



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2014

by **P Jarvis Bsc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 8 May 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/14/2215768

157 Shirley Drive, Hove, BN3 6UP

- 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 P Keating against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2014/04324 was refused by notice dated 17 February 2014.
 - The development proposed is the provision of a gable roof extension to the front elevation including increased ridge height. Installation of new windows and doors and creation of balcony to first floor front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

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

Reasons

3. The site is located along a road characterised by large detached dwellings of varying size and style. The dwelling on the appeal site is a large chalet style bungalow which sits in an elevated position relative to the road. It has a deep hipped roof with single 'eyebrow' dormer at first floor level in the front elevation. It lies at the end of a row of detached chalet bungalows which front Shirley Drive. Whilst these other dwellings are of varying design and appearance, they all have hipped roofs which gives a continuity to the built form in this part of the road.
4. The proposed extensions would introduce a large gable feature across the whole width of the front of the dwelling in place of the existing hipped roof shape, with increased ridge height to the front element. I consider that this would add significant bulk to the roof and introduce an incongruous and unduly prominent feature in the streetscene which would contrast starkly with the regular hipped roof forms of the adjoining dwellings. The elevated position of the dwelling would emphasise the intrusive nature of the addition. In my opinion this would not be sympathetic to the established pattern and form of buildings in the streetscene.
5. I therefore find that the proposal would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the streetscene. This would be contrary to Policy QD14 of

the Brighton and Hove Local Plan (2005) which seeks to ensure that extensions and alterations to buildings are well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended, adjoining properties and the surrounding area. Furthermore, it would fail to satisfy the Council's Design Guide on Residential Extensions and Alterations (2013) which indicates that the original design of the building and its setting should form the primary influence on the design of any extension. In respect of roof extensions it also indicates that excessively bulky additions can have a significantly harmful impact on the appearance of the property and the continuity of a streetscape.

6. The appellant has indicated that the proposal would provide improved headroom in the main bedroom with an increase in floor area and provision of a balcony. Whilst I agree that these features would enhance the accommodation within the property, these benefits would not outweigh the harm identified.
7. I also find that the overall aim of achieving good design set out in the National Planning Policy Framework would not be satisfied. The content of the Planning Practice Guidance has also been considered but does not alter my conclusions.
8. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR