



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2019

**by Paul T Hocking BA MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 12 April 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/W/18/3214934**

**31A Davigdor Road, Hove BN3 1QB**

- 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 Dr Hong Lu against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
  - The application Ref BH2018/01005, dated 29 March 2018, was refused by notice dated 28 August 2018.
  - The development proposed is replacement of dormer windows and formation of new roof lights.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for replacement of dormer windows and formation of new roof lights at 31A Davigdor Road, Hove BN3 1QB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BH2018/01005, dated 29 March 2018, subject to the following condition:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: As Built Roof Plan & North and South Elevations As Built (0501.AB.001); As Built West Elevation (0501.AB.002); As Built Window Detail/Elevations and Plans As Built (0501.AB.003); As Built Roof Light Detail/Elevations and Plans As Built (0501.AB.004).

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to a two-storey end of terrace building with accommodation in the roof. It is located on a corner plot on the junction with Davigdor and Osmond Roads. The appeal scheme relates to three replacement dormer windows as well as three additional roof lights. I could see from my site visit that the works had been completed externally.
4. The appeal building is reasonably prominent because of its design and siting on a corner plot. It is set in an area with a mixed and varied character. Some properties in the area have dormer windows and roof lights so they already form an established part of the streetscape of both roads, while other properties have strong front gables that mean plain roof-slopes are not a common feature in the area.

5. The replacement dormer windows are larger and do not feature the decorative arched detailing of their predecessors. The dormers also have relatively large areas of blank tile hanging on their front given the respective size of the windows. The front dormer window is however narrower in width than the bay window below it and significantly smaller than the ground floor fenestration. The side dormer is specified in the Appellant's Statement as being approximately 1m wider than its predecessor but sited so it is more central. That figure is not contested by the Council. The rear dormer is largely obscured by the remainder of the appeal building when viewed from Osmond Road and is otherwise unobtrusive. In my view therefore, the dormer windows appear as subservient additions and are neither heavy nor dominant in appearance.
6. Whilst the front and side dormer windows are plainly visible from the respective roads, given their size and use of appropriate matching materials in my view they are not conspicuous additions to the host property. They do not result in particularly large areas of cladding, on their front or at the side, and do not introduce significant bulk. They are therefore well designed and not overly large and so do not have an adverse impact on the host property or within the varied established character of the street-scene.
7. The three roof lights are small in-scale and sited alongside the front and side dormer windows. They are positioned at a consistent height which provides a sense of order. They therefore relate well to the scale and proportion of the elevations below. Whilst the roof light on the front elevation is not aligned above a window, given its small size and close relationship with the dormer window alongside, in my view it does not give rise to a roof slope of cluttered appearance.
8. I therefore conclude the development is not harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and area. This accords with saved Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan, as retained in March 2016. This requires, amongst other things, that alterations to existing buildings should be well designed in relation to the host property and surrounding area. This is also consistent with the good design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework. For the same reasons the development also accords with the Council's Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document, adopted June 2013.

### **Conclusion**

9. The Council have suggested one planning condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings. I agree this is necessary in the interests of future certainty.
10. For these reasons and having regard to all other relevant matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*Paul T Hocking*

INSPECTOR