



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 October 2017

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 2 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/17/3183633

66 Saltdean Drive, Saltdean, Brighton BN2 8SD

- 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 Ms Vicky Scott against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2017/02083, dated 20 June 2017, was refused by notice dated 5 September 2017.
 - The development proposed is dormer to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for dormer to front elevation at 66 Saltdean Drive, Saltdean, Brighton BN2 8SD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BH2017/02083, dated 20 June 2017, subject to the following conditions: -
 - (a) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - (b) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos PO1, P02A, PO6C and P07C.
 - (c) The materials to be used for the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Ms Vicky Scott against Brighton & Hove City Council. That application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue raised in respect of the proposed development is the effect on the character and appearance of the building and the area.

Reasons

4. There is a variety of styles and designs of properties along Saltdean Drive. These incorporate a mix of roof forms that comprise front and side dormers of varying types, including flat, pitched roof and eyebrow dormers, along with pitched roof front gables incorporating windows.

5. The proposal relates to a modestly sized pitched roof dormer extension. It would be set in from the roof pitches either side and stepped up from the eaves. The dormer would be a relatively small addition to the frontage of the dwelling. Its size and proportions would not create a feature that would visually dominate the front roof slope.
6. I observed that the front roof slopes of the bungalows either side of the appeal property have not been interrupted. The immediate bungalows either side along with that of the appeal property form a small group of similarly designed dwellings. However, the size and positioning of the proposed dormer would be sympathetic to the host property and would not significantly alter the appearance this group. Whilst the ridge of the proposed dormer would match that of the host dwelling, I saw other examples of this along Saltdean Drive.
7. Whilst the dormer would be a new addition I do not consider that its size and height would cause significant visual harm to the character and appearance of the host building. I cannot conclude that the proposed dormer roof extension would be out of keeping taking into consideration those other dormer roof extensions and the variations in roof styles to the properties along Saltdean Drive.
8. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the building and the area. For the reasons given, the proposed development would not materially conflict with Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan 2005 and Supplementary Planning Document: Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations (SPD12) 2013. These require the formulation of rooms in the roof to be well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended, adjoining properties and to the surrounding area, setting and local context, amongst other matters.

Conditions

9. I have considered the planning conditions suggested by the Council in light of paragraph 206 of the Framework and the advice in the Planning Policy Guidance. In addition to the standard time limit condition and in the interests of certainty it is appropriate that there is a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. A condition relating to materials is appropriate in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusions

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR