



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made 21 October 2010

**by Doug Cramond BSc MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 2 November 2010**

---

## **Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/10/2135414 10 Ravenswood Drive, Brighton, BN2 6WN**

- 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 C Podina, against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
  - The application Ref BH2010/00856, dated 25 March 2010, was refused by notice dated 21 June 2010.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey rear extension and a single storey rear/side extension.
- 

### **Decision**

1. I dismiss the appeal.

### **Main Issues**

2. I consider the main issues to be the effects on living conditions for neighbours and the appearance of the host property.

### **Reasons**

3. The appeal property is an end of terrace two storey home set on an estate with many similar properties and built on a site with a back garden which rises markedly toward the open ground at the rear. The proposal would lead to a sizeable L shaped single storey element, using in part an existing garage which is no longer needed, along with a more modest first floor room adjoining the rear elevation above this. The proposal includes considerable glazing with a large lantern roof on the single storey element and sizeable skylights and full length glazing at first floor level.
  4. Whilst the first floor extension would be some way off the common boundary its bulk and mass would nevertheless be dominant for the neighbours living at No 12 Ravenswood Drive when in the lower parts of their rear garden. It would be overbearing leading to a feeling of being hemmed-in within an amenity area which already lacks full open aspect due to ground levels, boundary treatment and the housing terrace itself. Furthermore as one moves up the neighbours' garden the full extent of the glazing on the first floor rear elevation would become apparent and there would be a very real sense of losing privacy and being overlooked to a far greater degree in reality and perception terms than
-

presently exists with the modest first floor glazing. The first floor works would thus unacceptably conflict with the aim to protect living conditions which is embodied within Policies QD14 and QD27 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan (LP).

5. Turning to appearance; the scale of the extension works taken together would appear excessive relative to the modest nature of the existing property, its footprint and this plot. The design proposed would not comfortably accord with the elevations of the current home and whilst contrasts should not always be ruled out, in this instance the form would appear unbalanced and incongruous. The lantern roof would look alien from the road and where visible from neighbours. The first floor accommodation, almost sun-room in style, would look strangely discordant at this level when viewed from across the rear. LP Policy QD14 includes a call for extensions to be well designed and sited in relation to an existing property and its surroundings; I conclude this scheme would run contrary to this.
6. I sympathise with the appellant's wish to increase accommodation and note the proposed use of matching materials and the varied extensions which have taken place alongside and in the locality. However the points put forward do not outweigh my concerns over the main issues.
7. I conclude that there would be unacceptable adverse effects on living conditions for neighbours and on the appearance of the host property. Accordingly I shall dismiss the appeal.

*Doug Cramond*

INSPECTOR