



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 January 2012

**by J Mansell Jagger MA(Cantab) DipTP MRTPI IHBC**

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

**Decision date: 10 January 2012**

---

## **Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/11/2165107**

### **3 Hazeldene Meads, Brighton BN1 5LR**

- 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 David Vaughan against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
  - The application ref BH2011/02120 dated 12 July 2011, was refused by notice dated 31 August 2011.
  - The development proposed is two-storey side and front extensions and single-storey rear extension.
- 

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### **Main issue**

2. The issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area.

### **Reasons**

3. The property is a two-storey detached house on the edge of a small estate of properties developed in the 1960s and 1970s. The design and style of the buildings vary, but they have a fairly uniform palette of materials, mainly red/brown brick frontages and concrete roof tiles, and with elements of tile hanging and render. The layout is spacious, with open plan frontages and grass verges, and a number of mature trees. Of particular note is the large open grassed area at the side of no.3, which contains a mature beech tree.
  4. The proposal involves a complete remodelling of the house, involving a two-storey extension over the site of the present garage, to the right hand side when viewed from the front, and the use of strikingly different materials. The Council does not object to the rear extension, but considers that the width of the side extension would be excessive and that the front extension would result in a complex side roof profile that would give the front a disjointed appearance.
-

5. In my opinion, the proposed side extension would be seen as balancing the existing 'wing' on the left hand side. It would not extend as far as the garage and would not materially reduce the open aspect of the site. Nor would it impinge significantly on the outlook of no.5, which is set behind no.3. I find the size and proportions of the extension to be acceptable and that the open character of the surrounding area would be maintained. The front extension would be an enlargement of the present gabled section of the frontage. The left hand side would be partially set back to give a modern appearance, but the extension would not add unduly to the bulk of the building.
6. However, the problem arises from the attempt to produce a wholly remodelled 'contemporary' building through the use of painted render, black 'Eternit' cladding, stained timber boarding, dark grey aluminium windows, and an artificial slate roof.
7. Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan states that extensions and alterations to existing buildings should be well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the property to be extended, adjoining properties and the surrounding area. The remodelled house would stand out as totally different from its neighbours. The chosen materials would accentuate the size of the building and the result would be wholly incongruous when seen in relation to the other houses on the estate.
8. Additionally, the design of the building lacks any architectural coherence, particularly on the front elevation, with a mish-mash of facing materials and an odd combination of windows of different sizes and styles, with both vertical and horizontal emphasis. I see no reason why the building should not be enlarged, but there would need to be far more consistency and articulation in the design, together with the use of materials that would enable the building to blend in with its surroundings.
9. I am aware that contemporary designs have been successfully introduced in a number of other roads in the vicinity, but I have considered this case on its own merits and in the context of its immediate surroundings.
10. In my view, through poor design and the use of inappropriate materials, the proposed remodelling would unacceptably detract from the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area, contrary to Local Plan Policy QD14. For these reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*J Mansell Jagger*

INSPECTOR