



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 March 2018

by R J Maile BSc FRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th March 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/18/3192812

9 Milton Road, Brighton, East Sussex, BN2 9TQ.

- 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 and Mrs A McQueen against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application ref: BH2017/03005, dated 6 September 2017, was refused by notice dated 8 November 2017.
 - The development proposed is installation of dormer with two windows to front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed dormer window upon the appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. The property comprises a small, two storey Victorian terraced house located in a residential area. Milton Road is not within a Conservation Area or an Area of Special Residential Character. Nevertheless, many of the buildings within the street retain original architectural features that are worthy of conservation. These include the uncluttered roofs of some of the smaller dwellings, such as those to nos. 9 and 10.
4. Milton Road is characterised by a number of differing roof styles/ridge heights. Several properties possess small dormer windows, the majority being on the taller dwellings to the south of no. 9 and also in nearby Islingword Road. These were noted during my site visit and are illustrated in the photographic record attached to the appellants' grounds of appeal.
5. No. 9 has been the subject of an extension to provide accommodation within the roof space. To this end it has a rear-facing dormer and roof lights to the front main roof slope. There are similar roof lights to the adjoining property at no. 10.
6. National policy at Chapter 7 (Requiring good design) of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') re-affirms the great importance the

Government attaches to the design of the built environment. Whilst planning decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes it is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness (see paragraph 60).

7. Policy QD14 of the Local Plan¹ states that extensions or alterations to existing buildings, including the formation of rooms in the roof, will only be granted if the proposed development is well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended, adjoining properties and to the surrounding area. This policy is supported by the Council's adopted SPD 12² which confirms that dormer windows will not be permitted on front or side roof slopes where they would unbalance a building or disrupt the continuity of a terrace or group.
8. Nos. 9 and 10 Milton Road are relatively modest dwellings, whose ridge heights are generally lower than many of the nearby properties in both Milton Road and Islingword Road. Whilst I acknowledge the varied form of those dwellings and the number of existing dormer windows, many of these are much smaller than that proposed here and may well pre-date both national and Development Plan policy as referred to above. In particular, the two dormer windows allowed on appeal at 16a Islingword Road facing Milton Road are smaller than that before me at this appeal and are sited on a taller and more substantial building at the junction of the two streets.
9. The Officer's Report acknowledges that the dormer window is well positioned within the roof slope and that the windows line up with the fenestration below. Notwithstanding this fact, the box dormer would represent an over-dominant and discordant feature within what is a very modest roof slope. It would also be highly visible in the street scene and adversely impact upon the uncluttered and original format of no. 9 and its immediate neighbour.
10. I therefore find upon the main issue that development as proposed would harm the appearance of the street scene contrary to national policy in the Framework as referred to above, Policy QD14 of the Local Plan and the requirements of the Council's adopted SPD 12.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

R. J. Maile

INSPECTOR

¹ Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005: Brighton & Hove Local Plan Policies Retained on Adoption of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part 1 (March 2016).

² Brighton & Hove City Council Local Development Framework: SPD 12 "Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations" Supplementary Planning Document (adopted 20 June 2013).