



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 June 2009

by **Sheila Holden**
BSc MSc CEng TPP MICE MRTPI FCIHT

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

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
12 July 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/A/10/2120741 2-3 Camden Terrace, Brighton BN1 3LR

- 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 Nicola Stevenson against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
- The application Ref BH2009/01951, dated 12 September 2009, was refused by notice dated 22 October 2009.
- The development proposed is the removal of UPVc and timber boarding and replace with render to match remainder of front elevation of 2 and 3 Camden Terrace.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the replacement of the existing UPVc and timber cladding with render would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the West Hill Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. Camden Terrace is a delightful twitten of residential properties which front onto a pedestrian route and, from the evidence presented appear to date from the 19th century. The houses vary in their design and style but a continuity of appearance arises from the predominance of white used for the treatments of the front elevations of the houses and the boundary walls. The twitten lies within the West Hill Conservation Area and is subject to an Article 4 direction which precludes alterations to the front of properties without planning permission.
4. Nos. 2 and 3 are a pair of semi-detached cottages which are viewed as a single building from the long oblique views along the terrace. The front of No 3 has been altered by the installation of UPVc windows and cladding. The retention of this cladding was dismissed on appeal (APP/Q1445/C/08/2071381). Its replacement by render was subsequently dismissed on appeal (APP/Q1445/A/09/2108478). No 2 has wooden window frames and wooden cladding. The proposal seeks to remove the timber cladding from No 2 and the UPVc cladding from No 3 and replace it with white painted render similar to that on other properties in Camden Terrace.
5. Although timber lap boarding is not a common feature on the properties in Camden Terrace in my view it contributes to the variety of features which

combine to create the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. It is also a feature of the adjoining property, No 1a. In this context I consider that its removal from No 2 would be detrimental to the area, resulting in the loss of original historic detailing and materials which add to the architectural and historic interest of the twitten.

6. The replacement of the UPVc cladding with render on No 3 has already been considered by a previous Inspector who concluded that this would unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties. The current proposal is an attempt to address this imbalance and I accept that by proposing render on both properties the symmetrical appearance of the building would be restored. However, this could only be achieved by the removal of a feature which I have found contributes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area as well as the removal of the unacceptable UPVc cladding. In my view the creation of a more balanced appearance to the building as a whole is not a sufficient justification for the removal of the timber cladding on No 2. Furthermore, the use of render on No 3 would result in the UPVc frames being more visible and accentuating the difference in the materials used in the window frames of the two cottages.
7. Whilst it is unlikely that the existing timber lapping on No 2 was used in the initial construction of the building it appears to me that it represents the maintenance of an original feature. The West Hill Conservation Area Character Statement states that many of the buildings are rendered and painted either in white or a pale pastel colour. However, this does not imply that other features, such as the timber lapping on the cottages in Camden Terrace, are not worthy of retention. I do not consider that the absence of a specific reference to the timber lapping in the character statement is a reason to allow it to be lost.
8. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the removal of the existing cladding on both cottages and its replacement with render across the full width the building would harm the character and appearance of this pair of cottages and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the West Hill Conservation Area. It would therefore be contrary to saved Policies QD2, QD14 and HE6 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan which require alterations to be high quality, appropriate to the property and to make use of sympathetic materials, especially in areas protected for their historic interest.

Other matters

9. I recognise that the appellant is facing difficult personal circumstances at this time. However, her financial position is an insufficient reason to set aside the permanent harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area which would result from the proposal.

Conclusions

10. Having considered this and all other matters raised, I find nothing to alter my conclusion that the appeal should be dismissed.

Sheila Holden

INSPECTOR