



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 November 2013

by **C J Leigh BSC(HONS) MPHIL MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 4 December 2013

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/13/2206477**

**4 Terminus Place, Brighton, BN1 3PR**

- 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 T Fitzgerald against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
  - The application Ref BH2013/01899, dated 4 June 2013, was refused by notice dated 7 August 2013.
  - The development proposed is two rear dormers & front conservation rooflight in connection with a loft conversion.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the West Hill Conservation Area, within which the appeal site lies.

### Reasons

3. The property is one of an attractive terrace of small houses that rise from Terminus Road. The vicinity of the area is characterised by similar short terraces of houses to the south, whilst to the west are the larger houses of Clifton Street that are set at a higher level. There is a good degree of consistency in the roofscape of the area, with few alterations evident; those that do exist, which include the examples pointed out by the appellant, are the exception and as a consequence the general appearance of the roofs in the vicinity is largely unaltered. The form of the roofs and the degree of originality make a positive contribution to the West Hill Conservation Area.
4. The proposed development would see a conservation-style roof light in the front roofslope, which would have no harmful effect upon the appearance of the building. The scheme would also see two dormers windows in the rear roof slope. I share the Council's concerns that these would appear over-dominant to the roof and the house below due to their size and proportions: they would in fact be larger than the size of the first floor windows beneath in the subject property. They would sit in a high position on the roof. These matters together would all create an imbalanced appearance to the rear elevation, and this unfortunate effect would be incongruous to the terrace and the wider area.

5. I acknowledge there are some alterations to roofs in the wider area, including dormer additions. However, as noted above these are very much the exception and the character of the area is largely one of unaltered roofslopes. In any event, such changes do not justify the construction of the two rear dormers as shown which would be disproportionate in scale and unduly imposing to the character of the host property and the area.
6. It is therefore concluded that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the West Hill Conservation Area, and this would be contrary to Policies QD2, QD14 and HE6 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan 2005 which, amongst other matters, seek to ensure all new development is well designed, sited and detailed and has no harmful effect on the townscape and roofscape of conservation areas. It would also be inconsistent with the advice contained in the Council's Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations SPD 12 (2013) relating to the design of roof extensions and alterations.
7. I agree the proposed development would not be harmful to the privacy of adjoining residents. I also acknowledge that the appellant has undertaken refurbishment works to the property. However, these matters do not outweigh the conflict with adopted planning policies as noted above, and the appeal is dismissed accordingly.

**C J Leigh**

INSPECTOR