
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2017

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

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

Decision date: 21 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/16/3165816

71 Grange Road, Hove, East Sussex BN3 5HW

- 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 & Ms Silas & Bryony Tyack & Homerton against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2016/00994, dated 15 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 28 September 2016.
 - The development proposed was described as: "demolition of existing conservatory structure to rear elevation; replaced with ground floor single storey side and rear extensions to create externally accessed refuse/office storage, internal cloakroom, utility, new kitchen area and dining/living areas; demolition of existing detached single garage to end of rear garden replaced with double access gates and tarmac matting (drive over grass) so rear garden external amenity space increases but 1No off street car parking space retained; timber fencing panels/trellising to rear elevation boundary".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. No 71 is a small end-of-terrace, two-storey dwelling set in a modest sized plot. It occupies a corner position at the junction of Grange Road with Kingsthorpe Road. Grange Road is characterised by terraced dwellings with a sense of uniformity due to their similar features, proportions and the strong building line. By contrast Kingsthorpe Road is more varied in character with a mix of two storey dwellings dating from different periods and less distinct building line on its southern side.
 4. The proposed extension would wrap around the side and rear elevations of No 71 and fully occupy the existing gap between the flank wall of the house and the back of the footway on Kingsthorpe Road. The side extension would also be significantly deeper than the existing dwelling as it would be connected to a replacement conservatory attached to the back of the house. The proposal as a whole would project approximately 3m beyond the original rear elevation.
 5. The extension would not be conspicuous from Grange Road as it would be flush with the front of the house. However, its rear corner would be particularly
-

prominent from Kingsthorpe Road due to its projection beyond the building line associated with the adjacent properties. From here its combination of pitched roofs and variable eaves level would appear both awkward and incongruous. The mix of different shapes and materials would result in a failure to integrate the side extension satisfactorily with the replacement conservatory. The complexity of this part of the proposal would appear out of keeping with the existing, simple design of this modest dwelling.

6. The existing dwelling is characterised by painted render under a tiled roof. The use of wooden cladding would be at odds with the materials used in the host property and its neighbours. Whilst wood may have been suitable for use in a development of contemporary style dwellings built in Stoneham Road, it does not follow that it would be appropriate for inclusion in an extension to an existing dwelling. In my view, the introduction of wooden cladding over the entire flank wall would appear out of place in the context of the surrounding buildings and their use of more traditional materials.
7. I accept that using timber would provide a lighter weight structure, but the side extension, including its rearwards projection, would still have a solid overall appearance which would be highly visible from the surrounding area. Whilst timber would have some similarity with the existing fence, materials used in a boundary treatment cannot be compared with those that would form part of a permanent extension attached to a building constructed of brick and render.
8. I appreciate that there is no objection to the removal of the garage; there were letters of support for the proposal and the appellants have had discussions with Council officers to try and find an acceptable scheme. However, these matters are not a justification for permitting a proposal which I have found to be harmful.
9. Taking all these factors into account, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would fail to comply with Policy CP12 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One and saved Policy QD 14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan. These policies require new development to be well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended and the surrounding area. They also require extensions to use materials that are sympathetic to the parent building. In addition, the scheme would be contrary to the advice of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: *Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations*, which advises that extensions should avoid jarring of materials and forms.
10. For this reason, and having regard to all other relevant matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Sheila Holden

INSPECTOR