



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2015

**by Louise Phillips MA (Cantab) MSc MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 23 January 2015**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/14/2229437**

**1 Barrowfield Drive, Hove, East Sussex BN3 6TQ**

- 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 Amir Solehi against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
  - The application Ref BH2014/02873, dated 20 August 2014, was refused by notice dated 10 October 2014.
  - The development comprises the replacement of a part block, part fence boundary with a painted, rendered block wall.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matters

2. The wall in question has already been constructed. I understand that the appellant misread the details of a previously approved scheme in completing it, but this has no bearing on my decision. Furthermore, I must determine the appeal on the basis of the development applied for and it is not for me to suggest alternative design solutions.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the host property and wider area.

### Reasons

4. The appeal property occupies a corner plot at the junction of Dyke Road Avenue and Barrowfield Drive. The wall subject to appeal is on the bend, occupying most of the Dyke Road Avenue frontage and extending into Barrowfield Drive. It is long and tall and thus it is very prominent in the street scene.
5. Dyke Road Avenue comprises houses of various ages, sizes and styles. The road is busy with traffic and I observed many solid front boundary treatments, including high walls and fences. Most of the walls I saw incorporate some form of decoration or detailing which affords them a thoughtfully designed and often attractive appearance. Whilst the appellant has drawn my attention to some of the plainer examples, the majority still have pillars, some colouring and/or capping.

6. By contrast, the wall at the appeal site is a continuous mass of rendered blockwork. It has no pillars or other design feature to commend it visually and it appears already to be suffering from damp. It has a purely functional appearance which is completely at odds with the more considered solutions I have described.
7. Moreover, the cream/grey coloured finish contrasts most unfavourably with the appearance of the host property itself as a red brick, tile hung dwelling of a traditional style. Similar properties are found all along Barrowfield Drive, which is a narrow side street with a leafy feel. The front boundaries are mainly marked by low-level solid structures and significant hedging or other vegetation so that landscaping prevails at the roadside. The appeal property retains a short stretch of complementary picket fencing and planting on Barrowfield Drive, but it is not sufficient to offset the harmful effect of the wall.
8. I therefore conclude that the development as proposed and constructed is significantly detrimental to the character and appearance of the host property and wider area. Thus it conflicts with Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan, which, amongst other things, requires development to be well designed and detailed in relation to the host property and surrounding area; and to use materials sympathetic to the parent building.

### **Conclusion**

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Louise Phillips*

INSPECTOR