



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18th December 2017

by Alison Roland BSc DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 02nd January 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/17/3186570

23 Selhurst Road, Brighton, East Sussex, BN2 6WE.

- 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 Mary Henderson against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref: BH2016/06382, dated 30 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 18 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is roof works to include new gable window to front, extended side dormer and roof over lounge and kitchen and replacement flat roof with lantern to existing conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to roof works to include extended side dormer and roof over lounge and kitchen and replacement flat roof with lantern to existing conservatory. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to roof works to include new gable window to front and planning permission is granted for the same, at 23 Selhurst Road, Brighton, East Sussex, BN2 6WE, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: BH2016/06382, dated 30 November 2016, and the plans submitted with it [so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted] and subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drwg No: DE680/01 Rev P1: Site Location & Block Plan; Drwg No: DE680/02 Rev P1: Existing Ground Floor & Loft Plans; Drwg No: DE680/03 Rev P2: Existing Front, Rear & Side Elevations; Drwg No: DE680/06 Rev P1: Proposed Loft and Roof Plans; Drwg No: DE680/07 Rev P1: Proposed Front, Rear & Side Elevations.
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the implications of the proposal for the character and appearance of the area.
-

Reasons

3. The proposed box dormer would be sited alongside and behind an existing box dormer in the side roof. Whilst it would not be prominent in the street scene by virtue of its position, it would nonetheless be visible. As it is, the existing box dormer imparts a rather top-heavy appearance to the roof of the property, but the proposal would consolidate this and the resultant roof of the property would have an ungainly and unbalanced appearance, especially when compared with the generally unaltered roofs of bungalows in this particular row. Whilst I saw two other box dormers to properties on the opposite side of the road, the Brighton & Hove City Council Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document 12: *Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations*, (2013) (SPD) states at paragraph 3.5 that the presence of inappropriate roof alterations in the street will not be accepted as evidence of established precedent.
4. In relation to the proposed alteration to the front roof, although this would be in a more prominent position, it would be a rather more discrete addition and I do not accept the Council's proposition that it would fail to appear subordinate to the host property. Whilst it would be a somewhat novel feature with its small glazed gable at the apex, it would nonetheless not unduly draw the eye and would be largely seen in the context of the vertical dormer cheek to its rear.
5. Overall on the main issue, I find that the front roof alteration would integrate satisfactorily with the host property and prevailing character of the area and would thus accord with Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan (2005) retained on adoption of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One (March 2016) and the advice in the SPD. These seek to ensure that alterations and extensions to dwellings are well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended and to the surrounding area. However, for the reasons given, I conclude that the proposed side dormer would not accord with the same and would detract from the host property and character and appearance of the area.
6. The Council take no issue with the balance of the development and I have no reason to either. However, the balance of the extensions to the roof and to the rear of the property are not clearly physically and functionally severable from the side dormer. I shall therefore issue a split decision, allowing the appeal insofar as it relates to the alteration to the roof at the front of the property, as this is clearly separate and divisible from the balance of the extensions.
7. In addition to the standard time limit for commencement of development, the Council suggest conditions confining the approval to the submitted plans and requiring the use of matching materials. The former is necessary for certainty and the latter is necessary to secure a satisfactory finished appearance.

ALISON ROLAND

INSPECTOR