

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2017

by Grahame Gould BA MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27th March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M3835/W/16/3160094

34 Harrison Road, Broadwater, Worthing BN14 8LN

- 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 Edward King against the decision of Worthing Borough Council.
 - The application Ref AWDM/0719/16, dated 6 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is new dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The development would involve the construction of an end of terrace, two storey, house of the same dimensions and design as the originally constructed property at 34 Harrison Road (No 34). The new dwelling would occupy the majority of the width of No 34's side garden and it is agreed that its flank wall would be around 900mm from the back edge of the footway in Harrison Road.
 4. Harrison Road between its junctions with Dominion Road and Southdownview Road is characterised by a mixture of dwellings that are either orientated at right angles to the street or have front elevations that run parallel to the road. Although Harrison Road is not subject to any special townscape designations the dwellings in this street, for the most part, have quite generous setbacks from the back edge of the footways and that characteristic contributes to there being a sense of space within what is otherwise a quite intensively developed residential area. No 34 backs onto a similar end of terrace house at 27 Russell Close (No 27) and No 27 has a similar setback from the back edge of the footway as that of No 34 and while the side gardens of both of these properties are enclosed by fencing, the space above that fencing nevertheless contributes to there being a sense of spaciousness.
 5. The shared setback of the flank walls of Nos 27 and 34 relative to the back edge of the footway in Harrison Road, in particular, is an example of the sense of space I have previously mentioned. The siting of the new house by being so close to the back edge of the footway would, in relative terms, be at
-

odds with the sense of spaciousness and would result in this development having an unacceptably prominent presence within Harrison Road's streetscene. The prominent siting of the new house would be accentuated by the fact that it would be located close to a quite pronounced bend in the road, with the result that it would be exposed to views across the open grassed area in front of Nos 8 to 16 and 24 to 34.

6. I recognise that the scale and architectural design of the house would be in keeping with the other properties in Harrison Road and in those respects the development is unobjectionable. However, those aspects of this development would not address the harm to the streetscene arising from the siting of the house.
7. The appellant has referred to planning permission having recently been granted for the construction of an end of terrace house at 1 Hamilton Close (No 1), a property that is opposite No 34. While there are some similarities between the house that has been approved at No 1 and the appeal development, I consider that these proposals are not directly comparable with one another. That is because No 1 is a property that I found to belong more to Hamilton Close's streetscene than to that of Harrison Road, with the properties opposite No 1 already extending further south towards Harrison Road. In addition there is an area of grassed verge to the south of No 1, which would be retained and would therefore contribute to a continued sense of openness in Harrison Road in the event that the permitted house is built. I therefore consider that the house that has been granted permission at No 1 does not justify the appeal development.
8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. The development would therefore be in conflict with Policy 16 of the Worthing Core Strategy of 2011 and the Council's 'Guide to Residential Development' Supplementary Planning Document of 2013. That is because the development would not respond positively to an important aspect of local character due to the erosion of openness within the public realm. I also consider that the harm that I have identified would mean that this development would not amount to good design or add to the overall quality of the area and as such that gives rise to conflict with paragraphs 56 and 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Other Matters

9. This development, through the provision of one dwelling, would make a small contribution to increasing the supply of housing. The house would be in a residential area and would provide its occupiers with good accessibility to local services and community facilities. I therefore acknowledge that there would be some social and economic benefits attached to this development, albeit very modest ones given its scale. I also accept that this development would have no adverse effects on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 34 or the neighbouring properties and that there is no highway objection. These other matters therefore weigh to a limited degree in favour of this development.
10. The appellant contends that the Council cannot currently demonstrate the availability of a five year supply of deliverable housing sites (HLS). Even if I were to conclude that there is a shortfall in the HLS of the scale referred to by

the appellant and that the relevant policies for the supply of housing should be considered as being not up-to-date, I consider that the adverse impacts of granting permission that I have identified would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits arising from this development. I therefore find that this scheme cannot be considered to be a sustainable form of development for the purposes of the Framework and that the harm that I have identified could not be overcome by my imposition of reasonable planning conditions.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Grahame Gould

INSPECTOR