



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 April 2013

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 11 April 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/13/2193015
102A Hallyburton Road, Hove, East Sussex BN3 7GN

- 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 Ms Katherine Browne against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2012/03898, dated 3 December 2012, was refused by notice dated 30 January 2013.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with rooflight to side and dormer to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have taken the description from the decision notice and which was repeated on the appeal form as this more appropriately describes the development proposed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a 2-storey dwelling at the end of a short terrace built to the rear of properties fronting on to Hallyburton Road. The terrace backs onto a railway line at Portslade Station. As such, it can be seen from this publicly accessible space along the immediately adjoining platforms and especially from the elevated position of a pedestrian footbridge over the track. From these areas the uniformity and symmetry of this building appears as a noticeable contemporary feature in the surrounding townscape.
 5. The proposed dormer would sit uncomfortably close to the ridge tiles along the terrace's hip ended roof. In addition, whilst I accept that the dormer would be of reasonably small proportions, designed with a pitched roof and set centrally over a first floor window below, it would stand out as an obvious addition to the terrace that would break up the unity of its original design. In this regard the
-

proposal would appear incongruous and harmful to the appearance of the terrace within its wider setting. This would be contrary to part a. of Policy QD14 *Extensions and alterations* of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005, which requires 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. It would also be contrary to a core planning principle of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, which is to secure high quality design.

6. The appellant has drawn my attention to an example at 49B Jesmond Road where the Council recently gave planning permission for a side dormer (LPA Ref BH2011/03670). However, I do not know the precise details of that case and there is nothing to show that the circumstances are in any way comparable to the current appeal, which I have, in any case, determined on its own merits.
7. I understand the appellant's concern over the advice that was apparently offered to them by Council officers before the application was submitted. However, this is not directly relevant to the matter that is before me.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given, and having regard to all other matters raised, including some support from a neighbour, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR