# **Appeal Decision**

Site visit made on 24 March 2011

## by S J Emerson BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 28 March 2011

# Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/11/2147561 50 Arundel Drive East, Saltdean, Brighton BN2 8SL

- 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 Steven Kennedy against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
- The application Ref BH2010/03353, dated 22 October 2010, was refused by notice dated 20 December 2010.
- The development proposed is: alterations to the existing front dormer to provide a balcony.

#### **Procedural matters**

- 1. The Council's decision notice refers to plans and the application submitted to the Council on 25 October 2010, but an *Informative* states that the decision is based on drawing 433/01 and 02 received on the 18 August 2010. The Council accepts that this latter reference is an error. The drawings submitted with the appeal and on which I have determined the proposal are 433/01 Rev A (Proposed Alterations) and 433/02A (Existing Layout).
- 2. At the time of my site visit the development was almost complete. The sloping roof had been cut away below the existing dormer to form a small flat-roofed area and a glazed door had been inserted in the dormer to provide access. The width of the opening in the roof is lightly narrower than the overall width of the dormer and slightly narrower than shown on the application drawing. The balcony rail has not been installed. There is no indication that the work was underway at the time that the application was submitted to the Council.

### **Decision**

3. I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission for alterations to the existing front dormer to provide a balcony at 50 Arundel Drive East, Saltdean, Brighton in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BH2010/03353, dated 22 October 2010.

## **Main Issue**

4. The main issue is the effect on the street scene.

#### Reasons

5. Arundel Drive East has built development on the eastern side only, which faces across the road to a large open space and to the sea in the distance. There are a variety of styles of dwelling, including bungalows, bungalows with a

basement garage and chalet bungalows. Several dwellings have a balcony at first floor level.

- 6. The appeal property is a chalet bungalow where the main living accommodation is sited well above natural ground level. There is a flat roofed dormer in the front elevation and a side dormer with a pitched roof. The proposal is to create a small balcony at the front of the front dormer by cutting away the roof slope below it.
- 7. The Council officer's written assessment of the application criticises the design of the front dormer as if this was part of the proposal. However, a comparison of the front dormer shown on the existing and proposed plans shows that there are no alterations to the size or position of the dormer. The only changes are the cutting away of the roof slope; the replacement of the single, large window with a glazed door and small windows on each side of it; and a balcony rail. The balcony would not project forward of the eaves line.
- 8. The proposal represents a small-scale alteration to the front elevation which would not significantly alter the appearance of the dwelling in the street scene. It is not out of keeping with the design and size of the dwelling or the variety of balconies along this road. It would cause no visual harm. The proposal does not conflict with policy QD14 (extensions and alterations) of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan 2005 or with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 1 Roof Alterations and Extensions.
- 9. Accordingly, I allow the appeal. As the development is already well underway there is no need for a commencement condition. There is also no need to require the approval of any materials. The size and position of the balcony rail is shown on the drawing and further control is not necessary given its modest width.

Simon Emerson

**INSPECTOR**