



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 June 2009

by **Y Mwanza BA(Hons) MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State  
for Communities and Local Government**

The Planning Inspectorate  
4/11 Eagle Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372  
email: [enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk)

**Decision date:  
11 August 2009**

---

## Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/A/09/2097251

### 2 Longhill Road, Ovingdean, Brighton, East Sussex, BN2 7BE

- 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 Mrs Jeanie Civil against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
- The application Ref BH2008/01903, dated 30 May 2008, was refused by notice dated 7 August 2008.
- The development proposed is extension from single to double garage and balcony across front of property on first floor.

---

## Decision

1. I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission for the extension from single to double garage and balcony across front of property on first floor at 2 Longhill Road, Ovingdean, Brighton, East Sussex, BN2 7BE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BH2008/01903, dated 30 May 2008, and the plans submitted with it, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

## Main issue

2. I consider the main issue in this appeal to be the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area.

## Reasons

3. The appeal proposal would create an enlarged garage at ground floor level. The enlarged garage would retain the existing pitched roof design and in my view its scale and design would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the property.
4. When I visited the appeal property and the wider area I saw a wide variety of architectural styles and noted that a number of properties had balconies. Indeed the appellant has submitted photographic evidence of similar balconies. In my opinion while the architectural styles vary in the locality a common feature seems to be a balcony on the front elevation.

5. Supplementary Guidance on Roof Alterations and Extensions (SPGBH 1) states that roof extensions, terraces or dormers should respect the particular character of the building and be carefully related to it. In my view, the appeal proposal would retain the basic shape and symmetry of the roof, and the existing roof slopes and form would remain clearly visible. Double French doors would provide access to the balcony, and an appropriately worded condition would ensure that the materials used match the existing house, in order to reflect the character and appearance of the property and the immediate surroundings.
6. I conclude that the appeal proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the property or the immediate surroundings, and would comply with Policies QD1, QD2, and QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan and SPGBH 1.

**Conclusion**

7. I conclude having regard to all other matters raised that the appeal should be allowed.

*Y Mwanza*

INSPECTOR