
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 November 2016

by David Reed BSc DipTP DMS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 2 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/U1430/W/16/3154365

Between 82 & 84 Lydd Road, Camber, East Sussex TN31 7RS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Rupert Cawte against the decision of Rother District Council.
 - The application Ref RR/2015/3049/P, dated 12 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2016.
 - The development proposed is clearing the area and the erection of a single storey eco dwelling with internal raised floors.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The application was submitted in outline with all matters reserved for later determination except appearance and scale. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis, treating the sketch views as illustrative only.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a former field access about 3 m wide and 45 m deep fronting the southern side of Lydd Road in Camber. The site is overgrown and unkempt, with a line of chalet bungalows on either side and single storey bungalows opposite.
5. The proposal is for an unusual, individually designed, single storey building which would occupy the rear half of the site. It would be flat roofed with roof lights for internal illumination and extend the full width of the plot as far as the fenced boundaries on each side. The materials, quality timber cladding with planted slopes, flat sedum roof and informal gravel frontage with board walk path, would reflect the natural dunes and beach of this seaside location.
6. However, although it would be set back from the road alongside the flat roofed garage of No 84 and have the appearance of a long outbuilding, it would have an incongruous sloping front elevation and appear an unrelated feature in the context of the single storey and chalet bungalows nearby. These are set in wide plots and are traditional in appearance with pitched roofs and gaps to the boundaries on either side.

7. In contrast, although an intriguing design, the proposal would be long and thin, filling the width of the site. As such it would be a discordant building which would appear cramped on its narrow site between the properties on either side. The result would be intrusive in the street scene and out of character with the low density, spacious bungalow development in the vicinity.
8. For these reasons the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area in conflict with Policy OSS4 of the Rother Local Plan Core Strategy 2014. This requires new development to respect and not detract from the character and appearance of the locality.
9. It is appreciated that the design has been improved from an earlier scheme, that there would be no significant impact on the living conditions of adjacent occupiers, and that the proposal would make good use of a vacant, untidy site. It would also be built to high environmental standards and provide a much needed new house with important social and economic benefits for the local community. However, these advantages, even in combination, do not outweigh the conclusions in relation to the main issue.
10. Having regard to the above, the appeal should be dismissed.

David Reed

INSPECTOR