

**23 Woodland Way, Brighton, East Sussex, BN1 8BA**

**Planning Statement**

**Document ref 02-0821-13**

This planning application seeks re-approval for the approval granted under reference BH2018/01095

BH2018/01095 was submitted following the refusal of planning application ref BH2017/02957 and the subsequent dismissal of appeal ref APP/Q1445/D/17/3188576.

BH2018/01095 differed from the original application (BH2017/02957) in that a raised patio area was removed from the scheme which the appeal inspector noted was likely to cause adverse effect on the amenity of the neighbouring properties.

In the appeal inspectors report however, the appeal inspector noted in regard to the extension to the living accommodation:

*The propose extension would be set approximately 1.1m from the common boundary with No 22, taking the Council's measurement, which has not been specifically disputed. No 22 is positioned fairly close to the boundary, where I saw the conservatory is currently largely screened from No23 by a section of hedge. The proposed single storey extension would project beyond the rear of the conservatory. However, I consider that this would not be such that it would significantly affect the outlook from the rear of No22, which would be principally down the rear garden of that property, or the general sense of spaciousness experienced by neighbouring occupiers.*

*The proposal would be situated entirely to the rear of No 23. While it would be partially visible from Woodland Way in the modest gaps either side of the detached host house, the effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the street scene would be very limited. The change in levels is such that, when viewed from the rear, the single storey extension would appear generally subservient to the greater mass of the existing two storey dwelling.*

*Furthermore, the proposal would not extend beyond the side walls of the existing house, and the single storey extension, excluding the patio, would only have a moderately greater depth than half the depth of the main dwelling. This would not result in any adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host property, or of the wider locality. I saw that many properties in the area have extensions, including some to the rear, and that raised patio areas are reasonably commonplace nearby. Accordingly, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not be significantly out of keeping with other development in the area.*

*I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It therefore would not conflict with retained Policy QD14 of the LP, which sets out general criteria for extensions and alterations and is generally consistent with the aims of the Framework. The proposal would also be generally consistent with the relevant requirements of SPD 12 in this regard*

Taking the appeal inspectors comments into account, revised drawings were prepared and submitted as part of planning application reference BH2018/01095 and this was approved on 9 July 2018.

The applicant wishes to reinstate this approval and this application is identical to that approved under reference BH2018/01095.