



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 December 2014

**by Harold Stephens BA MPhil DipTP MRTPI FRSA**

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

**Decision date: 2 January 2015**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q/1445/D/14/2228236**

**101 Green Ridge, Brighton BN1 5LU**

- 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 and Mrs G Modern against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
  - The application Ref BH2014/01686 was refused by notice dated 28 August 2014.
  - The development proposed is a front/side extension with pitched roof, side roof lights and associated works.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issues

2. I take the view that the main issues in this appeal are:
  - (i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing property and the street scene; and
  - (ii) the implications for neighbours' living conditions particularly in terms of loss of light, privacy and outlook.

### Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a detached bungalow on the north side of Green Ridge. The bungalow has already been extended to the side and in the roof in 2003. The proposal seeks to further extend the south-east corner of the property to enable the conversion of the existing garage to a utility room and an extension of the existing front bedroom at ground floor with a study in the roof space.
4. The development plan for the area includes the saved policies of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan 2005 (LP). Policy QD14 (Extensions and Alterations) and Policy QD27 (Protection of Amenity) are relevant in this case. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance SPD12: Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations, adopted in 2013, is a material consideration. The National Planning Policy Guidance Framework (NPPF) published on 27 March 2012 is also a material consideration. I have also taken into account the Brighton and Hove City Plan Part One (submission document) which is an emerging development plan. Given the stage of preparation of this plan limited weight may be given to Policy SS1 which applies the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

***Issue (i) the effect of the proposal on character and appearance***

5. The appeal site is within an established residential area situated on a prominent bend on Green Ridge close to its junction with Millcroft. The original built form of the bungalows on Green Ridge is similar although not entirely uniform in style and appearance many have been altered with a variety of side extensions, roof alterations and side dormers. The appeal dwelling has an existing side addition which is subservient to the main dwelling due to it being set down from the ridge and being set back from the front building line.
6. The proposal is to extend the property so that the front elevation of the existing side extension (currently a garage) would be increased by some 2.5m and be flush with the front porch. The side of the property would be built up matching the existing eaves height and a new roof added which would follow the pitch of the existing front projection ending with a north-south central ridge. This ridge although raised by 1.1m would remain lower than the existing north-south ridge of the property and the same height as the existing east west ridge to which it is attached. A window would be inserted within the new gable front and roof lights would be positioned in the side roof slopes. The fenestration on the eastern elevation would also be altered.
7. I accept that the barn-hipped gable end would remain a feature and that the extension would be set down from the main ridge. I also accept that more accommodation is needed for a growing family. However, the extension would appear unduly dominant and would not form a subservient addition to the existing property. The considerable scale and bulk that would be created at roof level would clearly unbalance the property and result in an overdevelopment of this modest bungalow, as well as relating poorly to the main roof form. Furthermore, the detailing of the extension compounds the inappropriate nature of the extension with, for example, the introduction of the window at the top of the gable.
8. Given the overall design, size and bulk of the extension the appeal proposal would result in an overextended appearance and dominate the existing property. It would appear as an incongruous addition on a prominent site close to a road junction. In my view the proposal would not relate well to the design of the existing property and the wider area. It would therefore be in conflict with criterion (a) of Policy QD14 of the LP and to the guidance within SPD 12 and the NPPF, notably section 7 which requires good design. It would be an overdevelopment of the site, particularly when viewed westwards from the junction of Green Ridge and Millcroft, and as such would significantly harm the character and appearance of the existing property and the street scene. On the first issue the appeal must fail.

***Issue (ii) Impact of the proposals on living conditions***

9. With regard to the impact of the proposal on neighbours' living conditions the property most likely to be affected is No 103 Green Ridge. At my visit I saw that both dwellings are detached and are set away from the shared boundary. In my view due to this separation, the proposed extension would not result in any significant harm in terms of loss of light, outlook or overbearing impact. The proposed window to be inserted in the new gable front (underneath the barn-end) and the roof lights would not result in any significant loss of privacy or overlooking due to their positioning. The proposed new windows to the side elevation would be obscure glazed and would therefore minimise any impact.

I conclude on the second issue that the proposal would not offend aforementioned planning policies and would not significantly harm the living conditions of neighbouring properties.

10. Although the proposal would not cause significant harm to neighbours' living conditions under the second issue, the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the existing property and the street scene under the first issue is sufficient on its own to warrant dismissal of this appeal.

### **Other Matters**

11. I have taken into account all other matters raised including the Planning Statement submitted with the application and the points made about house prices in the area and local schools. I appreciate that the Appellant works from home and seeks to create an office space in the loft area. I am aware that an alternative scheme was considered which would be set back from the front wall but was not pursued because it would not enhance the host dwelling or the street scene. I appreciate that the materials to be used in the extension would match those of the host dwelling. However, for the reasons given, I cannot agree that the proposal would create a pleasing and sympathetic appearance within the street scene. Nor can I accept that the proposal is sustainable development under the provisions of paragraph 14 of the NPPF. The proposal is in conflict with the development plan and the adverse impacts which I have described significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF as a whole.
12. Reference was made to other properties within the area where extensions have been approved by the Council. At my visit I looked at the various properties shown in the accompanying photographs including those at No 84 and No 97 Green Ridge. I do not have all the relevant details about these properties. However, none of these developments persuaded me that the appeal proposal would be appropriate in this situation. Suffice it to say that each decision must be considered on its own merits and in accordance with the provisions of the development plan and any other material considerations. Planning conditions would not overcome the harm that I have described. None of the points raised are sufficient to outweigh the conflict with the development plan and the NPPF. None of these matters changes my overall conclusion that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Harold Stephens*

INSPECTOR

