



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2026

by K Crutchfield BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/25/3376360

287 Hangleton Road, Hove BN3 7LR

- 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 Samy Sobhey against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref is BH2025/02069.
 - The development proposed is described as “front dormer in connection with permitted development loft conversion submitted for lawful development certificate”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of 2no. hip to gable roof extensions, and front and rear dormers at 287 Hangleton Road, Hove BN3 7LR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BH2025/02069, 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: 2025/106 sheet 1 of 2; and 2025/106 sheet 2 of 2.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading is taken from the application form. However, the Council has used a different wording on the decision notice. This wording includes the proposed hip to gable roof extensions and rear dormer. The amended description is more accurate and therefore I have used it in my formal decision.
3. There is an error in the labelling of the proposed elevations. However, the Council was content that the plans were adequate for the purposes of determining the application. I concur.

Main Issue

4. The scheme has multiple elements, including hip-to-gable enlargements and a rear dormer. However, the main issue in dispute is the effect of the proposed front dormer on the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and Hangleton Road.

Reasons

5. Hangleton Road is predominantly residential; the dwellings are diverse in type, architectural style and design. Many of the roofs have been extended, including some dormers and rooflights on the front elevations.
6. The proposed front dormer would be set in from the sides, ridge and eaves of the roof which accords with the advice in the Design guide for extensions and alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2013), and would ensure that the dormer would not be a prominent addition to the host property or street scene. The dormer would align with the bay window below which assimilates it into the design of the front elevation. The design, size and proportions of the glazing in the dormer would be similar to the glazing on the existing dwelling. Accordingly, the scale, siting and design of the proposed front dormer would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, and the varied character of Hangleton Road.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or Hangleton Road. It would accord with Policy CP12 of the Brighton and Hove City Plan Part One (2016); and policies DM18 and DM21 of the City Plan Part Two (2022). These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework in seeking to ensure that new development is sympathetic to local character.

Conditions

8. In addition to the standard time condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty. A condition requiring the use of matching materials is necessary to maintain the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and local area.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons, the proposal accords with the development plan. Material considerations do not indicate a decision should be taken other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude the appeal should be allowed.

K Crutchfield

INSPECTOR