



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 February 2014

by **C J Leigh BSC(HONS) MPHIL MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 7 March 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/14/2211967

6 Woodview Close, Brighton, BN1 9GH

- 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 Mrs S Mills against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2013/03414 was refused by notice dated 3 December 2013.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side and rear extension.
-

Procedural matters

1. The content of the National Planning Practice Guidance has been considered but in light of the facts in this case the Guidance does not alter my conclusions.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property lies at the end of a short terrace of modern housing within a wider residential estate. The terrace is raised up above Woodview Close and the adjoining access road to a garage court that lies to the west. The location of the proposed extension is visible from public viewpoints, including along the access to the garage court (which provides a pedestrian route through to housing further westwards).
5. There is a large side and rear garden to the appeal property, with an angled boundary. The proposed extension is an unusual shape to fit this boundary, and would be two storeys high and 500mm from the northern boundary. Whilst the size of the side and rear garden indicate that an extension may be possible to No. 6, the sheer scale, form and proximity of the proposals in the submitted drawings appear excessive and out of character with the area.
6. The appearance of the extension would be discordant with the host property and imposing upon the wider area, due to the proximity to the boundary and the shape of the extension, which would project to the side and appear to wrap around in an oddly angular form to the rear. Both of these matters would be emphasised by the elevated position of the extension.

7. The proposals would therefore cause harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. This would be contrary to Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005, which states that planning permission will only be granted for extensions to existing buildings if, amongst other matters, it is well designed and sited in relation to the property and the surrounding area. The proposals would also conflict with the objectives contained in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 12: Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations 2013, which resists side extensions that are poorly designed. The appeal is dismissed accordingly.

C J Leigh

INSPECTOR