



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2022

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 October 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/P1425/D/22/3302855

65 Bevendean Avenue, Saltdean, East Sussex BN2 8PF

- 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 R Young against the decision of Lewes District Council.
 - The application Ref LW/22/0068, dated 17 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is 2no gable end side extensions with raised pitch height, front and rear dormers, garage conversion and widening of driveway.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I use the Council's description of development which is more concise than the application form; I note the Appellant also uses this description on the appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is a rectangular plot sloping up away from the road with a hipped roof detached bungalow with a small front dormer and integral garage. Hipped properties sit to either side in a street of varied homes, primarily but not exclusively single storey, with varied roof forms and a number of dormers. The locality is of established suburban residential character with gardens, properties, levels and wider outlook all coming together to create an area of pleasing appearance. The proposal is as described above.
 5. Whilst the appeal property does sit in a short run of hipped properties, I do not see that as necessarily meaning one has to oppose a gabled approach in principle. However, in this instance it would be accompanied by an appreciable raising of the ridge height and to my mind introducing gables plus increasing height would lead to an excessively bulky appearance. In terms of the dormers, the rear one taken in isolation would not be a great anomaly as they are present at the rear of a number of nearby properties. However, the front dormer would appear excessive in actual scale and relative to almost all others along the stretch of road and would look very cumbersome in the street
-

scene. The combination of this 'full size' flat roofed dormer, gable ends, and raised ridge would completely remove any semblance of a subtle upper level for this property and be excessive in mass and incongruous in appearance. In my opinion it is important that good design should, where possible, prevail along this road; the generally low key streetscene is worth protecting here and regrettably the appeal proposal would run contrary to this.

6. Given the foregoing, I conclude that there would be conflict with Policies DM25 and DM28 of the Lewes District Local Plan 2020 - Part Two. These policies, taken together and amongst other matters, seek to secure development which would be sympathetic in form to an existing building, respect the character of the locality, and generally be of good design.

Other matters

7. I do understand the Appellant's wish to extend this property to increase and improve the present accommodation. I can see that thought has been given to selection of materials. The conversion of the garage is not an issue. I have carefully considered the other examples of extension work drawn to my attention. Some are not of a design quality that they should set a benchmark, but in any event, there is variance from the appeal proposal in terms of styles, sizes and positions and I have to assess the present scheme on its own merits. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation the main issue identified above.
8. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered and the development plan policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within that document.

Overall conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR