



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 August 2019 by Elizabeth Davies BSc (Hons) PIEMA

Decision by

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/19/3230414

18 Surrenden Crescent, Brighton BN1 6WF

- 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 Barbara Loman against the decision of Brighton and Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2019/01026 dated 4 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension above existing ground floor room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a large detached, two storey dwelling located on a residential crescent. The neighbouring properties are also detached, two storey properties with a similar footprint to the appeal property. It was apparent from my site visit that the properties along the crescent feature different styles and designs, but one notable feature in common along the crescent is the sense of space between the properties at first floor level which adds positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The appeal property features an existing single storey extension which extends up to the side wall of No. 16 Surrenden Crescent. The proposed first floor extension would be built above this existing extension. Given the absence of a gap at ground floor level between the appeal property and neighbouring property, the gap between the properties at first floor level is an important feature in order to maintain a sense of openness in keeping with the rest of the crescent. Whilst the proposed extension is modest in scale and wouldn't completely infill the gap that exists at first floor, it is considered it is substantial enough that it would result in a loss of the important sense of space between

the properties and therefore a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the crescent would result.

6. On this basis, the proposed extension would be contrary to saved Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure extensions take account of the existing space around buildings and the character of the area and an appropriate gap is retained between the extension and the joint boundary to prevent a terracing effect where this would be detrimental to the character of the area.

Other Matters

7. The personal reasons for the appellant wishing to construct the extension are understood, however these considerations do not outweigh the harm identified. Also the fact that no objections have been received from the occupiers of the neighbouring properties does not lend positive weight to the proposed development.
8. The sustainable design points highlighted by the appellant, the possible benefits to the local economy and the lack of harm to the living conditions of neighbouring properties are noted, but do not outweigh the harm to character and appearance that has been found.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Elizabeth Davies

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR