



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 April 2008

by **Stuart M Reid** D Arch (Hons) RIBA

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 May 2008

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/A/07/2059239

38 Victoria Street, Brighton BN1 3FQ

- 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 D Glynn against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
- The application Ref BH2007/03111, dated 16 August 2007, was refused by notice dated 05 October 2007.
- The development is a proposed loft conversion with a new mansard roof to the rear with two small lead-lined dormer windows.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

2. From my inspection of the site and its surroundings, and from the written representations made, I consider that the main issue in this appeal is the effect that the proposed extension would have on the original dwelling and on the Montpellier and Cliftonhill Conservation Area within which it is situated.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a 2-storey mid-terrace property, and the proposal is to provide a roof extension to form a mansard roof at the rear with 2 dormers. The 2 properties either side at 37 and 39 Victoria Street have dormers on their rear roof slopes.
4. The proposal would not be seen from Victoria Street, but would be seen from other properties at the rear. It would replace the original roof shape with an inappropriate mansard roof which would be out-of-keeping with the historic character of the original dwelling. This is borne out by the unattractive and out-of-keeping roof extensions either side. The Council state that there is no record of planning permission being granted for them. The appeal building does at present maintain its original roof, and thus its integrity, as a building which contributes to the special architectural or historic interest of the Conservation Area. It is certainly not an unsightly gap at roof level, but an attractive original roof between 2 unsightly roof extensions.
5. The proposal does not follow the advice in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Roof Alterations & Extensions (SPG) with regard to the

design of the mansard roof, but appears to rely on a slightly off-vertical rear roof elevation, and a close to horizontal flat roof across to the existing ridge. It is not, therefore, a traditional mansard roof. Even if it were, its bulk and visual intrusion, along with the loss of the original roof, would still render it unacceptable.

6. The proposed over-dominant and bulky extension would have a harmful effect on the townscape and, in particular, on the roofscape, of the Conservation Area, as can be seen with the roof extensions either side. With the inappropriate false mansard roof and its overly large dormers, it would be unsympathetic to the appeal building, and would cause harm to the entire terrace and to the wider area, and it would in consequence fail to preserve the special interest of the Conservation Area.
7. I therefore consider that the proposal would be harmful to the integrity of the original dwelling, and thus to the whole of the terrace, and it would be visually unacceptable in the locality, due to its poor design, and its failure to respect the original dwelling. It would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, and it would fail to satisfy Policies HE6, QD1, and QD14 in the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005 and the advice in the SPG. I conclude that the appeal should fail.

Stuart M Reid

INSPECTOR