

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2016

by L Gibbons BA (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 5 August 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/C3810/W/16/3148367

12 Tamarisk Way, East Preston, Littlehampton BN16 2TF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant consent, agreement or approval to details required by a condition of a planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Emmanuel Gilbert against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref EP/163/15/DOC, dated 26 November 2015, sought approval of details pursuant to condition No 3 of planning permission Ref EP/4/15/HH, granted on 27 February 2015.
 - The application was refused by notice dated 10 February 2016.
 - The development proposed is extensions and alterations – resubmission of EP/93/14/HH.
 - The details for which approval is sought are: Concrete plain tile – Anthracite. (sample enclosed).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and approval for Ref EP/163/15/DOC dated 26 November 2015 is given to the details submitted pursuant to condition 3 of a planning permission Ref EP/4/15/HH, namely Concrete plain tile – Anthracite. (sample enclosed).

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Emmanuel Gilbert against Arun District Council. This application will be the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural Matters

3. Planning permission for proposed extensions and alterations on this site has already been granted so it is the acceptability or otherwise of the details now put forward in respect of condition 3 which sets out that *'No development shall be carried out unless and until a schedule of materials and finishes to be used for the roofs of the existing dwelling and extensions have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and the materials so approved shall be used in the construction of the extension and on the existing roof'*.
 4. The roof material is in place and I have therefore determined the appeal on the development as carried out.
-

Main Issue

5. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed roofing material on the character and appearance of No.12 Tamarisk Way and the surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is located in a residential area. Tamarisk Way generally consists of large detached houses. The houses are all individually designed in a variety of styles ranging from an older style to contemporary designs. Materials used in the construction of the dwellings and extensions are also very varied in nature and include some modern materials such as glass and metal in balconies. The majority of houses have brown, red or light coloured roofs. However, dark and gray colours are also present including on properties close to the appeal site. I consider the variety in the dwellings is a pleasant and key characteristic of the area.
7. The appeal building is a large detached house similar in size to surrounding properties. The walls are a mix of render and white painted timber and this is comparable to a small number of other houses along the road. The windows are a dark colour. The anthracite tiles on the roofs of the main house and extensions are similar in shade to the surrounds of the windows. I consider that the overall effect of the roof is complementary to the contemporary design of the appeal building. It does not have a detrimental effect on the dwelling.
8. Whilst the property is large, it is set back from the roadside and its presence in the street scene is similar to others in the road even with the colour of the roof and light walls. The adjoining properties have different styles and materials used in the roofs. The tiles are not much darker than the roofing material used on Nos. 19, 21 and 23 Tamarisk Way which appear to have been in place for some time. This is the case as some of the new tiles at No. 12 appear to have weathered slightly and are lighter in shade than others. The tiles and the house add to the variety of designs and materials of houses in the road. I therefore consider the anthracite tiles are appropriate to the area given that context.
9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed roof material does not cause harm to the character and appearance of No.12 Tamarisk Way and the surrounding area. It is not in conflict with saved Policy GEN7(ii) of the Arun District Local Plan 2003 and Policy 1 of the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan. These amongst other things seek new development that responds positively to the identified characteristics and resources of the site and area and enhances local distinctiveness and that materials to be used should harmonise in both colour and texture with the materials used in adjoining properties.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

L Gibbons

INSPECTOR