



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 June 2025

by **JJ Packman MPlan MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/25/3363563

34 Queens Park Rise, Brighton, BN2 9ZF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Kathryn Tomlinson against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref is BH2025/00202.
 - The development proposed is Loft conversion with rear dormer and 2 no. front rooflights.
-

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 dwelling, street scene and wider conservation area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to No. 34 Queens Park Rise, a handsome terrace house located within the Queens Park Conservation Area.
4. No. 34 forms part of terrace of dwellings of similar construction featuring square bays with triple sash windows on the ground and first floors facing the street frontage. The front elevations of the dwellings have a wealth of attractive period features including decorative panels and timber gable detailing. The dwelling contributes positively to the overall character of Conservation Area on an individual level and contributes towards the group value of the terrace. It is understood that the dwellings in this area date from the Edwardian period.
5. The imposing form of St Lukes Primary School (A Grade II Listed building) sits directly opposite No. 34. The terrace forms part of its setting, and the traditional architectural forms of the dwellings, their detailing and materials make a positive contribution to that setting.
6. Conversely, the rear of the properties on Queens Park Rise contribute very little towards the overall historic and architectural quality of the conservation area. The rear elevations feature little in the way of detailing and ornamentation and have been subject to numerous alterations and additions over the years. Many properties have small extensions and loft conversions and there are numerous examples of flat roof dormer windows, especially on properties situated opposite (fronting

Freshfield Road). This has resulted in an area of diminished architectural quality within the conservation area.

7. There is limited intervisibility between the rear of the properties and the wider conservation area, with only glimpses achievable from St Lukes Terrace.
8. The appeal scheme proposes a full width rear dormer window on the rear elevation of the main dwelling behind the rearward projection. The proposed dormer would occupy most of the roof plane, rising from just above eaves height to just below ridge height. The proposed rear dormer would include full width glazing with glazing bars but no discernible gaps between windows. Two small skylights are proposed on the front elevation.
9. Whilst the overall scale of the proposed dormer window would broadly reflect some others found in the local area, the proposal would not reflect the scale and architectural style of the host building or reflect the quality of architecture within the conservation area more generally. The width and height of the proposed dormer and flat roof would result in an overly bulky development that would be harmful to the existing building and would dominate its roof profile. The large expanse of uninterrupted glazing and lack of appropriate architectural detailing would also harm the character of the building. These factors combined would contribute towards the further degradation of the built environment in this area.
10. Whilst the impact of the proposed rooflights on the street scene (as seen from Queens Park Rise) and St Lukes Primary School would be negligible, overall it is considered that the proposal, including the dormer would further erode architectural quality rather than help raise standards within the city. The result would neither preserve nor enhance the Conservation Area and would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the conservation area.
11. Consequently, it is considered that the proposal would fail to comply with policies DM18, DM21 and DM26 of the Brighton and Hove City Plan Part 2 (October 2022). These policies require a high standard of design with proposals being scaled, sited and detailed in relation to the existing property and surrounding area, and for proposals within conservation areas to preserve or enhance the distinctive character and appearance of that conservation area.
12. The proposals also conflict with policies CP12 and CP15 of the Brighton and Hove City Plan Part One (March 2016) which expect all new development to raise the standard of architecture and design in the city and for the city's historic environment to be conserved in accordance with its identified significance. The proposal also does not accord with the detailed design guidance contained within Supplementary Planning Document 12, design guide for extensions and alterations (June 2013).

Other Matters

13. I note that the appellant raised concerns about the planning officer not undertaking a site visit to inform their decision. In coming to this decision I undertook a comprehensive site visit, including a walk of surrounding streets.
14. The appellant has drawn attention to a number of planning applications and appeal decisions. Whilst some of these concern properties nearby, the examples given were not directly comparable, and in many cases the proposals were significantly

smaller. I note that many of the appeal examples given did not relate to conservation areas and so were also not directly comparable. Notwithstanding this, I have reached my conclusion as a result of the particular circumstances of this case.

15. I have also noted the appellant's comments regarding the representations of support for the proposal from third parties. However, in light of my findings on the main issue of the appeal, my decision does not turn on these matters.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

JJ Packman

INSPECTOR