



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 August 2008

by **Alison Lea MA(Cantab) Solicitor**

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:**  
21 August 2008

## Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/A/08/2069187

### 1 Marine Close, Saltdean, Brighton BN2 8SA

- 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 N Rose against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
- The application Ref BH2007/04354, dated 6 November 2007, was refused by notice dated 30 January 2008.
- The development proposed is the conversion of the bungalow to a 2 storey house including first floor extension, new roof with balconies and lower ground garage extension.

## Decision

1. I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission for the conversion of the bungalow to a 2 storey house including first floor roof extension, new roof with balconies and lower ground garage extension at 1 Marine Close, Saltdean, Brighton BN2 8SA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BH2007/04354, dated 6 November 2007, 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) No development shall take place until samples of the materials (including colour of render, paintwork or colourwash) to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
  - 3) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no extension, enlargement or other alteration of the development hereby permitted shall be carried out.
  - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no window, dormer window or rooflight, other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed.
  - 5) No development shall take place until a written waste minimisation statement, confirming how demolition and construction waste will be

recovered and reused on site or at other sites has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

### **Main issue**

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area.

### **Reasons**

3. The appeal property is a detached bungalow situated on the south side of a residential close. It forms the end of a row of similar properties, albeit that many of them have been extended in a variety of ways. The surrounding area consists of residential properties of a variety of sizes and designs and immediately to the south is a steep slope which forms part of a cutting for the A259 road. Planning permission was granted by the Council in May 2008 for the conversion of the bungalow to a 2 storey house in accordance with a revised application and at the time of my site visit substantial work had commenced in relation to the conversion.
4. The appeal proposal would result in a complete redesign of the bungalow, including an additional floor of accommodation and enlarged garage. I agree that the garage, although it would extend a considerable distance beyond the existing building line would not appear prominent and also that given the location of the appeal site, at the end of Marine Close, where it meets Saltdean Close which is characterised by properties of a variety of sizes and designs, and where there is a noticeable change of levels, a detached 2 storey house would not appear out of keeping with the area. The Council's main concern relates to the alterations to the roof and I shall therefore concentrate on this matter.
5. The proposal would have a ridge height similar to that of the bungalow and the replacement of the side gable ends with a pitched roof would result in a reduction of the bulk of the main roof and in its prominence when viewed from the front and rear. This would accord with advice in Policy QD2 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005 (LP) which states that local characteristics such as height, scale and bulk of existing buildings should be taken into account.
6. The proposal also includes significant extensions to the front and rear elevations which would give the roof a complex appearance. The Council accepts that the design of the roof extensions is not inappropriate given the location of the property and in my opinion they would add visual interest to the proposal. The roof slopes of the front and rear extensions would be below the ridge height of the main roof and would not appear dominant or overbearing. I consider that the roof would complement the property as altered.
7. Although the front extension would extend over 6m beyond the main roof line, it would be only about 2.5m beyond the front elevation of the existing building and given the varied building line in Marine Close including forward projecting garages, and the position of the appeal site at the end of the close, I consider that the proposal would not appear incongruous in the street scene. The rear extension would have a covered balcony to take advantage of the sea views. It would be visible from the A259 but would not be an unusual feature given the

location of the property and in my opinion would not appear out of keeping with the area.

8. I conclude therefore that although the proposal would have a significant effect on the character and appearance of the original bungalow, the proposal would make a positive contribution to the visual quality of the environment whilst taking into account local characteristics. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would not cause significant harm to the character or appearance of the appeal property or the surrounding area and that it would not be contrary to LP Policies QD1 or QD2.
9. In addition to the standard commencement of development condition the Council has suggested 4 conditions. I agree that in the interests of the character and appearance of the property and surrounding area a condition requiring the submission and approval of samples of external materials is necessary. For the same reason and also to protect the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties I agree that in this case it is reasonable and necessary to impose conditions removing permitted development rights relating to future extensions and the insertion of additional windows. A condition requiring a waste minimisation statement is required to comply with policies in the East Sussex and Brighton & Hove Waste Local Plan and in the local and structure plan.

*Alison Lea*

INSPECTOR