



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 June 2014

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 June 2014

---

### Appeal Ref: **APP/Q1445/D/14/2218086**

### **22 Pembroke Crescent, Hove, BN3 5DD**

- 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 J Everard against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
  - The application Ref BH2013/04362 was refused by notice dated 27 February 2014.
  - The development proposed is demolition of existing single garage and construction of single storey side extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the locality.

### Reasons

3. The appeal property is a well proportioned, pleasingly elevated, detached two storey Victorian Villa with a detached garage and an enclosed rear garden on a corner plot. It is located within an established residential area of generally characterful detached and semi-detached Victorian Villas creating a very agreeable streetscene. The proposal is described above as on the application form albeit "extension" should be plural as a single storey addition is planned for each side of the house.
4. The site lies within the Pembroke and Princes Conservation Area. There is a duty imposed by Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requiring decision makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. Saved Policy HE6 of the adopted Brighton & Hove Local Plan (LP) broadly reflects S72(1) as well as setting out appropriate requirements to achieve suitable design.
5. The existing main dwelling stands proud and well-balanced. The larger extension to the east would be too wide in this context and its unsuitability would be emphasised by the height and bulk of the roof, the inappropriate design of the door with its individual pitched roof over and the poor relationship to the main house as a whole. Furthermore, the garage is an attractive small edifice with quaint and subordinate design and its loss for this plain and bulky

proposal would be a negative step in terms of both character and appearance. Most local properties display largely original front elevations and in contrast this scheme would result in a very noticeable and detrimental difference to this frontage which presently sits so comfortably and well-balanced within a degree of space.

6. The proposed extension to the south west would not be open to such wide views but nevertheless with a property of this elevational quality within a Conservation Area it is important to ensure that any additions would harmonise with the host dwelling. The proposal here would have an awkward visual relationship to the main building. It would emerge at a strange angle, have an unrelated roof, detract from and impinge upon an extremely attractive large bay and sit uncomfortably and uncharacteristically on the boundary.
7. Having regard to all of the above I conclude that there would be conflict with S72(1) of the Act and LP Saved Policy HE6; there would not be preservation of the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The LP also includes Saved Policy QD14 which, amongst other matters, and in common with the Council's Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations, seeks to ensure extensions are well designed; being sympathetic to the scale, proportion and character of the original building and respectful of its setting. Given the nature of the appeal scheme, I conclude that the proposal would run contrary to these objectives.
8. I sympathise with the Appellant's wish to increase the accommodation of this property and can see how efforts have been made to seek to replicate roofs, walls, windows and materials and not step outside the building lines. I note that no trees would be under threat, that there would be no privacy intrusion and that there has, in the past, been development within what is now the gap between house and garage. I can see that a roof which presently overhangs a boundary wall would be 'pulled back'. 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.
9. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered. Key objectives of the Framework are to protect and enhance the qualities of the built environment as well as to safeguard heritage assets; development plan policies which I cite mirror these.

*Overall conclusion*

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

*D Cramond*

INSPECTOR