



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 March 2016

by **Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA**

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

Decision date: 07 April 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/16/3142070

31 Coldean Lane, Brighton, East Sussex, BN1 9GD.

- 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 Clive Morgan against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2015/03779, dated 14 October 2015, was refused by notice dated 23 November 2015.
 - The development proposed is for a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council has confirmed that it adopted the Brighton and Hove City Council's Development Plan – *Brighton and Hove City Plan Part One* on the 24 March 2016. However, Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan (2005) (LP) has not been replaced by any policy in the new plan and remains a retained saved policy. Further, I am advised that Supplementary Planning Document 12: *Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations* (spd 12) has also been retained. I shall proceed to determine the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host building and thereby the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

4. The property the subject of this appeal, 31 Coldean Lane, is one half of a semi-detached pair of houses. The pair is, in turn, one of four similar pairs of houses located to the south of Coldean Lane and directly facing towards it. They were designed with matching hipped roofs that extend down, via a 'catslide', to a low eaves line just above the head of the ground floor windows at either end. While two of the houses have flat roofed dormers built into these lower slopes, the three-dimensional symmetrical form of the roofs remains a distinctive feature of all the houses in this group.
-

5. As I saw the group of houses, of which this is one, is a prominent feature in the street scene due to its elevated position alongside a busy road with limited screening.
6. The appellants propose a two-storey side extension with dormer. The proposal is to extend the width of the house by about 1.5 metres. The addition would have a matching roof configuration that would maintain the eaves, ridge height and detailing. However, despite the modest size of the proposed extension, by reason of extending the length of the ridge, it would unbalance the semi-detached pair when viewed from the street. As identified by the appellants the form of the roofs of a number of other houses, outside this distinctive group, have been altered thereby creating an imbalance in the semi-detached pair of which they are part. However, I am not persuaded that this is sufficient justification for the proposed roof alterations here.
7. Two of the houses in this group, as well as a number of other dwellings elsewhere in the locality, have side dormers. Nevertheless, in this case, due to the overall height, length and three-dimensional form of the proposed dormer, it would add significantly to the bulk of the roof, as extended, drawing further attention to the loss of symmetry.
8. In itself the extension as designed would be well mannered. Nevertheless, I consider, on balance, it would be unacceptable due to the harm that would ensue to the semi-detached pair, the group and thereby the surrounding street scene.
9. I therefore conclude, in respect of the main issue, that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the architectural integrity of the host building and the group of which it is part and thereby the character and appearance of the street scene. To allow it would therefore be contrary to the objectives of LP Policy QD14 and guidance within spd 12 as they relate to the quality of design and the impact of new development on adjoining properties and the surrounding area.

Other Matters

10. The appellants have drawn my attention to an appeal decision, APP/Q1445/A/02/1098145, which amongst other things considers the impact of a flat roof side dormer on the balance of number 29 Coldean Lane, also one half of a semi-detached pair of houses. In addition to that decision preceding both the National Planning Policy Framework and the current development plan, as far as I can tell the proposal did not include for either a ground floor side extension or alteration to the main roof as proposed here. Accordingly, while I have noted the Inspector's comments, I have considered this appeal on its individual planning merits.

Conclusions

11. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposal would not be in accordance with the development plan, when read as a whole, and therefore the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR