
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2017

by L Gibbons BA (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 29th March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/B1415/W/16/3161951

4 Linton Road, Hastings TN34 1TN

- 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 Thomas Branczyk against the decision of Hastings Borough Council.
 - The application Ref HS/FA/16/00244, dated 5 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within a residential area. The houses on the west side of the road in the vicinity of the appeal site are three storey semi-detached Victorian properties. The houses are in a highly elevated position above Linton Road. The north facing flank elevations in particular are very exposed to public view in the street scene. Side extensions which face towards the north are not common and there are very few flat roofs visible in the immediate area.
4. The proposal is for a single storey flat roof side extension. The appeal site has a planning history which includes appeals for Nos 3 and 4 Linton Road which were dismissed in 2015¹. I have considered the previous Inspector's findings and recognise the need for consistency. The main issues related to the occupancy of the dwellings, and the effect on the character and appearance of the street scene and the existing dwellings. I acknowledge that the scheme before me seeks to overcome the concerns of the previous Inspector and the Council. This includes a reduction in the depth of the extension and omitting the rear projection.
5. However, the extension would be very visible when seen from the road due to the elevated position of the house. Even with a gap to the side boundary with No 5 Linton Road the length, bulk and design of the flat roof would draw the

¹ APP/B1415/W/15/3002813 & APP/B1415/W/15/3002829

eye. It would be seen as an incongruous addition, and with the exception of materials to be used it would be completely unrelated to the design and detailed features of the original dwelling. In addition, there would not be a sufficient set back from the main elevation, and as a result the extension would not be seen as a subservient addition to the house.

6. There is a small tree which when in leaf, would partly obscure the front elevation from views directly opposite in the street. However, it would still be possible to see the front window which is very different in size and shape from the original dwelling, and therefore out of character. The tree would not obscure the rest of the extension when seen from the north looking down the slope towards No 4. For these reasons, it would not balance with No 3, and it would fail to make a positive contribution to the character of the area and the house.
7. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and the existing dwelling. It would be in conflict with Policy DM1 of the Hastings Development Management Plan 2015 and Policy SC1 (i) of the Hastings Planning Strategy 2014. These amongst other things seek high quality distinctive architecture and urban design which adds to local character and sense of place, and new development that protects and enhances local character and shows an appreciation of the surrounding neighbourhood's historic context, street patterns, plot layouts and boundaries, block sizes and scale, height, massing and materials. It would be contrary to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in respect of the need for high quality design.

Other matters

8. The Council does not object to the proposed development in terms of its effect on the occupiers of No 5 Linton Road. Based on the evidence before me and observations on my site visit I see no reason to disagree with this matter. However, this does not outweigh the harm I have found.
9. I have been referred to an appeal decision at Pinner, Middlesex. However, this relates to a development within another area. Accordingly, the circumstances are not directly comparable with those that apply in this appeal. I have in any case, reached my own conclusions on the proposed development based on the evidence before me.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would enhance the living conditions of the residents by increasing the number of bathrooms and kitchens. However, this benefit is not sufficient to outweigh the harm I have found in respect of character and appearance.
11. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Gibbons

INSPECTOR