



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 March 2026

by **David Prentis BA BPI MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st April 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/W/25/3375353

Flat 3 Brunswick Lodge, 37-38 Brunswick Road, Hove, Sussex BN3 1DH

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Michael Hemsley against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
 - The application reference is BH2024/02465.
 - The works proposed are described as *replacement of glass doors on rear of property - switching from old single glazed wooden framed doors to modern double glazed aluminium framed doors. Existing frames are white and would be replaced with white.*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for *replacement of glass doors on rear of property, switching from old single glazed wooden framed doors to modern double glazed aluminium framed doors. Existing frames are white and would be replaced with white* at Flat 3 Brunswick Lodge, 37-38 Brunswick Road, Hove, Sussex BN3 1DH in accordance with the terms of the application, reference BH2024/02465, and the plans submitted with it.

Preliminary matters

2. As the proposal relates to a listed building and is in a conservation area, I have had special regard to sections 16(2) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
3. The works described in the application had already been carried out at the time of my site visit.

Main issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the setting and special interest of Nos 31 to 58 Brunswick Road, which together comprise a Grade II listed building, and on the character and appearance of the Brunswick Town Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The listing description notes that Nos 31 to 58 form a terrace, dating from around 1850 to 1860. The architectural features of the terrace include bow windows to the street elevation and sash windows with glazing bars. The front and rear elevations are finished in stucco. The terrace has architectural and historic interest as an example of the domestic architecture of the period. It has group value with a similar terrace on the opposite side of Brunswick Road.
6. The Brunswick Town Conservation Area is characterised by straight streets, fronted by terraces such as those at Brunswick Road, running back from the

seafront. Consistency of scale and repeated architectural features such as railings and bow windows are important to the distinctive character of the area. The subject terrace is characteristic of the wider conservation area and makes a positive contribution to it.

7. Nos 37 and 38 have been converted to flats. The appeal relates to Flat 3, which is on the ground floor. The glazed doors which are the subject of the appeal provide light to a bedroom and open onto the back garden. The rear elevation is faced in white stucco, consistent with much of the terrace. The windows on the upper floors of the rear elevation have sliding sash windows, as do those of other buildings in the terrace. The retention of these traditional windows makes an important contribution to the special interest of the listed terrace as a whole.
8. In contrast, the garden doors are an obviously modern intervention. The opening in the masonry is significantly wider than the windows above. Moreover, it seems unlikely that full-height glazed doors in this location would have been an original or historic feature of the building. The applicant states that the previous doors were installed about 15 to 20 years ago. Having regard to the photographic evidence, I have no reason to doubt that is the case. Whether the masonry opening was formed when those doors were installed, or at an earlier time, is not known. In any event, there is no suggestion that the works have resulted in any change to the opening. I therefore conclude that the works applied for have not resulted in the loss of any original or historic fabric.
9. The timber doors that have been replaced were different from their replacements in style and materials. The glazing was subdivided, no doubt seeking to respond to the subdivision of the windows above. That said, the design and appearance of the doors was such that they would have been readily identifiable as a modern feature. The replacement doors have a simpler design, with a single pane in each door providing a vertical emphasis, within white framing. They have a neat and uncluttered appearance which does not compete with or distract from the traditional windows above. To my mind, these two design approaches are alternative ways of inserting doors into an existing modern opening. I do not consider that the special interest of the listed building has been harmed by the change.
10. With regard to the effect on the terrace as a whole, and the conservation area, it is relevant to note that the doors are not visible from the public realm because they are located to the rear of a mid-terrace property. This is not to say that the rear elevation is unimportant, because the rear elevation of the terrace can be appreciated in views from private gardens and from the rear windows of properties in York Road. However, the ground floor level is not readily visible in such views because of intervening garden boundaries. The doors may be glimpsed in views from upper floor rooms but would have a negligible effect on the ability to appreciate the subject property or the terrace as a whole.
11. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document SPD 09 provides guidance on architectural features. It describes the contribution made by traditional doors and windows to the historic environment. The section on doors is mainly concerned with historic front doors and is not therefore relevant. The SPD states that original or historic windows should be retained unless beyond economic repair. That advice is not relevant either because no historic windows have been removed in this case.

12. I conclude that the works applied for have not harmed the special interest of the listed building, nor its significance as a designated heritage asset. The special interest of the building has been preserved. The character and appearance of the conservation area has also been preserved.
13. The proposal would not conflict with Policy CP15 of the Brighton and Hove City Plan Part One, which seeks to protect the historic environment. Nor would it conflict with Policies DM26, DM27 and DM29 of the City Plan Part Two. These policies together seek to preserve or enhance conservation areas, to protect the special interest of listed buildings and to avoid harm through development in the settings of heritage assets.

Conditions

14. The Council has not suggested any conditions. The works have already taken place. I have not identified the need for any conditions.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be allowed.

David Prentis

Inspector