



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 August 2013

**by D Lamont BSc(Hons) MBA MRTPI MCMi**

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

**Decision date: 21 August 2013**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/13/2200422**

**25 Withyham Avenue, Saltdean, Brighton, BN2 8LF**

- 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 R Thompson against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
  - The application Ref BH2013/01082 was refused by notice dated 28 May 2013.
  - The development proposed is extension and conservatory to rear.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an extension and conservatory to the rear of 25 Withyham Avenue, Saltdean, Brighton, BN2 8LF, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BH2013/01082, dated 4 April 2013, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than three years from the date of this permission.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers: OS-01 (Location Plan); 600201/01 (Existing Lower Ground Floor Plan); 600201/02 (Existing Ground Floor Plan); 600201/04 (Existing Roof Plan); 600201/05 (Existing Elevations / Section); 600201/06 (Existing Side Elevations); 600201/10 (Proposed Roof Plan); 600201/001/07 (Proposed Lower Ground Floor Plan); 600201/001/08 (Proposed Ground Floor Plan); 600201/001/10 (Existing / Proposed Block Plan); 600201/001/11 (Proposed Elevations / Section) and 600201/001/12 (Proposed Side Elevations).
  - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the area

### Reasons

3. The area is a suburban residential neighbourhood and the character and appearance of dwellings in the vicinity varies significantly, featuring flats, bungalows and two-storey houses. Some properties have larger dormer roof

extensions to the side or rear and many have extensive additions, including elevated rear balcony extensions of varying styles and design details.

4. The proposal, at the rear of the dwelling, would not be readily visible from Withyham Avenue, although it would be seen from the rear of neighbouring properties. The development's materials (upvc framed glazing, brick and white render) accord with those of the existing property and others in the area. Although unusual, its asymmetrical roof would not be out of keeping given the wide variety of styles and design details evident in the vicinity, nor would its bulk and thus, in comparison with other properties in the area, the dwelling would not appear over-extended.
5. Moreover, whilst the modern style of the development would contrast with the more traditional front elevation of the property the two styles would not be readily seen at the same time from any particular viewpoint. In any case, although of less modern appearance than that now proposed, the existing balcony at the rear of the property already contrasts with the front of the dwelling. It is not unusual for properties to display features of more than one style and I consider that, in this instance and bearing in mind the intended use of matching materials, this would not be harmful or result in the dwelling appearing disjointed. The development is therefore appropriately well-designed and detailed in relation to the appeal property and surrounding area.
6. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the building or the surrounding area, nor would it harm the visual amenities of neighbouring properties. As such, it would be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) presumption in favour of sustainable residential development and Brighton and Hove Local Plan 2005 (Local Plan) Policy QD14, which requires extensions to relate to the host property and surrounding area. I therefore allow the appeal.

#### *Conditions*

7. In addition to the standard time limit condition, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning and appearance, I have also attached conditions to require the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and its finishing materials to match the existing building.

*D Lamont*

INSPECTOR