

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2016

**by Richard S Jones BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 23 June 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/T1410/W/15/3142025**

**Cambridge House Guest House, 6 Cambridge Road, Eastbourne, East Sussex BN22 7BS**

- 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 Peter Russell against the decision of Eastbourne Borough Council.
  - The application Ref PC/151010, dated 21 September 2015, was refused by notice dated 18 November 2015.
  - The development proposed is an extension to rear and new hardstanding.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

## Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises an end of terrace guest house, prominently sited on the corner of Cambridge Road and Rylstone Road.
  4. Although described as a rear extension, the main part of the development would project from the side elevation of the existing rear outrigger extension towards Rylstone Road, the character of which is strongly defined by the attractive rhythm of the terrace of two storey properties with their two storey bays and gable features and tiled shared entrance canopies.
  5. Whilst I accept that the line of garages on the opposite side of Rylstone Road do not positively interact with the street scene, the development would primarily be seen in the context of the western side of the road and the character I have described. Here, the existing side elevation of the host property relates well to the street scene of Rylstone Road. The two storey bay on the main flank wall is an attractive feature that presents the visual focus whilst the main part of the outrigger extension is set well back and subservient within the street scene.
  6. In comparison, the proposed development would bring the side of the outrigger extension forward of the main flank wall of the property and align with the two storey bay feature. This would result in an overly prominent addition which would relate poorly to the host dwelling and Rylstone Road.
-

7. In this regard, the extension would carry forward the pitch of the roof of the outrigger extension resulting in a much lower eaves line than the host and neighbouring properties, as well as an uncharacteristically large and disproportionate roof plane. The extension would also partly project beyond the existing back wall of the outrigger resulting in a staggered and awkward rear building line.
8. Despite being of sliding sash design, the windows would appear wider and more squat than the consistently tall and narrow openings of the main property whilst the positioning of the windows and doors would also create an unbalanced appearance to an uncharacteristically flat elevation.
9. Given the height of the existing boundary wall and the levels within the rear part of the site, the existing shed is not prominent and has little visual effect on the street scene. Any benefits arising from its removal would not therefore outweigh the more substantial harm I have identified. Moreover, whilst it is stated that a fence at the back of the hardstanding would screen the extension of No 8 Cambridge Road, this would not amount to a material benefit as screening is already substantially provided by the existing boundary wall.
10. It is the appellants contention that the development would be a reflection of the extension at the other end of the Cambridge Road terrace facing onto Latimer Road. Although I accept that there are some similarities, the proposed extension is materially taller and my observations of that development served to confirm the prominence of such additions within the street scene. I have also had regard to the other developments to which I have been referred, but each case will invariably have its own particular circumstances, and none of these lead me to alter the decision that I have reached. In any event, each case should be considered on its own particular merits.
11. The appeal site is separated by Rylstone Road and Nos 2 and 4 Cambridge Road from the boundary of the Town Centre and Seafront Conservation Area. Paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) makes clear that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, and to their setting.
12. Having regard to the principal orientation of the seafront properties within the Conservation Area and the intervening properties on Cambridge Road which would screen the development from Royal Parade, the proposal would not result in any material change to the setting of the Conservation Area and thus would preserve the same.
13. Nevertheless, for the reasons I have explained, the development would appear as an awkward and visually dominant and incongruous form of development that would lack coherence with the host building and street scene. Whilst the development may not be located on a main thoroughfare or 'cut through', it would nonetheless be very prominent along Rylstone Road and from its junction with Cambridge Road.
14. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would result in significant harm to the host dwelling and the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy D10A of the Eastbourne Plan Submission Core Strategy 2006-2027 and Saved Policy UHT1 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan 2001-2011. These policies require, amongst other matters, all development to harmonise with the appearance and character of the local environment respecting local

distinctiveness and to be appropriate and sympathetic to its setting in terms of scale, height, massing and density, and its relationship to adjoining buildings.

15. I do not consider that the harm I have found would be materially alleviated by the gap that would be retained to No 1 Rylstone Road or the large shrub in that neighbouring garden. Nor do I consider that such harm would be outweighed by any benefits arising to the quality and accessibility of the holiday accommodation or acceptably mitigated by replacing the proposed gable dormer with roof lights.
16. Accordingly, for the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters before me, I dismiss the appeal.

*Richard S Jones*

Inspector