



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 January 2012

by J Mansell Jagger MA(Cantab) DipTP MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 6 January 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/11/2164891
32 The Cliff, Brighton BN2 5RE

- 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 Al-Kad against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application ref BH/2011/02122, dated 15 July 2011, was refused by notice dated 14 October 2011.
 - The development proposed is installation of new dormer window to front-facing roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation of new dormer window to front-facing roof slope at 32 The Cliff, Brighton BN2 5RE in accordance with the terms of the application, ref BH/2011/02122, dated 15 July 2011, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: drawing nos. 1121-01A and 1121-02B.

Main Issue

2. The issue is the effect of the proposed dormer window on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The property comprises a substantial modern detached chalet style residence occupying a large plot on the south side of The Cliff. The local area is mostly characterised by large individually designed properties, several of which have first or second floor dormer windows.
4. Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan states that extensions and alterations should be well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the existing property, adjoining properties and the surrounding area, whilst the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Roof Alterations and Extensions

(SPGBH1) contains more detailed guidance, including for the construction of dormer windows.

5. Although SPGBH1 states that dormers should generally be kept as small as possible, ideally no larger than the windows below, and have minimal cladding, in my view each proposal should be judged on its own merits. In this case, the dormer would match the general design, proportions and materials of the existing front dormer. It would be set well below the existing ridge height, set in from the half-hipped gable and be above eaves level. It would appear subservient in respect of the size and scale of the existing roof and produce a balanced effect with the existing dormer.
6. In my opinion, the proposed dormer would blend satisfactorily with the overall design of the dwelling and have a neutral effect on adjacent buildings and the street scene. It would therefore not have a detrimental effect on the character or appearance of the dwelling or the surrounding area and would not conflict with the Council's adopted policies or Supplementary Planning Guidance.
7. For the avoidance of doubt, I have added a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Subject to that condition, I see no reason why the appeal should not be allowed.

J Mansell Jagger

INSPECTOR