



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2010

by J M Trask BSc (Hons) CEng MICE

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

Decision date: 9 December 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/A/10/2136113

First Floor Flat A, 1 Frith Road, Hove, East Sussex BN3 7AJ

- 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 Mark Jackson against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2010/00819, dated 13 March 2010, was refused by notice dated 8 June 2010.
 - The development proposed is described as a "loft conversion to provide additional living space with a rear dormer and 2 No front Velux windows. As part of the proposed works the applicant intends reinstating a slate roof. This will replace the "Redland 49" concrete tile cover affixed to the front and rear slopes."
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council did not attend at the time of my site visit and I carried out an unaccompanied inspection.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to an end of terrace property that is divided into flats. The dormer window would occupy a high proportion of the rear roof slope. It would be considerably wider than the windows below and there would be large areas of cladding to the side and below the windows of the proposed dormer. Thus the proposal would result in the dwelling having a top heavy appearance which would be detrimental to its traditional character and appearance. There would be some screening by trees but the side of the dormer could be seen from the street and the rear would be apparent from nearby properties. The proposed dormer window would not be well designed, sited or detailed in relation to the property to be extended and so has to be regarded as in conflict with the provisions of Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan as well as those of Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) BH note 1.
5. There are a number of other dormers in the area but the Council has advised that none have the benefit of recent planning permission. Furthermore the

presence of inappropriate roof alterations cannot set a precedent and each individual case must be assessed on its merits in terms of how a particular proposal would affect its immediate environment.

6. The appellant has advised the proposal includes improving insulation and reinstating the original slate roof appearance. However, it has not been shown that the development proposed is required to obtain these benefits. While the appellant has also referred to conflict with the 2005 5 year plan *Sustainable communities: Homes for all* I have seen no details. I have also noted the concerns expressed by the appellant in his dealings with the Council. However, these are not matters for me to comment upon in the context of this decision. I have had regard to all other matters raised but they are not sufficient to outweigh the considerations which have led me to my conclusion.
7. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J M Trask

INSPECTOR