

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 March 2017

by L Gibbons BA (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 07 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L3815/D/17/3168647

20 Sturt Avenue, Camelsdale, Linchmere GU27 3SJ

- 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 Daniel Butterworth against the decision of Chichester District Council.
 - The application Ref LM/16/03653/DOM, dated 4 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is the removal of an existing garage and its replacement with a new garage and home office linked to the existing detached house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The appellant refers to Policy 33 of the Chichester Local Plan Key Policies (LPKP) as relating specifically to new dwellings. However, the policy does refer to 'residential development' and I consider that extensions to homes would apply in this case.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of No 20 Sturt Avenue and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Paragraph 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) amongst other things indicates that planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes. However, it does go on to state that it is proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.
 5. The appeal site is located within a residential area. The houses along Sturt Avenue are two storey detached and semi-detached properties. The designs vary with some recent additions of more modern housing. However, there are some locally distinctive and predominant features of the street. These include bay windows, small areas of tile hanging, and red brick. Sturt Avenue is set back from the main road. No 20 Sturt Avenue is not a listed building nor is the house within a conservation area. However, it has similar characteristics and is a good representative of the traditional design of the majority of buildings found in the road.
-

6. The appeal site has a planning history which includes a previous planning application that was refused. I acknowledge that the scheme before me seeks to overcome the concerns of the Council. This includes a set back from the alley, a window facing towards the alley, and a change in materials. The proposal is to replace the existing garage with a two storey linked extension.
7. The scheme would incorporate a link to the garage and office that would have areas of glass on the ground and first floor, and a flat roof. Flat roofs are not common features in the area. I note that it is intended that the areas of glass would bring light in to the space. However, they would be unrelated in design to other windows found in the area. The combination of the flat roof and glass would result in the link appearing as an incongruous element in the street scene. The effect of the link would also result in the two storey extension appearing as a feature unrelated to the main dwelling. Although, the extension would be set back it would still appear as a prominent feature within the street scene as houses in the area are highly visible along the road in any event.
8. The large area of tile hanging would be excessive in comparison to the main dwelling and the general small scale nature of this feature found in the street. The pitch of the roof would be unrelated to that of the main roof and would draw the eye. The mass and bulk of the extension would be significant in comparison to the scale and proportions of the existing dwelling.
9. The windows would match the sizes of windows at No 20. Nevertheless, this is not sufficient reason to overcome the concerns I have identified. The appellant refers to the extension at the adjacent property. However, this extension is clearly related to the main dwelling and does not have a glass link. As such it does not directly parallel the proposed extension and therefore does not provide justification for the scheme.
10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of No 20 Sturt Avenue and the surrounding area. It would be in conflict with Policy 33 of the LPKP. This amongst other things seeks new development that respects and where possible enhances the character of the surrounding area and site and its setting. It would also be in conflict with Policy 1 of the LPKP which indicates that planning applications that accord with the policies of the Plan will be approved. It would be contrary to the provisions of the Framework in respect of the need for high quality design.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Gibbons

INSPECTOR