



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 July 2010

by **Sheila Holden**
BSc MSc CEng TPP MICE MRTPI FCIHT

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 August 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/10/2131564

3 Ovingdean Close, Brighton, East Sussex BN2 7AD

- 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 L Catt against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
- The application Ref BH2010/00651, dated 8 March 2010, was refused by notice dated 3 June 2010.
- The development proposed is an extension to rear and side of property, comprising at ground floor a garage, utility room and kitchen and some internal alterations to ground floor layout to facilitate proposal. Also some alterations at first floor to existing bedroom/shower room, the formation of an additional bedroom over new kitchen extension at first floor.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed alterations and extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Ovingdean Close is characterised by detached bungalows and chalet bungalows on modest sized plots. Nos. 2-6 are more widely spaced than those elsewhere in the street and exhibit more individualistic styles and designs. Nos. 3 and 5 are set above the road with steeply rising gardens to the rear. The detached garages of these two dwellings are sited immediately on either side of the shared boundary. The proposal is for a substantial two-storey side and rear extension to No 3 which would wrap around the north and west sides of the house and incorporate the existing car port and garage. In addition new dormer windows are proposed in both the front and rear elevations.
4. At present there is a good sized gap between Nos. 3 and 5. The garages appear to be tucked into the rising ground and are unobtrusive. By contrast the proposed two-storey side extension would abut the shared boundary and its additional height, depth and bulk would be visible from the surrounding street scene, particularly the eastern side of Ovingdean Close. It would reduce the gap between the adjoining dwellings which contributes to the spacious nature of the area and, in my view, would be harmful to the area's appearance.

5. The main ridge of the roof would be extended to permit the insertion of two new dormer windows in the front roof slope. I consider this would be an acceptable design when viewed from the street since the proposed dormers would match the existing one and the ridge extension and garage would integrate satisfactorily with the existing house. However, the rear extension would involve the addition of second ridge at right angles to the existing roof which would be at the same height and of greater length than the existing ridge. The effect of both extending the existing ridge and adding the new ridge would give rise to a large, complex and bulky roof form. In my opinion, the overall proposal would therefore fail to respect the proportions of the host property and would overwhelm the modest design of the original house.
6. The insertion of dormer windows in the rear roof slope to replace roof lights would replicate a feature of the existing house and would appear to comply with the guidelines for dormer windows set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: *Roof Alterations and Extensions*. I consider this element of the proposal to be acceptable. However, the insertion of five roof lights on the rear extension would make the roof appear cluttered. Their number and position would not reflect the scale or proportions of the host property, reinforcing my view that the proposed rear extension, with its large roof, is too tall, deep and bulky. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and to the wider street scene, contrary to saved Policies QD1, QD2 and QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan which requires extensions to respect the design of host property and its relationship with the surrounding area.
7. I appreciate that the appellant wishes to extend his home and improve the layout, circulation, security and usability of the accommodation. However, these are insufficient reasons to set aside the harm I have identified with the proposal. Whilst the appellant referred to a previous rear extension no specific evidence was presented to allow comparisons to be made with the current scheme. I acknowledge that other properties in the area have been altered but have no details of how these proposals were assessed. In any event I have considered the appeal proposal on its planning merits.

Other matters

8. A number of neighbours have raised concerns about the extension in relation to visual intrusion and loss of privacy. In my view the height and depth of the proposed side and rear extension would appear overbearing alongside the shared boundary with No 5 and there would be some overshadowing of the approach to the main entrance which would make this part of the property a less pleasant place. There would be some perceived loss of privacy for the occupants of No 1 from the roof lights in the rear extension but this would be limited by the distances separating the buildings.

Conclusions

9. For the reasons set out above and having regard to other matters raised by main and third parties I find that none of them, either individually or collectively, outweighs the decision I have reached to dismiss the appeal.

Sheila Holden INSPECTOR