



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 June 2009

by **J D Westbrook BSc(hons) MSc 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:
22 June 2009

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/A/09/2096350 **49 Hill Drive, Hove, BN3 6QL**

- 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 Rob Starr against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
- The application (Ref BH2008/01385), dated 3 April 2008, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2008.
- The development proposed is an additional storey to form 4 bedrooms.

Decision

1. I allow the appeal and grant planning permission for an additional storey to form 4 bedrooms at 49 Hill Drive, Hove, BN3 6QL, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref. BH2008/01385, dated 3 April 2008, and the plans submitted therewith, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 3) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows/dormer windows other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed on the south-west and north-east elevations.

Main issue

2. I consider the main issue in this case to be the effect of the proposed additional storey on the character and appearance of Hill Drive.

Reasons

3. No 49 is a detached house located on the south-eastern side of Hill Drive. Hill Drive slopes steeply up from south-west to north-east. The properties in the vicinity of No 49 slope steeply down from the rear of the plot to the road. There is considerable variation in the design of the dwellings along Hill Drive and, in the vicinity of the appeal site, there is no clearly established building line, although most properties are set well back from the road. There is, however, a consistent stepped down nature of the roof lines along the road, albeit with a wide variety of roof types and styles.

4. The main body of No 49 is effectively a bungalow following an approximate building line formed by Nos 47 to 53. There are two projecting front extensions to the appeal property which, because of the sloping nature of the plot, are two storeys high, and have half-hipped roofs with ridge lines at the same height as that of the main body of the dwelling. These projections follow an approximate building line formed by Nos 35 – 41. No 47 is currently under construction and, although it would appear that work has been halted for some time, if the property were to be completed it would appear from the approved plans that it would be a 2/3 storey house with a ridge line at approximately the same level as that of the current No 49. No 51 is a two-storey house set some 2 metres above the level of No 49.
5. Since the site slopes up significantly from the road, the front projections of No 49 appear prominent, and the ridge of the main body of the house is seen as lower than the roofs of the forward extensions. The proposed additional storey would result in the property having a new two-storey element following the approximate building line of Nos 47 and 51. The proposed new roof would result in the roof profile attaining a more balanced stepped down appearance between Nos 51 and No 47. Furthermore, the pitch of the hipped element of the roof would reflect the pitch of the roofs over the front projections.
6. In my opinion, the proposed addition would not appear prominent in the street scene due both to the distance of the addition from the front boundary of the site, and also to the fact that from road level, the front projections would break up the view of the new roof and reduce its visual impact. Moreover, the design of the roof of the additional storey would be in keeping with the rest of the property in terms of pitch and proportion. Finally, I consider that the proposal would result in a greater degree of consistency in the stepped pattern of the roof profile along this part of Hill Drive.
7. In conclusion, therefore, I find that the proposal would not be detrimental to the character or appearance of Hill Drive, and that it would not conflict with policies QD1 or QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan, or with advice in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance note 1: Roof Alterations and Extensions.
8. The Council has accepted that the proposal would not result in any significant detriment to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings by way of privacy, and I concur with that view. I have, however, added a condition to restrict the construction of windows in the side elevations of the addition, in order to protect the future residential amenities of the occupiers of these dwellings. I have also added a condition relating to the materials to be used in the construction of the proposed addition, in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area in the vicinity of No 49.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR
