



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on [Event Date]

by Robin Buchanan BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/22/3306351

7 Lynchets Crescent, Hove BN3 8EL

- 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 Ali Sina Forouzandeh against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2022/02097, dated 28 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 23 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey front and side extensions, front dormer extension, revised fenestration and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The banner above contains the description of development used in the Council's decision notice because it is more accurate.
3. The Council adopted the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part Two (CPP2) on 22 October 2022. It replaced Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005 listed in the Council's reason for refusal. The main parties were invited to comment on the relevant CPP2 Policy DM21. No comments were received. I have given full weight to this policy.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposed front dormer extension on the character and appearance of No.7 Lynchets Crescent and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. No.7 Lynchets Crescent is a modest sized detached bungalow with a simple design including a pitched roof slope facing the road, set behind an open plan front garden. It is similar in these respects to most other bungalows in this road and in the surrounding area and this is locally distinctive.
6. The front dormer extension (dormer) would stretch across nearly the entire front roof slope, from eaves to just below ridge with a deep flat roof and wide side cheeks. It would obliterate any semblance of the existing roof profile. This substantial increase in built form projecting beyond the roof plane, towards the road, would give the bungalow a disproportionate, top heavy appearance. This fundamental change to the intrinsic form of No.7 would render it manifestly out of keeping with itself and the prevailing appearance of bungalows in this road and in surrounding area.

7. The dormer would be unduly prominent and conspicuous in public views in both directions in Lynchets Crescent and have an incongruous, jarring presence in this streetscene. This would undermine the otherwise broadly cohesive appearance of bungalows in this road and in the surrounding area.
8. Some external materials would match the bungalow but this would not overcome the unsympathetic change to its design or the disruption to the continuity and rhythm in the appearance of bungalows in this road. Most dormers of this type and size in Lynchets Crescent and in the surrounding area are in the rear roof slope so do not have the same public visual impact. Front dormers are generally significantly smaller and single storey front extensions are narrow with hipped or gabled roofs so do not overlap so much into the main roof slope or unduly alter overall scale and massing.
9. While the front dormer at No.31 Lynchets Crescent is similar to that which is proposed in this case, it is a solitary exception and plainly at odds with the prevailing character of bungalows in this road. The limited number of other such dormers elsewhere in the surrounding area cannot be observed in the context of No.7. None of these set a welcome precedent.
10. Accordingly, there would be significant harm to the character and appearance of No.7 Lynchets Crescent and to the surrounding area. Consequently, the dormer would conflict with Policy CP12 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One and with CPP2 Policy DM21. These policies require extensions and alterations to be well designed and scaled in relation to the property to be extended, adjoining properties and the existing character of the area.

Other Matters

11. Enlargement of the bungalow to provide additional living accommodation would be aligned with objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework to meet housing needs. However, the Framework also refers to well-designed and distinctive places to live as a key objective of sustainable development.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

12. The proposed development would not accord with the development plan. There are no other material considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons given above the appeal does not succeed.

Robin Buchanan

INSPECTOR