



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2011

**by Sheila Holden** BSc MSc CEng TPP MICE MRTPI FCIHT

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

**Decision date: 4 March 2011**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/10/2143465**  
**103 Goldstone Crescent, Hove, BN3 6LS**

- 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 Stephen Dugard against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
  - The application Ref BH2010/02815, dated 2 September 2010, was refused by notice dated 8 November 2010.
  - The development proposed is alterations and extension to a dwelling.
- 

## Decision

1. I allow the appeal and grant planning permission for the erection of rear extension replacing existing conservatory. Alterations including installation of rooflight to side and dormers to rear and side and altered fenestration at 103 Goldstone Crescent, Hove, BN3 6LS in accordance with the application Ref BH2010/02815, dated 2 September 2010, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.
  - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the layout and details shown on the following approved plans: Drawing No. 938.00, dated 2 September 2010 and Drawing Nos. 938.09, 938.10, 938.11 and 938.12a, dated 19 April 2010.

## Procedural matter

2. The Council describe the development as erection of rear extension replacing existing conservatory. Alterations including installation of rooflight to side and dormers to rear and side and altered fenestration. I have used this fuller description of the proposal in my determination of the appeal.

## Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension and rear dormer windows on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

## Reasons

4. No 103 is a detached two-storey house dating from the 1930s set in a modest sized plot. The house was altered and extended in the 1960s and again in the mid 1970s. The existing first floor rear extension has a flat roof and angled mansard style walls with three windows, two of which look over the rear garden and the third towards the adjoining property, No 105.
5. If the extension was going to be visible from the street it would be important for the eaves to line up with those of the original house. However, as the proposal would be entirely to the rear of the property it seems to me that it would be equally appropriate for the eaves to be a little lower, giving the impression of a more traditional rear projection or outrigger. I consider that the extension could therefore be satisfactorily integrated into the existing dwelling, particularly as the proposed pitched roof would be more compatible with the style and appearance of the original property.
6. The two proposed half dormers would not dominate the new roof and their roof slopes would match those of the proposed extension. The size of the windows would be proportionate to the extension, compatible with others on the rear elevation and relate well to the new ground floor windows. The dormers would be close to one another but the sketch showing a possible alternative proposal with a single window would not, in my view, offer substantial advantages over the appeal proposal. The overall proposal would, in my view, result in a significant improvement to the appearance of the rear of the house.
7. I conclude that the proposed extension would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and would comply with saved Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan which seeks high quality alterations that respect the host property and its surroundings. The dormer windows would also be in general conformity with the guidelines set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: *Roof Alterations and Extensions*. As this extension would not affect the wider street scene I consider it to be one of the rare cases where locating the dormer flush with the rear elevation, rather than set back from the eaves, would not be harmful.
8. I shall therefore allow the appeal, subject to conditions. In addition to the standard time limit I have imposed a materials condition in the interests of the appearance of the building and specified the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of good planning. The officer's report refers to the need for obscure glazing in the windows that face Nos. 101 and 105. The plans show those facing No 101 fitted with obscure glass so a condition is not necessary to secure these details. The window facing No 105 would be both smaller and further from the shared boundary than the existing plain glass one. Since the development will not increase the amount of overlooking of this adjacent property I consider that a condition requiring obscure glazing is not justified.

*Sheila Holden*  
INSPECTOR