



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2022

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 October 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/W/22/3300172 **58B Davigdor Road, Hove BN3 1 RB**

- 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 Mrs Pauline Redfern against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2022/00242, dated 4 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is a roof extension to facilitate additional living space and installation of side window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I use the Council's description of development which is more encompassing than the application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a maisonette with a hipped roof in an end of terrace situation in a locality of varied building types and scales which come together to form an area of established character and interesting appearance. This interest is increased by the Church building which, across a footway, abuts the appeal property. The relevant terrace is of well-balanced design and the varied hipped roofs contribute to this pleasing form. The appeal scheme is as described above; in simple terms it is changing a hip end to a gable.
 5. The existing prominently located terrace building has a lot to commend it visually and, as touched on above, this is not least in the roof arrangement which both in its original form and where extended to date, has subtle hipped design. Regrettably the proposed gable would markedly intrude upon the pleasing uniformity and rhythm. It would unbalance the building and appear incongruous and I do believe this obtrusive change would unfortunately be readily noticeable in the streetscene. I should also add that there is something to be said for the Church being given 'space' in the scene and whilst the current hip helps with this a gable arrangement would do the opposite.
-

6. Overall, in my assessment the appeal proposal would be aesthetically unfortunate, jarring on the eye, and damaging to the streetscene.
7. Policies QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan, CP12 of the City Plan Part One and DM21 of the City Plan Part 2 are relevant. Taken together and amongst other matters, these policies seek well designed and suitably scaled development that should protect the character and visual quality of buildings and the local distinctiveness of their wider area and generally have architectural merit. In all the circumstances I conclude that the appeal scheme would conflict with these planning policies.

Other matters

8. I do understand the Appellant's wish to re-arrange and increase useable accommodation and I can see that thought has been given to matters such as external materials and bathroom positioning. I do agree that this development would not impinge upon neighbours' amenity. I appreciate there are some other roof alterations in the locality albeit I do not know their full planning background and I am not convinced that they all provide a positive contribution to the scene. In any event, they are not necessarily identical to the appeal scheme in form and certainly not in the immediate context building, and I must assess this case on its own merits. I understand the point about 'permitted development' fall-back but as the Appellant fairly acknowledges this would not apply in this instance and I do have a failed planning application to consider. I have carefully contemplated all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
9. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered; the Council's policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within that document.

Overall conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR