



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 June 2015

by **J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 22 July 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/W/15/3004478

1 Saltdean Drive, Saltdean, Brighton, East Sussex BN2 8SB

- 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 Nigel Rose, Homemakers of Brighton Ltd against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2014/03475 dated 15 October 2014 was refused by notice dated 30 January 2015.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing house and construction of six residential units.
-

Costs

1. An application for costs was made by Mr Nigel Rose, Homemakers of Brighton Ltd against Brighton and Hove City Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

3. I consider the main issues to be the effect of the proposal on the appearance of adjoining properties, the character and appearance of the surrounding area and strategic views along the coastline.

Reasons

4. The appeal site lies within a primarily residential area in a prominent location on the coast road. Detached dwellings of various designs and sizes are a characteristic of the area. The White House close to the site is a distinctive building in the streetscene, as is the contemporary dwelling at 1 Marine Close adjacent to the appeal site. Otherwise, residential development primarily comprises bungalows and modest dwellings.
5. The existing chalet bungalow on the site is in a poor condition and has a number of unsympathetic single-storey extensions. The proposed building would be of contemporary design. The upper block would comprise three storeys above basement level with the eaves level at a similar height to the eaves on the adjacent dwelling at 1 Marine Close. The lower block would comprise two storeys above the basement, built in tiers and set back from the main block. The footprint of development on the site would project forward from that of the existing dwelling.

6. From my observations, due to the combined height, footprint and bulk of the proposed building in such a prominent elevated location, I consider that it would appear as an excessively dominant building. As such it would constitute an overdevelopment of the site. This would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would overwhelm adjoining properties to the detriment of their appearance in the streetscene. In addition, as the building would appear very prominent from longer public strategic views along the coastline, it would be to the detriment of these strategic views.
7. In reaching my conclusion, I have had regard to all matters raised, including the views of local residents and the quality of construction. I am in no doubt that the detailing would be to a high standard. However, due to the reasons stated above, I do not consider this matter justifies allowing the appeal.
8. For the above reasons, the proposal would be contrary to Policies QD1, QD2, QD3 and QD4 in the Brighton and Hove Local Plan 2005, where they seek new development to make a positive contribution to the visual quality of the environment, to incorporate an intensity of development appropriate to the locality and to preserve or enhance strategic views. I consider that these policies are broadly in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework as far as they meet the Framework's core principles; particularly that planning should be taking account of the different roles and character of an area.
9. The Council has stated that there is no agreed up-to-date housing provision target against which to assess a five-year housing land supply position. The Framework states at paragraph 49 that *relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites*.
10. It must be acknowledged that at the heart of the Framework is the presumption in favour of sustainable development. It sets out the three dimensions that need to be considered, and that the roles should not be taken in isolation.
11. I recognise the economic benefits of the proposal, particularly in terms of construction of the development and the social role of providing additional accommodation. However, taking the three dimensions together, in the light of my concerns regarding the environmental impact of the proposal, I consider that the benefits I have acknowledged would arise from the proposal are not outweighed by this harm. Thus, I consider that the proposal would not constitute sustainable development.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR