



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 July 2025

by **C Coles MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/W/25/3365715

55 Shanklin Road, Brighton, East Sussex BN2 3LP

- 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 Mr David Pritchard against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref is BH2024/02066.
 - The development proposed is roof alterations incorporating raised roof ridge height, rear dormer with Juliet balcony and 3 no rooflights to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for roof alterations incorporating raised roof ridge height, rear dormer with Juliet balcony and 3 no rooflights to front elevation at 55 Shanklin Road, Brighton, East Sussex BN2 3LP in accordance with the terms of the application Ref BH2024/02066, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Block Plan (SR-R00-PR-101), Proposed Drawing (SR-R00-PR-102), Proposed Drawing (SR-R00-PR-103), Proposed Drawing (SR-R00-PR-104), Location Plan.
 - 3) Unless otherwise shown on the drawings hereby approved, the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) All ecological measures and/or works shall be carried out in accordance with the details contained in the Bat Scoping Survey (Crossman Associates, 11/12/24, Ref. P1166.001) as already submitted with the planning application and agreed in principle with the Council prior to determination.

Preliminary Matters

2. Following a review of the appellant's Statement of Case the Council has stated that in principle this addresses the second reason for refusal provided the Inspector is satisfied that they have sufficient information to demonstrate an internal ceiling height of 2.3m (accounting for required insulation) and the Council would not contest reason No 2 further. Based on the information submitted, I am satisfied that the internal ceiling height of 2.3m can be met and therefore the second reason for refusal is not a matter that I need to consider.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a two-storey mid-terrace maisonette located on the northern side of Shanklin Road, within a stepped terrace of traditional character. The character of the area is suburban and residential with terraced properties of traditional design.
5. The ridge height of the property would be raised but would retain the stepped appearance with the properties either side and would therefore have no significant impact on the character and appearance of the area.
6. The proposed rooflights to the front of the dwelling would be located at high level, would be evenly spaced and aligned with the windows below. The rooflights proposed would be modest in scale and set flush with the roof slope to minimise their prominence. At my site visit I observed examples of rooflights on the front elevation of nearby and neighbouring properties. Although the majority of properties with rooflights to the front have 2 rooflights, I do not consider 3 rooflights evenly spaced within the roof space to unduly clutter the roof slope and the proposed rooflights would form part of the established character and appearance of the wider area.
7. The proposed flat roof dormer would occupy almost the full width and height of the roof and would accommodate an obscure glazed Juliet balcony centrally positioned within the dormer with a window either side positioned above the windows on the floors below. Whilst the Juliet balcony would be a more contemporary addition to the property, the design is simple and would not conflict with the more traditional style of the dwelling.
8. Supplementary Planning Document 12: Design guide for extensions and alterations 2013 (SPD) provides greater detail on policies in the development plan and is a material consideration that must be taken into account. The SPD states that in all cases, box dormers constructed using the full width (and/or height) of the roof are an inappropriate design solution and will not be permitted as they give the appearance of an extra storey on top of the building. Whilst I have taken this into account as a material consideration, this is guidance only and does not have the same status as policy. Each proposal will need to be considered on its merits having regard to the individual context of each case.
9. The rear of the site backs onto a road and a cemetery which would be at a lower level than the proposal. Views into the site from the rear would be from an oblique angle and limited to members of the public accessing the cemetery. At my site visit, I noted the site was screened by existing dense foliage restricting views of the appeal site. Whilst views would potentially be greater in winter months due to the loss of some foliage on the trees, the proposal would be seen against a backdrop of terraced housing where there is another example of dormer development adjacent to the site and would not appear as a prominent feature that would be to the detriment of the visual amenity of the host property or wider terrace.

10. Views of the dormer from neighbouring properties would be limited by the two-storey flat roof rear outriggers.
11. Although the design of the proposal would be contrary to the SPD, the proposed dormer would not be readily visible from neighbouring properties, or from the rear due to the screening, distance and oblique views from which it would be seen and as a result, I have not identified harm to the character and appearance of the area or the host dwelling from the proposal.
12. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or the wider area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policies CP12 of Brighton and Hove City Plan Part 1 (2016) or Policies DM18 and DM21 of Brighton and Hove City Plan Part 2 (2022). Together, these policies seek to (amongst other considerations) raise the standard of architecture and design in the city; ensure development is well designed, scaled, sited and detailed in relation to the host dwelling, takes account of the existing character of the area and uses materials that complement the parent building.

Conditions

13. A condition is necessary requiring materials in accordance with those shown on the approved plan to integrate the appearance of the proposal with that of the original building. I have amended the wording from that proposed by the Council for clarity.
14. An ecological condition is required to ensure the protection of protected species. This was not suggested by the Council but was suggested by the Ecology Officer and I agree should be included.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Coles

INSPECTOR