

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2017

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 8 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L3815/D/16/3162716

Dakar, Nab Walk, East Wittering, Chichester PO20 8DH

- 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 Gerald Lenanton against the decision of Chichester District Council.
 - The application Ref EWB/16/02532/DOM, dated 28 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first floor extension over the existing garage to provide a new studio.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a contemporary style chalet bungalow featuring black weatherboard cladding and a dark slate pitched roof. It has an attached flat-roofed garage that projects forward of the principal frontage. The property is situated in a private road comprising a mix of bungalows and houses of differing scale, age and appearance. Despite this variety the front building lines of the houses on both sides of the road are reasonably consistent, particularly in respect of the distance between the upper parts of dwellings and the road.
 4. The proposal would comprise a first floor level extension above the garage with a pitched roof and would incorporate materials to match the host property. Whilst it would be secondary in height and bulk to the host dwelling it would project a significant distance forward of the principal frontage of the host dwelling. It would also protrude forward of the upper parts of nearby 2-storey houses.
 5. In my judgement, due to its siting, size and forward projection, the proposal would be an overly prominent and incongruous addition to the street scene which would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the street. The proposal is therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy
-

Framework (2012) which states at paragraph 64 that permission should be refused for development that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area. Policy 33 of the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014 to 2029 seeks new housing development and replacement dwellings that respects and where possible enhances the character of the surrounding area. Whilst the Policy does not explicitly refer to domestic extensions, I see no good reasons why such aims should not also be met by the appeal proposal; hence there is also conflict with the aims of Policy 33.

Conclusion

6. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR