



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 July 2008

by **S J Turner** RIBA MRTPI IHBC

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:  
1 August 2008

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/A/08/2064947**

**26 Chalkland Rise, Woodingdean, Brighton, East Sussex, BN2 6RH**

- 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 Peter Millis against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
- The application Ref BH2007/04235, dated 12 November 2007, was refused by notice dated 9 January 2008.
- The development proposed is ground floor extension to rear and room in the roof.

## Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

## Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

## Reasons

3. The appeal property is situated on high ground in residential area. There are some larger houses and a school nearby but the area is characterised predominantly by modest bungalows with shallow hipped roofs. No 26 already has large dormer windows positioned at high level in the side and rear roof slopes. These are visible from the street and from lower ground to the west.
4. The proposal would extend the main roof, making it project out to the rear with a gable facing west over the back garden. The existing shallow pitch would be maintained, the proposal would not increase the roof height and the large rear dormer would be removed. However the gable end would be prominent in long views from the west and the extended roof would be visible in oblique views from the street and from adjacent properties.
5. I consider that the extended roof in particular would be unsympathetic to the scale and appearance of the existing modest bungalow and would appear awkward and out of proportion. Furthermore the proposal would create a significantly enlarged dwelling which, even taking account of existing dormers and extensions in the locality, would be out of keeping with the established scale and appearance other similar bungalows nearby.
6. I note the appellant's need for additional accommodation, the existence of gables in Woodingdean and the range of styles in the area. However none of these matters outweighs my conclusion that this particular proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would conflict with Brighton and Hove Local Plan Policy QD14.

7. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Sue Turner*

INSPECTOR