



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2013

by **S Holden BSc MSc CEng TPP MRTPI FCIHT**

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

Decision date: 15 July 2013

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/13/2198949**  
**26 Whitethorn Drive, Brighton, BN1 5LH**

- 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 and Mrs Collis against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
  - The application Ref BH2013/00642 was refused by notice dated 19 April 2013.
  - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted for a single storey rear extension at 26 Whitehorn Drive, Brighton BN1 5LH, in accordance with the application ref: BH2013/00642, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.
  - 3) The development shall not take place other than in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans: 1472/1673 and 1472/1674A.

## Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

## Reasons

3. Whitehorn Drive is within a well-established residential area dating from the 1970s, characterised by detached dwellings in modest sized plots. The houses vary in style and design and there is no strong sense of rhythm or uniformity to the street scene. No 26 is a chalet bungalow with flat roof dormer windows on both front and rear roof slopes. There is an attached single garage with a false pitched roof and a small single storey rear extension. The proposal is for a single storey rear extension that would be sited behind the existing garage.
4. The proposal would extend the flank wall of the garage to beyond the depth of the existing rear extension. It would therefore include a long section of dummy pitched roof adjacent to the shared boundary with No 25. It would extend approximately 5m beyond the rear elevation of the house and would be a little deeper and wider than the current extension. However, its overall

proportions would reflect those of the existing extension and its height and roof form would be complimentary to the features of the existing building. It would therefore appear to be subordinate to the host property, notwithstanding its dimensions. In my view these factors would enable the proposed extension to be satisfactorily integrated with the existing building.

5. An adequate separation distance would be retained between the extension and the shared boundary with No 25. As this adjoining property is sited on slightly higher ground the extension would be only marginally taller than the boundary fence. It would therefore not appear dominant with respect to the surrounding buildings. The position of the proposed extension would ensure that it would not be prominent in the street scene. The gap between Nos 25 and 26, which provides views over the existing garage towards development beyond the rear gardens, would be retained. The additional length of the wall and the mock pitched roof would be visible, but its low level, proximity to the boundary fence and the relationship between this and No 25 would reduce any harmful effects on views from the surrounding area.
6. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area. It would comply with saved Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan, which seeks development that respects its setting. It would also accord with the aim of the National Planning Policy Framework to secure design that is appropriate in its context. I am therefore of the view that the appeal should succeed.
7. In addition to the standard time limit the Council has requested a materials condition. This is justified in the interests of the appearance of the building. It is also necessary that the development should be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. A condition to this effect is required for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
8. For these reasons, and having regard to all other relevant matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, subject to conditions.

*Sheila Holden*

INSPECTOR