
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 May 2014

by Robert Parker BSc (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15 May 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/14/2217040
61 Millcroft, Brighton, East Sussex, BN1 5HD

- 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 Clive Newitt against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref. BH2014/00027, dated 6 January 2014, was refused by notice dated 11 March 2014.
 - The development proposed is removal of gable roof and installation of 2 no. dormer windows to front of dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. No.61 is a detached bungalow within a row of five similar properties near the junction of Millcroft and Millrise. The properties form a discrete group and they are relatively uniform in appearance. The addition of roof lights to the front of two of the properties has not interrupted the simplicity of roof form.
4. The proposed dormers would be modest in size and aligned with the windows below. They would be subordinate additions to the roof and would maintain balance to the front elevation. However, the removal of the existing gable feature and the addition of dormers would disrupt the continuity of the group of bungalows, none of which have been extended beyond the plane of the roof slope. This would conflict with guidance contained within the adopted Supplementary Planning Document 12: Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations (2013) (SPD). For this reason, the dormers would appear as discordant and incongruous features in the street scene.
5. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposals would be materially harmful to the character and appearance of the area. They would conflict with Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005, as interpreted by the SPD. This policy requires proposals for extensions and alterations to existing buildings to be well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended, adjoining properties and to the surrounding area.

Other Matters

6. The Planning Statement makes reference to two planning permissions relating to new dormers in Millcroft. One was granted in 2008, prior to the adoption of the SPD. The other reintroduces the symmetry which was lost when a dormer was constructed on the attached semi-detached property. The circumstances are therefore different to those in the present appeal case.
7. I have also been supplied with photographs of a variety of dormers which exist on other properties in the local area. The Council has confirmed that none of these, apart from the recent example referred to above, was granted planning permission under current policies and guidance. As such they carry very limited weight as a precedent.
8. My decision takes into account the benefits of gaining additional headroom for the first floor bedrooms. However, these do not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Robert Parker

INSPECTOR