



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2021

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 November 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/21/3281609
186 Mackie Avenue, Brighton, BN1 8SB

- 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 Ryan Pratt against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2021/01510, dated 22 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a front dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow. It has attractive elevations with a simple roof form and a distinctive front projection with a curved corner. The property lies in a row of about 15 pairs of homes which are of similar design and with largely unaltered front-facing roof form in terms of any dormers. This makes an attractive and distinctive immediate scene and is a key stretch within a wider generally calm suburban setting with pleasing appearance. The appeal scheme is as described above.
 4. The planned front dormer works might be innocuous in many circumstances but in this case would significantly change the appearance of the dwelling. The effect of this sizeable dormer would be to make this house lose its subtle and pleasing front elevation and look alien and ill at ease in the context of the immediate attached dwelling and the row of homes it sits within. The works would be widely visible and lead to a prominent disruption to the uniformity of the streetscene on this stretch of homes on the south east side of Mackie Avenue.
 5. Brighton & Hove Local Plan Saved Policy QD14 and Policy CP12 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One are pertinent. Taken together and amongst other matters they seek well designed development that should protect the character and visual quality of an area along with local distinctiveness and generally have architectural merit. I conclude that the proposal would conflict with these
-

policies. The scheme would also run contrary to the SPD12 Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations which has aims reflective of the policies.

Other matters

6. I do understand the Appellant's wish to enhance upper-level accommodation. I noted the variety of development styles in the wider area and on other parts of the road along with the appreciable numbers of dormers drawn to my attention. I nevertheless feel that it is worth protecting the pleasing uniformity of this particular pair and row of dwellings. I do not know the planning circumstances of the dormers drawn to my attention, some are visually innocuous, others I would deem to be not of good design. In any event I do have to assess this scheme on its own merits. Regrettably I reach the view that the dormer would create a front elevation which would be visually awkward in this context and would not qualify as good design and hence I could not condone the scheme.
7. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
8. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered and the development plan policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within that document.

Overall conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR