



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2011

by Jessica Graham BA(Hons) PgDipL

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

Decision date: 27 October 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/11/2160241
218 Ditchling Road, Brighton BN1 6JE

- 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 Shah against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2011/01862, dated 27 June 2011, was refused by notice dated 22 August 2011.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a new single-storey extension to the rear and side of the property to provide an extension to the existing kitchen with adjacent utility room and bathroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect that the proposed development would have upon the character and appearance of No. 218 and the wider area.

Reasons

3. No. 218 is one of a semi-detached pair of dwellings which, in common with the others on this side of Ditchling Road, has a central two-storey outrigger to the rear, and backs on to Ditchling Gardens. While the outrigger is of substantial size, its ridge and eaves heights are set below those of the main dwellings, indicating its subordinate function. The proposed extension would wrap around the end of this outrigger, creating an L-shaped single-storey structure with a gap of some 3m to the rear elevation of the main dwelling.
4. The new extension would be far wider than the existing outrigger serving No. 218; in fact it would be of equivalent width to the main dwelling. As such it would appear an unduly large addition to the rear of this property, with a bulk that would be out of keeping with the proportions of the existing house and outrigger, and unreflective of its function as a subsidiary extension. In my judgment the proposed development would appear an overly dominant addition to the existing dwelling, and as such would undermine its original character. The new extension would also appear as an incongruous addition in views from Ditchling Gardens, and so have a detrimental visual impact on the street scene.
5. I therefore find that the proposed development would conflict with the objectives of Policies QD1, QD2 and QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan 2005, which seek to ensure that any new extension makes a positive contribution to the visual quality of the environment, and relates well to the building to be extended.

6. I note that the occupiers of No. 216 have expressed concern about the impact the proposed extension would have upon the outlook from their property. While the extension would clearly be visible from No. 216, I am satisfied that its height and massing would not reduce the outlook from that property to such an extent as would harm the living conditions of the occupiers. However, the considerable harm that the proposed development would cause to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, as discussed above, is sufficient reason in itself to refuse planning permission.
7. I therefore determine that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jessica Graham

INSPECTOR