
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 January 2017

by R J Maile BSc FRICS

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

Decision date: 7th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/16/3162401

1 Cranmer Avenue, Hove, East Sussex, BN3 7JP.

- 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 Ms Melanie Newnam against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application ref: BH2016/05198, dated 26 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is one storey rear and two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the two storey side extension upon the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The subject property forms one of a pair of inter-war, semi-detached houses, being prominently sited at the junction of Cranmer Avenue and Weald Avenue. The plot is wedge-shaped, tapering towards the rear.
4. The new extension has been carefully designed to mimic the fenestration of the host building and to create a lean-to roof above the two storey element, which would continue the slope of the barn end feature to the main roof in matching materials.
5. The front elevation of the extension would be set back, while its overall width would be half that of the existing front elevation. As such, the scheme would remain subservient to the original dwelling as required by paragraph 3.2 of the Council's adopted SPD¹.
6. For these reasons I have concluded that the proposal will not have an adverse impact upon the character or appearance of the host building.

¹ Supplementary Planning Document 12 – Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations: June 2013.

7. Notwithstanding my comments above, the plot is restricted in width adjacent to the rearmost portion of the two storey element of the extension. As a result, the full height of its flank elevation would be highly visible in the street scene and would project beyond the return frontage established by the properties to the south at nos. 203 and 226 Old Shoreham Road.
8. The two storey side extension would extend above the existing flank boundary to no. 1. As such, it would appear as a disproportionate and over-dominant feature as viewed from both Cranmer Avenue and, in particular, Weald Avenue towards the rear building line of the dwelling.
9. For these reasons, I find upon the main issue that the siting of the two storey extension closely abutting the return frontage to Weald Avenue would have an unacceptable impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Accordingly, development as proposed would be contrary to Policy QD14 a. and c. of the Council's adopted City Plan² and would not integrate into the established built environment, contrary to paragraph 61 of the Framework³.
10. In arriving at my decision I have taken account of the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out at Policy SS1 of the City Plan. However, I have concluded that the dominant impact of the flank elevation where it abuts the site boundary would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of permitting this particular proposal.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

R. J. Maile

INSPECTOR

² Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One: March 2016.

³ The National Planning Policy Framework.