



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 April 2022

By Guy Davies BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/W/21/3284472

64 Goldstone Villas, Hove BN3 3RS

- 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 Tevfik Safran against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2021/01953, dated 21 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 July 2021.
 - The development is an extension to the existing shopfront.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The extension has been built and is in use as an enlargement of the shop. I have omitted the term 'retrospective' from the description as my consideration of the appeal is based on the development for which permission is sought; the fact that it has already been built plays no part in the decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the Hove Station Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. Goldstone Villas is a wide, tree-lined avenue leading up to Hove Station. It is flanked on either side by terraces of houses with lower scale buildings to the south. The terrace on the western side of the road closest to the station contains a parade of shops at ground floor level. The significance of the Conservation Area lies in the cohesive and regular form of the buildings framing the approach to the station and linking it with other elements of the town to the south.
5. 64 Goldstone Villas forms the end of one of the terraces of late Victorian houses one road down from the station. It differs from the other houses in the terrace by containing a shop on the ground floor but otherwise the building exhibits the same architectural form, style and detailing. The terrace is set back from the road with low walls enclosing the front gardens and steps leading up to the front doors and down to the semi-basements respectively. It forms an integral part of the Conservation Area and contributes towards its character and appearance.

6. The extension projects in front of the building line of the terrace, enclosing the forecourt. This contrasts with the more open front gardens, bounded only by low walls, and results in a prominent projection at odds with the regularity of the terrace and other terraces in the Conservation Area.
7. In addition, the form of the extension with its shallow pitched roof, timber construction and cladding, and roller shutter door is incongruous and results in a discordant appearance between it and the materials and architectural detailing of the original building.
8. The forecourt of the shop has previously been used for the display of fresh produce in moveable stalls. Neither these nor the use of a retractable awning has the same solidity as does the extension, which is a larger, permanent structure. Nor do the low walls and steps to the houses in the terrace, or the seating area on the forecourt of a nearby coffee shop in an adjoining terrace, have the same visual prominence in the street scene, or are as disparate in their design or use of materials.
9. As a result of its position, design and materials, the extension causes harm to the character and appearance of the Hove Station Conservation Area, and consequently conflicts with Policies QD5, QD8, QD10, QD14 and HE6 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005, and Policies CP12, CP13 and CP15 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One 2016, which require good design, including extensions and alterations to shop fronts, that respect their settings and conserve heritage assets.
10. The Brighton & Hove City Plan Part Two 2020 is currently being examined, with consultation being undertaken on main modifications to the Plan. Given the advanced nature of the examination, I give weight to emerging Policies DM21, DM23 and DM26, which update current development plan policies relating to extensions, shop fronts and development in conservation areas. The extension conflicts with these policies for the same reasons.
11. Because the extension causes less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, it is necessary to weigh that harm against the public benefits of the development. Although it is of public benefit that the business is able to thrive and sell a wide range of produce, that benefit does not outweigh the harm identified above, to which I assign great weight. It would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Hove Station Conservation Area.

Conclusion

12. I conclude that the extension conflicts with the development plan when taken as a whole. As there are no material considerations that outweigh that conflict, it follows that the appeal should be dismissed.

Guy Davies

INSPECTOR