementary Planning Document – design guide for extensions and alterations* (SPD12). This indicates, amongst other things, that dormer windows should be kept as small as possible and clearly be subordinate additions to the roof and set appropriately in the roof space well off the sides and ridge.
8. I consider that the proposal would be materially harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scenes of both Downland Road and Seaview Road. The proposal would conflict with Policy QD14 of the *Brighton and Hove Local Plan 2005* which indicates that extensions should be well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended, adjoining properties and to the surrounding area.
9. The appellant has submitted letters setting out the medical circumstances of her daughter but there is no indication as to how the proposal would assist in alleviating her condition. I understand the appellant's wishes to improve the home environment for her daughter but personal circumstances will seldom outweigh the harm to public interests that may arise. I have seen no evidence to indicate that the significant harm that I consider would be caused to the character and appearance of the area would be outweighed by the benefit to the appellant's family.

### **Conclusion**

10. I have had regard to the personal circumstances of the appellant; however taking account of all matters I have concluded that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area and that the appeal should not succeed.

*Clive Tokley*

INSPECTOR