

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2021

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 November 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/21/3282229
194 New Church Road, Hove, BN3 4EA

- 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 Steven Lowry-Smith against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2021/01896, dated 20 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of two storey side extension and demolition of existing conservatory; and installation of two front dormers, first floor balcony at rear and associated alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I use the Council's description of development for clarity; I note the Appellant also uses this on the appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached two storey dwelling on a corner plot. It has attractive elevations with a distinctive uninterrupted cat slide roof element running to the front from the ridge. The property lies at the end of a row of 6 very similar semi-detached pairs which are positioned along the principal road between two side street junctions with a good degree of spaciousness at their corners. This makes an attractive and distinctive immediate scene and is a key feature within a wider generally calm suburban setting with pleasing appearance. The appeal scheme is as described above.
 5. The planned works would significantly change the appearance of the dwelling and very markedly increase its size. The effect would be to make this house lose its subtle and pleasing front elevation and look alien and ill at ease in the context of the immediate attached dwelling and the row of homes beyond. The works would involve a front roof scape becoming fussy and cluttered; a side elevation, even allowing for its slightly reduced surface area, being too close to the side road with the full height well in front with of the building line and
-

unduly imposing accordingly; and a widely visible rear elevation not characteristic of the area with its balcony highly prominent in the streetscene.

6. Regrettably the property would change from a pleasing characteristic dwelling to one which would appear inordinately ungainly and incongruous in its own right, as one of a pair, and within the wider streetscene.
7. Brighton & Hove Local Plan Saved Policy QD14 and Policy CP12 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One are pertinent. Taken together and amongst other matters they seek well designed development that should protect the character and visual quality of an area along with local distinctiveness and generally have architectural merit. I conclude that the proposal would conflict with these policies.

Other matters

8. I do sympathise with the Appellant's wish to extend this dwelling. I noted the variety of development styles in the wider area and on other parts of the road along with extension works drawn to my attention. None of the alterations mirror the case in hand and I do have to assess this scheme on its own merits. I take the points that street trees and other vegetation filter views, and that overall height will not increase, and clearly materials have been selected to match the existing structure. Nevertheless, I reach the view that the overall works would create a building which would be visually awkward in this context and would not qualify as good design and hence I could not condone the scheme.
9. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
10. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered and the development plan policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within that document.

Overall conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR