
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2013

by Catherine Hughes BA (Hons) MRUP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 9 October 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/13/2200992

6 Stanmer Avenue, Saltdean, Brighton BN2 8QL

- 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 Ashley Skein against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2013/01014, dated 26 March 2013, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2013.
 - The development proposed is single storey extensions (re-submission of BH2013/00209).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of single storey extensions at 6 Stanmer Avenue, Saltdean, Brighton BN2 8QL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BH2013/01014, dated 26 March 2013, and the plan Ref 599/03A as amended by Drawing No. SK01 submitted as Appendix 3 to the Grounds of Appeal.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development was changed by the Council to reflect that the proposed development was built in part at the time of the planning application site visit, and thus the application was in part retrospective. At the time of my site visit however the works had been completed and the property was furnished and occupied. The application is therefore retrospective and as a result I have retained the original description and have dealt with the appeal on the basis of the extensions as built.
3. The appellant has submitted a revised drawing Ref SK01 with the Grounds of Appeal. This shows the position of the rear extension as built, about 1m from the site boundary. At my site visit I noted that the rear fenestration as built differs from that shown on the amended plan with the kitchen door omitted in favour of a large window. These differences are minor and do not alter my consideration of the appeal based on the amended plan.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the rear extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area.
-

Reasons

5. Stanmer Avenue is made up of detached bungalows arranged around a central green area. Dwellings and plots are modest, with the majority exhibiting some visible form of alteration and extension to their appearance over the years when seen from the road.
6. The works to No. 6 which are the subject of this appeal have recently been completed. These comprise two matching single storey extensions to the front of the property and a further single storey extension to the rear. The Council has not raised any objection to the alterations to the front of the bungalow which it considers preserves the symmetry of the front elevation of the property. I similarly find these to be appropriate additions to the bungalow.
7. The extension to the rear projects some 4 metres from the original rear wall across the width of the property and extends beyond it by approximately 1.3 metres on the south eastern side of the building. Given the modest size of the plot this is a sizeable extension. However, the resultant scale and footprint of the dwelling is comparable to those of other nearby bungalows including No. 8 immediately to the west, and the extension projects the property no closer to the rear boundary with the properties in Westfield Avenue South than as is the case with adjoining bungalows.
8. Although the side projection of the rear extension is visible from the road, it is set back and subservient in scale to the main dwelling. In this regard it is comparable in massing and appearance in the streetscene to the garages which are to be found set back alongside many of the bungalows in Stanmer Avenue and a number of nearby similarly extended properties.
9. For these reasons I conclude that the single storey extensions as built to 6 Stanmer Avenue are in keeping with the surrounding development and do not harm either the character and appearance of the host property or the wider area. In this regard, they comply with Saved Policies QD2 and QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan 2005 which require extensions to be well related to the existing building and the positive qualities of the neighbourhood.

Other matters

10. Rear gardens here, as viewed from the appeal site across the low boundaries between gardens, are predominantly of limited depth. The land to the rear of the appeal site slopes steeply away to the north resulting in properties in Westfield Avenue South lying at a significantly lower level to the appeal property and its neighbours. Although the rear extension closes the distance between the appeal property and Nos. 44 and 46 Westfield Avenue South, I noted at my site visit that it was not possible to look into the rear windows or garden of either of these neighbouring properties from inside the rear extension given the steeply sloping ground.
11. In addition, mature planting and fencing along the boundary between the appeal site and No. 46 prevents overlooking of this property. No. 44 is currently overlooked from the rear boundary of the garden of the appeal site given the low boundary fence between the two gardens. However, the extension does not exacerbate this existing situation.

Conclusion

12. For these reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed. As the extensions have already been erected there is no need to attach the usual time limit condition. No other conditions are necessary.

Catherine Hughes

INSPECTOR

