



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2009

by **Richard A. Hersey BA DipTP 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

Decision date:
6 March 2009

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/A/08/2092285

27 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 George Danaher against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
- The application, ref. BH2008/01370, dated 16 April 2008, was refused by notice dated 16 October 2008.
- The development proposed is *Single storey extension with pitched roof over.*

Decision

1. I allow the appeal and grant permission for the erection of a single storey side extension with pitched roof at 27 Stanmer Avenue, Saltdean, in accordance with the terms of the application, ref. BH2008/01370, dated 16 April 2008, and the drawings submitted therewith, subject to the conditions:-
 1. The materials to be used on the external surfaces of the extension shall match those of the existing building.
 2. The window on the north western elevation shall be glazed with obscure glass and retained as such.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect that the extension would have on the appearance of the building, the street scene and the character of the area.

Reasons

3. The property is a detached bungalow in a steeply sloping street. The proposed side extension (already partly constructed) to replace a garage, would project at the front to align with the bay on the opposite side of the frontage.
4. I saw that there is considerable variety in the detailed designs of the bungalows on both sides of the street. I appreciate the Council's point that, apart from one or two properties where unsympathetic roof extensions have been erected, the original main roofs retain their ridges, but the length and direction of the ridges varies considerably from property to property, as does the pattern of gables or hipped roofs over front projections.
5. Although the proposal would introduce an area of flat roof, I agree with the appellant that, at about 4sq.m, it would not be extensive. Despite the slope of the road and the views that would be possible from the central green space, I

do not consider that the section of flat roof would be at all prominent in the street scene. In my opinion the extension as a whole would not be out of keeping with the design of the building or its setting. It would accord with policies QD1 (design), QD14 (alterations and extensions) in the Local Plan and with adopted supplementary planning guidance on roof alterations.

6. I have had regard to the Council's reference to its refusal of permission to the same appellant for an extension at 29 Stanmer Avenue and to an appeal decision in Chalkland Rise, Woodingdean. However both these cases involved the provision of substantial habitable space at roof level, in significant contrast to the present proposal. I do not consider that they are directly comparable.
7. With regard to the conditions suggested by the Council, I agree with the need to require matching external materials and, in order to minimise overlooking, to require the new side window (in the north-west rather than north-east elevation) to be glazed with obscure glass.

R.A.Hersey

INSPECTOR