



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 March 2011

by **S J Emerson BSc DipTP MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 29 March 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/11/2147017
10 The Vale, Ovingdean, Brighton, BN2 7AB.

- 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 Steven Reid against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2010/03443, dated 6 October 2010, was refused by notice dated 6 January 2011.
 - The development proposed is: front extension to increase living area at ground level and forming an additional bedroom and balcony at first floor level.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the appearance of the dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

3. This part of The Vale is an unmade road with dwellings on the western side of the road only. There are a variety of styles of dwelling, including bungalows, bungalows with basement garage and chalet bungalows. Several dwellings have balconies or terraces. The appeal property has the appearance of a bungalow and has a basement garage. The property is set well back from the road.
4. The proposal has several elements. The projecting gable wing on the southern side of the dwelling would be extended over the existing narrow terrace above the front part of the garage. The Council does not raise any objection to this element and I consider that it is acceptable.
5. A ground floor bedroom and bathroom would be extended forward over the existing terrace. This extension would have a flat roof which would become a terrace at first floor level. This terrace would have a glazed screen across the front, with a higher screen at the northern side to prevent overlooking of the front terrace of the neighbouring dwelling. Access to this new terrace would be via a new dormer with 3 sets of glazed doors. A new ground level terrace and front entrance steps would be created forward of the new front wall.
6. The dormer would be a wide element in the roofscape. The horizontal emphasis of the dormer combined with the wide, flat-roofed terrace and accompanying glazed screen would be out of proportion with, and dominate,

the rest of the building. The proposed glazed doors in the dormer would not align with the new fenestration below. Although the proposed privacy screen would be essential to prevent overlooking, it would be a tall, wide and rather bland feature which would be an unattractive element when seen from the north.

7. Overall, I consider that the proposal would result in incongruous additions to the building which would detract from the street scene. The proposal would conflict with policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local plan 2005. Accordingly, I have dismissed the appeal.

Simon Emerson

INSPECTOR