



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 April 2010

by **B D Bagot BA (Arch) MCP 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](mailto:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk)

**Decision date:  
28 April 2010**

---

## **Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/10/2125431 24 Deanway, Hove, East Sussex BN3 6DG**

- 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 Henrik Schou against the decision of the Brighton & Hove City Council.
- The application, Ref: BH2009/02673 dated 5 November 2009, was refused by notice dated 25 January 2010.
- The development proposed is two-storey front/side extension.

---

### **Preliminary Matter**

1. The appeal application was amended following submission by revised plans submitted on 11 November 2009. I have determined the appeal on the basis of those revised plans.

### **Decision**

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted for two-storey front/side extension on land at 24 Deanway, Hove, East Sussex BN3 6DG, in accordance with the terms of the application No BH2009/02673 dated 5 November 2009, as amended by revised plans submitted on 11 November 2009, subject to the following conditions:
  - (1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - (2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
  - (3) The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the revised plans, numbers 23/01c, 23/02i, 23/03a, 23/04d, 23/05a, 23/06a, and 23/07a.

### **Main Issues**

3. The main issues are whether the proposed extension would appear incongruous and out of character with the existing building and the street scene generally, and whether it would interfere to an unreasonable extent with the outlook from the adjoining house at 55 Woodland Drive, and have an overbearing impact in relation to that house.

## Reasons

4. The appeal property is on the north-east side of the angled junction of Deanway with Woodland Drive. It is a 2 storey house built on rising ground above a lower ground floor garage, and is one of a number of houses of similar style built on the north-east side of Deanway as it rises up from the road junction towards the south-east. The appeal proposal is to add a gabled 2 storey extension on the north-west side, with its floors level with the existing garage and ground floor of the property. The extension would be set 200 mm back from the front of the existing house, and would be separated from it by an external staircase leading to an extended entrance lobby.
5. The front of the extension has been designed to reflect the overall character and appearance of the existing house, with a similar gable angle and similar window proportions and detailing. The overall height of the gable, being one floor lower than that of the main house, would be subservient to it. The extension would be of good architectural quality in design terms, and would not appear incongruous in relation to the design of the existing house.
6. The front of the extension would add to the curved line of the properties in Woodland Drive and Deanway on the north-east side of the road junction, and would effect a visual transition from the higher properties in Deanway to the lower scale of the houses fronting Woodland Drive. It would not be unduly prominent or out of character with the street scene or the locality generally.
7. The adjoining property at 55 Woodland Drive is at an angle to this property, and the proposed extension would not interfere to any marked degree with the outlook from 2 first floor windows to habitable rooms in the side elevation of that house. The building of the extension would have the merit of preventing the overlooking of those windows that can now be had from the staircase landing outside the entrance to this house. The eaves level of the extension would be only slightly higher than that of the adjoining house, and there would be sufficient space between the dwellings to avoid creating an unreasonable sense of enclosure or overbearing impact for the neighbouring occupiers.
8. I conclude that the proposed extension would not appear incongruous or out of character with the existing building or the street scene generally, and would not interfere to an unreasonable extent with the outlook from the adjoining house at 55 Woodland Drive, or have an overbearing impact in relation to that house. The development would be in accordance with the saved policies of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan adopted in 2005 to which the Council have referred, namely QD1 (design quality), QD2 (local characteristics), QD14 (extensions and alterations), and QD27 (protection of amenity).
9. In granting planning permission I have required the external materials of the extension to match those of the existing house, so as to ensure consistency in architectural character. I have also required the development to be carried out in accordance with the revised plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

*Brian Bagot*

INSPECTOR

---