



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2025

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/25/3371949

Spindrift Cottage, 3 Roedean Way, Brighton BN2 5RJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant [outline] planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr David Peppin against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref is BH2025/00989.
 - The development proposed is extension and remodelling of the existing house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and on the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached two storey dwelling on the north side of Roedean Way and within a predominantly residential area on the eastern approach to Brighton, mainly comprising generous sized, detached dwellings on good sized plots. I am advised that the house was built in the 1930s in an Arts and Crafts style but was subsequently altered in the 1950s to reflect a Mock Tudor style. The house has a distinct shape, but it shares its Mock Tudor design elements with the houses immediately adjoining to the east. The dwelling sits back from the road frontage and is elevated in terms of its ground floor in relation to the properties on either side and the land continues to rise to the rear, with some of the houses in Roedean Crescent appearing behind.
4. There are a variety of dwelling styles in the wider local area, and particularly along Roedean Crescent to the rear of Roedean Way; the individually designed houses range from mid twentieth century style properties including the appeal property and adjoining properties, some with mock Tudor elements to very modern redevelopments with flat roofs and a greater proportion of glass and rendered finishes. However, and although some of the properties have been remodelled or redeveloped, along Roedean Way there is a repetitive feature of pitched roofs and front gable features, albeit of varying detailed designs, which provide a consistent pattern in short and longer views.
5. The proposal would seek to remodel the existing property by removing the existing roof to create an additional storey set in from the floor below and under a flat roof, together with extensions and a single storey rear extension, all with new

fenestration and materials. The resultant building would have three storeys of accommodation with two balconies to the front elevation at first and second floors. The top floor would be of a darker render to the ground and first floors.

6. The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) and in particular Section 12, as well as policies in the Brighton & Hove City Plan Parts One and Two seek a high quality of design which respects the local context. Although I have noted that the increase in height from the existing ridge height would be less than 1m, it would result in a much heavier form in terms of massing. I consider that the resultant building with the change at roof level together with the other remodelling and extensions proposed would appear very bulky, with poorly designed proportions. The side elevations, in particular, lack articulation and the overall composition would be unbalanced and overly heavy. Taking all these matters together, it would fall short of the high standards of design which is the aim of both national and local policies.
7. The resultant building would also stand in stark contrast to the immediately adjoining buildings, both in terms of its increased height and massing as well as its design. Whilst I have taken into account the range of individual designs in the wider area, including modern developments, the use of pitched roofs with gable details is a distinctive and coherent feature along much of Roedean Way. The remodelled building would be visually incongruous and overly prominent, in terms of its scale, height and design in relation to the immediately surrounding buildings and in the street scene.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not respect the character and appearance of the existing building or of the local area. It would conflict with Policies DM18 and DM21 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part Two, Policy CP12 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One and the Framework and in particular Section 12, all of which amongst other matters seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.
9. The Appellant has referred me to the Council's Brighton & Hove Urban Characterisation Study dated January 2009 and in particular to the section on the Black Rock Neighbourhood which contains the appeal property. This is primarily a factual and descriptive document for each sub-area, and does not persuade me to a different view in respect of this particular proposal.
10. I have had regard to the Appellant's contention that the existing house is in poor condition and in need of refurbishment to bring it up to modern standards. There is no objection to the principle of refurbishing or extending the property, and the harm I have found is to the particular form and design of the proposal the subject of this appeal.

Conclusion

11. For the reason given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including in representations both raising objections as well as in support, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR