



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 September 2019

by C Osgathorp BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/19/3232912

49 Hollingbury Park Avenue, Brighton BN1 7JQ

- 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 Mark Wagstaff against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2019/01358, dated 4 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of roof extension incorporating rear dormer, raising the ridge height and insertion of a rear rooflight.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have used the description of development shown on the Council's decision notice and the appellant's appeal form in the banner heading because it is more precise than the description shown on the planning application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a 2 storey semi-detached dwelling which is located in an established residential area. It is positioned within a row of properties on the western side of Hollingbury Park Avenue, which have a homogenous character and appearance in terms of their proportions, scale, architectural detailing and external materials. The ridgeline is stepped in places along the street frontage, which is due to the slope of the road rather than any significant variation in the scale or proportions of the dwellings. Whilst there is variation in the design of the front 2 storey bays, the design of the semi-detached building comprising Nos 47 and 49 has symmetrical scale and proportions, which provides a pleasing appearance.
5. The appeal scheme proposes to raise the ridgeline of the dwelling by 750mm, which would project above the roof of the adjoining semi-detached property at No 47. The proposal would add bulk to the main roof, which would unbalance the symmetrical scale and proportions of the semi-detached building comprising Nos 47 and 49 to the detriment of its character and appearance.

Furthermore, the extended roof would appear out of keeping with the consistent scale and proportions of the adjacent properties on the western side of Hollingbury Park Avenue.

6. The appellant has drawn my attention to the significant number of full width rear dormers that are located in the surrounding area. Taking into account that the proposed rear dormer would be smaller than other dormers in the area and that views of it would be partially screened by the existing two storey rear outrigger, I find that it would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. Although I have not found harm in this respect it does not overcome the harm that I have found in relation to the proposed raising of the ridge height.
7. I have had regard to the appellant's statement that the appeal scheme would make more effective use of the loft space, however this does not outweigh the harm that I have identified.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to saved Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan 2005, which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure that extensions or alterations to existing buildings are well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended, adjoining properties and to the surrounding area.

Other Matters

9. I have had regard to the concerns raised by the occupier of a neighbouring property, which, in addition to the above matters, relate to overdevelopment, overshadowing and structural impact on the building. However, as I find the proposed development unacceptable for other reasons, these considerations would not alter my decision.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Osgathorp

INSPECTOR