
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February 2017

by Stephen Brown MA(Cantab) DipArch RIBA

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

Decision date: 18 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C3810/D/16/3157123

'Tradewinds', Arun Way, Aldwick Bay Estate, Bognor Regis PO21 4HF.

- 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 by Geoffrey Toms against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application ref.AW/93/16/HH, dated 18 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is a new garage replacing a demolished water tank and garden room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

The main issue

2. From my inspection of the site and its surroundings, and from the written representations made, I consider the main issue in this case to be the effect of the development on the street scene in the vicinity of the appeal site, and the setting of the adjacent Aldwick Bay Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The proposed new garage would be in the north-eastern corner of the area to the front of this substantial detached house, which is mainly set out for vehicle parking and manoeuvring. I saw that the water tank has already been removed, and that the back wall of the garden room that would be demolished forms part of the Arun Way boundary of the property. This part of the site projects northward of the predominantly east-west line of the northern site boundary, so that the proposed garage would be close to the double garage of no. 8 Arun Way, the neighbouring house to the north.
4. The proposed garage would be rectangular on plan, about 6.7 metres wide and 9.1 metres long, with a pitched roof, 5.3 metres high to the ridge, and two roof-lights in the eastern roof slope. Walls, and the gable ends would be rendered, and there would be porthole windows in the gable ends. There would be a WC/shower compartment in the rear corner of the building. The drawings show what are probably intended to be tiles on the roof, but the written specification indicates there would be slates – however this is a matter that could be controlled by condition, and is not critical to my determination.
5. This would be a substantial building, and the gabled roof would be in distinct contrast with the predominantly hipped roof forms of the parent building, the

neighbouring house and its garage. In my opinion this would give it a bulky appearance, and given its proximity to the garage of the neighbouring house, would result in a cramped form of development. Furthermore it would be significantly higher than the boundary wall, and would be very conspicuous from the street. I consider this building would be quite incongruous in the context of the generally spacious layout of houses and plots on the estate at large.

6. At this point the boundary of the Aldwick Bay Conservation Area runs along the north-eastern side of Arun Way and across The Fairway – one of the main avenues running through the estate. As a result the new garage would be readily seen from within the Conservation Area, and in views into it. In my opinion the garage would appear of simplistic design, and be out-of-scale in terms of its form and materials, as compared with the richly elaborated forms and details of houses within the Conservation Area. I consider the new building would appear out of place in terms of this prevailing character.
7. I conclude that the proposal would cause significant harm to the street scene in the vicinity of the appeal site, and to the setting of the adjacent conservation area. The development would not accord with the development plan, particularly with respect to Policies GEN7 and AREA2 of the Arun District Local Plan of 2003, which seek to promote schemes displaying high quality design and layout, and include aims to preserve or enhance the settings of conservation areas. Furthermore it would not accord with the aims of Policies D DM1 and HER DM3 of the Arun Local Plan 2011-2031 of 2014. These include aims to reflect or improve upon the character of development sites and surroundings, and to protect the settings of conservation areas.
8. I accept that the harm to conservation area interests would be significantly less than substantial. Nevertheless, such harm as would occur must be weighed against any public benefits of the proposal, as advised by National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 134. In this case no public benefits would be derived from building a garage for entirely private use.
9. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I consider the appeal should be dismissed.

Stephen Brown

INSPECTOR