



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 October 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:
29 October 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/A/10/2131947
141-143 Sackville Road, Hove, East Sussex BN3 3HD

- 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 S Sparks and Mr N Dowsing against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
- The application Ref BH/2010/00817, dated 11 March 2010, was refused by notice dated 12 May 2010.
- The development proposed is a new self contained flat to roofspace.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Nos. 141-143 Sackville Road is a prominent property, the upper section of which is typical of a Victorian semi with bay windows. This part of the building has been rendered and painted white. It has a double gable front with a valley between the two sections of roof. Much of the original shape and style of the lower part of the building has been lost through the construction of a flat roof brick building of little architectural merit which is attached the front elevation. The proposal is to alter the roof, filling in the valley with a pitch which would slope away from the front elevation, enabling an additional one bedroom flat to be provided in the roof space.
4. The existing roof with its two prominent gables and valley between them is a distinctive feature of this particular property. The upper part of the front elevation and the roof are highly visible from Sackville Road, especially when travelling northbound, a factor which is accentuated by the alignment of the street at this point. The loss of the valley and the insertion of a sloping tiled roof would fundamentally change the appearance of the building from the street. The enlarged roof would sit awkwardly between the two gables and would increase the apparent bulk and height of the building in relation to the immediately surrounding properties, particularly the terraced properties to the rear and north. Furthermore, the symmetry of the roof would be lost with the insertion of a small dormer window on the eastern side.

5. I consider this combination of factors would result in the alterations to the roof failing to integrate satisfactorily with the traditional appearance of this prominent building and the other properties in the immediate vicinity. I conclude that this would give rise to harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area contrary to saved Policies QD1, QD2 and QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan which seek high quality design that respects its setting.

Other matters

6. The appeal proposal would provide accommodation of a standard which is comparable with other flats in the area although there would be no private amenity space or parking. The Council is satisfied that, although not ideal, cycle parking could be provided on the highway and that appropriate provision for storage of refuge could be secured by condition. However, the acceptability of the development in relation to these matters and its sustainable location are not reasons to set aside the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Sheila Holden

INSPECTOR