

---

## 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: 19 May 2014**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/14/2216372**

**1 Addison Road, Hove, East Sussex, BN3 1TN**

- 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 Peter Goodsman against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
  - The application Ref. BH2013/04164, dated 9 December 2013, was refused by notice dated 7 February 2014.
  - The development proposed is described as "additional roof light to front elevation – retrospectively".
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for additional roof light to front elevation – retrospectively at 1 Addison Road, Hove, East Sussex, BN3 1TN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. BH2013/04164, dated 9 December 2013, and the plans submitted with it.

### Procedural Matter

2. The description of development indicates that the planning application was made retrospectively. This was confirmed by my site visit where I saw that the additional roof light had already been installed.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the additional roof light on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider street scene.

### Reasons

4. The appeal property is a recently constructed end terrace dwelling in a street of attractive terraced housing. The dwelling has been designed with fenestration to replicate other properties in the terrace. The plans originally approved showed a pair of roof lights on the front facing roof slope. These have been installed. However, a third roof light has also been added and it is this which is the subject of the appeal.
5. Relevant guidance is contained in Supplementary Planning Document 12: Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations (adopted June 2013) (SPD). This states that roof lights (particularly to street elevations) should be kept as few and as small as possible and should relate well to the scale and proportions of the elevation below, including aligning with windows where possible or centring

- on the spaces between them where appropriate. Irregular roof light sizes and positioning should be avoided, and in particular will be resisted on street elevations.
6. Although neighbouring dwellings have fewer roof lights, those in the appeal property are smaller. All three roof lights in the appeal property are of equal size and, contrary to the Council's assertions, they have been installed in a horizontal row with regular spacing. This creates an ordered appearance and for this reason I disagree with the Council's assessment that the roof lights appear cluttered.
  7. I accept that the additional roof light does not align with the fenestration below. However, this is not obvious to the casual observer in the street and installation of the roof light in a different position may have drawn attention to the irregular spacing. Moreover, I consider that the roof lights are not unduly prominent within the wider street scene. They are only visible from a short stretch of the street, and only then when viewing the property from the opposite pavement.
  8. I conclude that the addition of a third roof light has not caused material harm to the character or appearance of the host property, or to the wider street scene. Accordingly, I find no conflict with saved Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan (2005), as interpreted by the SPD. This policy seeks to ensure that alterations to existing buildings are well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property itself, adjoining properties and to the surrounding area.

### **Conditions**

9. As the roof light has already been installed there is no need to attach the usual time limit condition. No other conditions have been suggested by the Council and I agree that none are necessary.

### **Conclusion**

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

*Robert Parker*

INSPECTOR