

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2014

**by P Jarvis Bsc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 22 May 2014**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/A/14/2212938**

**48 Braemore Road, Hove, BN3 4HB**

- 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 Nathan Camilleri against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
  - The application Ref BH2013/03699 was refused by notice dated 16 December 2013.
  - The development proposed is the installation of a dormer to the side and rooflights to the front and rear.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation of a dormer to the side and rooflights to the front and rear, in accordance with the terms of application ref: BH2013/03699 dated 30<sup>th</sup> October 2013 and 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: 48B.0001A (existing plan and elevation) and 48B.0002A (proposed plan and elevation).
  - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those on the existing building.

## Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider streetscene.

## Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within a residential street characterised by semi-detached dwellings. Many of the dwellings in the immediate and wider streetscene have been altered and extended, including the addition of dormers and rooflights to front and side roofslopes and some hip to gable roof alterations.
4. The Council's design guide for extensions and alterations (SPD 12) (2013) provides detailed design guidance for all residential buildings. In relation to dormers and rooflights it indicates that dormer windows will not be permitted on front or side roof slope where they would unbalance a building or disrupt the continuity of a terrace or group; in such cases rooflights will be preferred.

Where such groups were originally designed without dormers but over the years a majority of the buildings now have them, new dormers may be acceptable provided their scale, design and positioning is sympathetic to the continuity of the group. Dormers should be a subordinate addition, set appropriately in the roof space and well off the sides, ridge and eaves.

5. The proposed side dormer would sit centrally within the roofslope above a first floor arched window. Its overall height would be below the main ridge and it would be set above the eaves level with gaps to the sides. Whilst it would be slightly wider than the window it would contain, I consider that overall it would be subordinate addition and would not appear overly large or unduly prominent.
6. The proposed front rooflights would consist of one either side of the roof above the main front bay window with a smaller one to the side. In my view they would not be so large, nor so numerous, as to result in a cluttered appearance nor would they significantly detract from the appearance of the front tiled roofslope, a good proportion of which would be retained.
7. The main roof of the other half of the semi-detached pair attached to the appeal property has not been extended or altered but a large two-storey rear addition has been added towards the rear. It is set back from the front elevation, but has altered the form and appearance of the property and the semi-detached pair to an extent. Although the proposed dormer at the appeal site would be set further forward relative to the streetscene in this context, by reason of its size and position, I do not consider that it would serve to unbalance the pair to the extent that it would have an unacceptable impact.
8. In terms of the wider streetscene, having regard to the number of similar dormer extensions and rooflight additions, many of which are similar in size and form to those proposed at the appeal site, I consider that the continuity of the built form would not be disrupted.
9. I therefore find that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or wider streetscene. There would be no conflict with Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan (2005) which seeks to ensure that development is well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended. Furthermore I find that it would satisfy the guidance in SPD 12.
10. I also find that the proposal would comply with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity. The content of the Planning Practice Guidance has also been considered but does not alter my conclusions.
11. The Council has suggested a condition to require matching materials which I agree is necessary in the interests of good design and the visual amenity of the area. A further condition to refer to the approved plans is also necessary in the interests of proper planning and for the avoidance of doubt.
12. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted.

*P Jarvis*

INSPECTOR