

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2014

**by D Lamont BSC(Hons) MBA MRTPI MCMI**

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

**Decision date: 14 January 2014**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/A/13/2204631**

**147 Westbourne Street, Hove, East Sussex, BN3 5FB.**

- 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 & Mrs David Toscano against Brighton & Hove City Council.
  - The application Ref BH2013/01993, dated 17 June 2013, was refused by notice dated 13 August 2013.
  - The development proposed is erection of a rear dormer roof extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issues

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

## Reasons

3. The host property is a traditional terraced property within a suburban area of similar properties. The traditional form and appearance of the host property has largely been retained, consistent with similar properties in the area. This provides the subject property and the area with a traditional charm and character. Some of the properties have been the subject of larger dormer extensions to the rear. However, as such examples are relatively few, the traditional character of the terraces' roofscape, which contributes to the traditional suburban character of the area, is generally maintained.
  4. Within the host property's terraced group is a large rear dormer roof extension. It lies to the rear of No. 149 Westbourne Street and adjacent to the subject appeal property. It has a pair of central glazed doors and Juliet balcony and rear-facing windows on either side. Although this is at variance with the traditional roofscape which predominates locally, it is an exception to the group's traditional roof form which is otherwise generally maintained and contributes to the traditional built character of the building and the wider area.
  5. A bedroom has been created within the host property's roof and is served by a rear rooflight. However, the window is of a relatively modest scale within the
-

context of the rear roof surface and it respects the rear roof plane and finishes. Consequently, the rear roofscape of the property largely maintains the traditional character and appearance of the rear of the host property and the local roofscape. The proposal would create a large dormer which is similar in scale, form design and details to the adjacent one at No.149. It would create a full height dormer which would extend across the majority of the host roof to close to its boundary with No. 149, where the existing dormer starts.

6. The proposal would create an extension of such bulk and massing as to detract from the predominantly traditional character and appearance of the roof profile and form of the host property and that which predominates locally and contributes to the area's character and appearance. The harm would be exacerbated by the design of the central glazed doors, Juliet balcony, adjacent windows and extensive tile-hung cladding. These details would be inconsistent with the rear elevation and traditional roof plane of the host property and which predominate locally to contribute to the area's traditional charm.
7. The harm would be exacerbated by the proximity of the subject dormer to the adjacent existing dormer. The combined effect of the adjacent dormers would be read from Byron Street as an excessively wide continuum of an expanse of substantial dormer extension which is out of character with the predominant rooflines and details of the area. The harm would be further exacerbated by the prominence of the dormer as viewed from the private rear gardens to the east, which serve the housing onto Byron Street and Coleridge Street.
8. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would cause substantial harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. This would also be contrary to the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005 (Local Plan) saved Policy QD14 and the Council's 'Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations' (SPD); which require extensions to be of a siting, design, detail and external finishes which are well-related to the property and surrounding area.
9. I have considered the appellants' argument that the proposed structure would be similar to the adjacent structure and that there are other similar examples locally. However, the existence of comparable development examples alone does not warrant departure from Local Plan policy and guidance; and these issues do not outweigh the considerations which have lead to my conclusion.
10. For these reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposal would cause substantial harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area, contrary to Local Plan Policy QD14 and the SPD, and dismiss the appeal.

*D Lamont*

INSPECTOR