
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 September 2020

by C Jack BSc MA MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/20/3251670

11 Donnington Road, Brighton BN2 6WH

- 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 Mark Peters against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2020/00588, dated 12 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is an extension to the rear of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an extension to the rear of the property at 11 Donnington Road, Brighton BN2 6WH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BH2020/00588, dated 12 February 2020, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Reasons

3. 11 Donnington Road is a semi-detached bungalow, which originally would have been modest in scale and retains a modest appearance in the street scene. The local area is principally residential, and I saw that many properties nearby have been significantly altered or extended in a variety of ways including rear extensions at the neighbouring properties either side. No 11 has also been subject to significant extensions at the rear, which are flat-roofed and single-storey and screened from public views by the main bungalow and the garage at the side.

4. The proposed single-storey, flat-roofed extension would essentially infill the area between the existing side extension/garage, the rear of the bungalow, and the boundary with No 9. It would partially replace an existing extension at the rear, covering a raised patio area, and would abut the boundary adjacent to the conservatory at No 9. In this position, the proposed extension would be highly concealed from public view and therefore its effect on the appearance of the host dwelling would be very limited.
5. The cumulative extended portion of the dwelling would be substantial in relation to the likely original scale of the host bungalow. Nevertheless, the detailed circumstances of the siting and relationship of the proposed extension with existing built form on the site, and at adjoining properties, would result in a development that would be tucked-away and not unduly at odds with the character and appearance of No 11 or with the surrounding area.
6. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling. It would not conflict with saved Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan 2005, which among other things seeks to ensure that extensions would relate well to the host and neighbouring dwellings.

Other Matters

7. The Council also referred to saved Policy QD27 in its reason for refusal. This policy relates to the protection of amenity, principally in terms of living conditions and human health. The Council has not indicated any significant concerns in these terms and, given factors including the relative orientation and siting of the proposal with the conservatory at No 9, I am satisfied that the proposal would not give rise to any significant adverse effects in this regard.
8. I note that the conservatory at No 9 is not full width, does not adjoin the garage, and is a more lightweight structure. However, this does not alter my finding that the proposed extension would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time limit, a condition requiring adherence to the approved plans is necessary in the interests of certainty, and a materials condition is necessary in the interests of the satisfactory appearance of the completed development.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, the appeal is allowed.

Catherine Jack

INSPECTOR