

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 August 2022

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/22/3296091

97 Dean Gardens, Portslade, BN41 2FX

- 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 Jamie Tuke against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2021/04370, dated 10 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 March 2022.
 - 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 with a front bay, gable ended roof and roof lights. The locality is of established residential character and buildings and gardens come together to create a neighbourhood of pleasing appearance with an understated sense of suburbia. The appeal property is in a row of broadly similar low-key single storey dwellings on its side of the road, with two storey homes featuring across the street. The appeal scheme is as described above.
 4. The scene along this row of bungalows is serene and generally visually uniform and regrettably the proposed dormer would markedly interrupt the pleasing rhythm. More specifically it would also unbalance these semi-detached homes and look an incongruous element on a roofscape which, in a good sense, is unremarkable. In my assessment the appeal proposal would be aesthetically unfortunate, jarring on the eye, and damaging to the streetscene.
 5. Policies QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan, CP12 of the City Plan Part One and DM21 of the City Plan Part 2 are relevant. Taken together and amongst other matters, these policies seek well designed and suitably scaled development that should protect the character and visual quality of buildings and the local distinctiveness of their wider area and generally have
-

architectural merit. In all the circumstances I conclude that the appeal scheme would conflict with these planning policies.

Other matters

6. I do understand the Appellant's wish to increase accommodation and I can see that thought has been given to materials and window alignments. I appreciate there are some other roof alterations in the locality albeit I do not know their full planning background and I am not convinced that they provide a positive contribution to the scene. In any event, they are not necessarily identical to the appeal scheme in form and certainly not in the immediate context of this run of homes, and I must assess this case on its own merits. 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.
7. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered; the Council's policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within that document.

Overall conclusion

8. 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