



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 December 2018

by **Paul T Hocking BA MSc MCMi MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 January 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/W/18/3203914

First Floor Flat 19 Glendale Road, Hove BN3 6ES

- 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 Andrew Harrold against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2018/00045, dated 5 January 2018, was refused by notice dated 20 March 2018.
 - The development proposed is for roof alterations incorporating rear dormer and insertion of front rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for roof alterations incorporating rear dormer and insertion of front rooflights at First Floor Flat 19 Glendale Road, Hove BN3 6ES in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BH2018/00045, dated 5 January 2018, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PBP0890/01; PBP0890/02; PBP0890/03.
 - 3) The external finishes used in the development hereby permitted shall match in material, colour, style, bonding and texture those used on the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Procedural Matters

3. The proposed development is described as a loft conversion in the submitted application form. However, the description on the appeal form and Council's decision notice more precisely describes the development works applied for and I have determined the appeal accordingly.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a first-floor flat within a row of attractive two-storey terraced houses with front bay-windows addressing Glendale Road. It is proposed to create a second-floor for a bedroom and en-suite within the roof

- space. This would introduce three roof lights in the front roof slope and a dormer window in the rear. Other properties in the immediate area have been the subject of similar conversions.
5. The appeal property and those adjoining it have large two-storey flat roof outriggers to the rear. These dominate the properties but also have the effect of setting the pitched roof slopes back from the rear of the houses, reducing their visibility from the surrounding area.
 6. As a consequence the width and size of the proposed dormer window, which is neither for the full width nor full height of the roof, would not appear as an overly dominant roof addition or one that relates poorly to the rear elevation. It could only be glimpsed in views from Avondale Road which runs parallel to the rear of the appeal site. It would therefore not give the appearance of an additional storey on top of the building.
 7. The dormer would have two windows. These would be of a smaller overall size than the windows below. This would respect the hierarchy of window sizes and I therefore find this would not disrupt the general appearance of the building.
 8. The roof lights on the front roof-slope total three in number. As they would be of modest size and positioned appropriately, in my view the roof would not appear as overly cluttered.
 9. The Council has referred to Supplementary Planning Document 12 – Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations (the SPD) which gives guidance about the size, height and appearance of dormer windows as well as fenestration. I have however found the appeal proposal would not result in a dormer window or fenestration that conflicts with the SPD.
 10. Whilst similar roof alterations in the area have been undertaken, albeit using permitted development rights, I find the appeal proposal takes the appropriate cues from these examples and so is not harmful to the character of the area.
 11. I therefore find the appeal proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and would comply with the SPD and saved Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan. This policy, amongst other things, requires that development should be well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended and takes account of the character of the area.

Conclusion

12. In addition to the standard time condition it is necessary to specify the plans in the interests of certainty. A materials condition is also necessary to protect the character and appearance of the area.
13. Having regard to this and all other relevant matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Paul T Hocking

INSPECTOR