



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2010

by Simon Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 3 October 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/11/2157790

2 Hangleton Valley Drive, Hove, East Sussex, BN3 8AP

- 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 Darren Logan against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2011/01420, dated 10 April 2011, was refused by notice dated 24 June 2011.
 - The development proposed is the installation of pitched roof dormer to the front elevation.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached house situated in a residential area. It forms the end property of a group of essentially identical pairs of semi-detached houses with prominent gables facing the street and substantial pitched roofs. These properties have an attractive appearance partly due to the uniformity of their roof forms, a matter to which I attach significant weight.
4. The proposal would involve the installation of a dormer on the front roof pitch of the appeal property immediately next to the party wall with No. 2a. This would have a pitched roof and would be clad in tiles to match the roof. I recognise that the dormer would be a relatively small element compared to the overall size of the roof and the gables of the semi-detached pair. However, in my judgement, due to its siting on a street-facing roof of a property that forms part of a uniform group of attractive houses, the proposal would be an incongruous element in the street scene which would have an unacceptable effect on the appearance of the host property, its pair and the surrounding area.

5. I conclude therefore that the proposal fails to accord with Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan (2005) which, amongst other matters, seeks extensions and alterations to existing buildings that are well sited. The proposal also fails to comply with Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 1: *Roof Alterations and Extensions* which seeks to prevent new dormers on front roof slopes in a uniform terrace or group if visible from a street.
6. I note that the property opposite the appeal site includes tile hung dormers and there are other such additions on other properties in the wider area. I also recognise that the room in the roof adds, albeit marginally, to the mix of dwelling sizes in the area. However, these matters do not outweigh my conclusions set out above.
7. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

Simon Poole

INSPECTOR