



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 January 2012

by J Mansell Jagger MA(Cantab) DipTP MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 10 January 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/11/2165055

63 Coombe Vale, Saltdean, Brighton BN2 8HN

- 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 Pete Coker against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application ref BH2011/02463, dated 18 August 2011, was refused by notice dated 18 October 2011.
 - The development proposed is erection of single-storey rear extension, loft conversion, raised ridge height, side roof lights, Juliet balcony to rear, and front window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of single-storey rear extension, loft conversion, raised ridge height, side roof lights, Juliet balcony to rear, and front window at 63 Coombe Vale, Saltdean, Brighton BN2 8HN in accordance with the terms of the application, ref BH2011/02463, dated 18 August 2011, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: drawing nos. 684/1, 684/2, 684/3, 684/4, 684/5 and 684/6.

Main Issue

2. The issue is the effect of the proposal on the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining dwellings.

Reasons

3. The property comprises a detached 1960s bungalow occupying an elevated position on the north side of Coombe Vale on the edge of the residential area of Saltdean. The proposal is to construct a steeper pitched roof over the main part of the bungalow, to incorporate new accommodation at first floor level, and to extend over a new rear addition, effectively making this a chalet bungalow.
-

4. The Council does not object to the architectural design of the proposal, but believes that the rear extension would have an overbearing impact on the adjoining dwellings, resulting in overlooking and a loss of light and privacy.
5. This part of Coombe Vale rises quite steeply from west to east. On the west side, no.61, which has also been heightened to form a chalet-style bungalow, is at a lower level. However, the proposed extension would be set back sufficiently from the common boundary, with its roof plane sloping away to the east, to ensure that it would not be overbearing or intrusive on the outlook of the occupiers of that property.
6. Given the orientation of nos.61, 62 and 63, and the sloping topography, there would be no significant overshadowing or loss of sunlight or daylight to affect either of the adjoining properties. In the case of no.65, the high wall and boundary fence would further limit any material impact. There would be no direct overlooking from the high-level roof lights and, whilst there might be oblique views of their rear gardens from the window with the Juliet balcony, any impact would be confined to the rearmost end of their gardens. Such oblique views are not unusual in urban residential areas and any effect on privacy would not be sufficient to refuse the application.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not materially harm the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining dwellings and would therefore not conflict with Policy QD27 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan. For the avoidance of doubt I will add a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Subject to that condition, I allow the appeal.

J Mansell Jagger

INSPECTOR