
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 February 2020

by N Holdsworth MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/19/3240131

22 Winton Avenue, Saltdean, Brighton, BN2 8FN

- 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 Ian Pinder against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2019/02554, dated 26 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey rear extension at lower ground floor and ground floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host building.
3. No.22 Winton Avenue is a bungalow with a shallow hipped roof. It forms a pair with No.20, and the road is characterised by similar properties.
4. The proposal has been reduced in size in comparison with an earlier scheme dismissed at appeal¹, primarily by moving the extension away from the boundary with No. 20. However, it would still expand beyond the side elevation of the main part of the host building. Consequently, the extension would appear as an unusually large addition, eroding the distinction between the bungalow and the visually subordinate attached garage.
5. Furthermore, the extension would continue to exhibit a large area of flat roof, which would sit beside the original hipped roof of the bungalow. Whilst the mock pitched roof would follow the angles of the main roof, it would be of limited height, doing little to disguise the flat roof.
6. Consequently, from the rear the building would exhibit a combination of different roof shapes and forms, diminishing the status of the original hipped roof without a coherent design justification. The combination of factors discussed above mean that the rear extension would not be subservient to the host building. It would appear as a poorly designed and incongruous addition, that does not integrate effectively with the host building.

¹ APP/Q1445/D/18/3215949

7. As such, the revised proposal does not successfully address the principal issues identified in the previous appeal decision, as argued by the appellant. Whilst I have assessed this case afresh and on its individual merits, I concur that, because of its siting, scale and roof form, the extension proposed would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host building.
8. It is maintained that a similar extension could be built under permitted development rights, but no alternative fall-back scheme has been presented to me to assess. As such, I attach very little weight to this argument.
9. Details are also provided of other properties, including those close to the appeal site, which have been extended in various ways. Some comprise very wide single storey extensions. Others comprise visually prominent alterations, readily apparent from public views, along with examples of similar mock pitched roofs. It is possible that these works have been carried out through the exercise of permitted development rights, but I do not know the full planning background to these cases.
10. However, these extended properties do not constitute examples of good design that should inevitably be followed. Whilst the proposal now before me would be less visually intrusive than some of these existing developments, this does not make the proposal acceptable.
11. The siting of the extension away from the boundary of No.20 means that it would not appear overbearing from this neighbouring property or its garden, and the proposal would not lead to any terracing effect. The extension would also be set well away from other residential properties and would not therefore result in harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents through any overshadowing or overlooking. However, these are neutral factors in the planning balance.
12. The proposal would achieve improved living conditions for the occupants of the host property, and there is some local support for the proposal. These are considerations that weigh in favour of the development. Furthermore, the proposal would be set to the rear of the property and as such its visual impact would be largely limited to the application site itself.
13. However, the National Planning Policy Framework seeks to promote well designed places. This principle applies to both private as well as public views. The proposed rear extension would detract from the architectural coherence of the host building, to the point where it would appear sprawling and visually unresolved at the rear. The proposal fails the policy test, set out in saved policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan 2005 which requires, amongst other things, that extensions should be well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended.
14. As such, the proposal conflicts with the development plan and there are no other considerations that outweigh this finding. The appeal should be dismissed.

Neil Holdsworth

INSPECTOR