
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 April 2017

by D. M. Young BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI MIHE

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

Decision date: 18 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L3815/W/17/3169435

Arun Posts, Southern Road, Selsey PO20 0BD.

- 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 J Alan against the decision of Chichester District Council.
 - The application Ref SY/16/02196/FUL, dated 29 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is the change of use of existing ancillary outbuilding to a 2-bed dwelling with alterations, formation of a projecting front gable and new access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the change of use of existing ancillary outbuilding to a 2-bed dwelling with alterations, formation of a projecting front gable and new access at Arun Posts, Southern Road, Selsey PO20 0BD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref SY/16/02196/FUL , dated 29 June 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1A (A3) and Drawing No 2 Fence Detail.
 - 3) The dwelling hereby approved shall not be occupied until the external surfaces of the building have been faced in materials that have first been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting or amending that Order) no additions to, or extensions or enlargements of, or alterations affecting the external appearance of, the outbuilding hereby approved shall be made or erected without a grant of planning permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.
-

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a single storey outbuilding located to the rear of Arun Posts. It fronts Southern Road and is a relatively simple and unobtrusive building both in terms of its proportions and appearance. The surrounding area is characterised predominantly by bungalows of varying design. Width wise dwellings tend to occupy the majority of their plots. Whilst the area has a peaceful suburban character it is not particularly sensitive in streetscape terms.
4. The building although perhaps of a smaller footprint than neighbouring properties would be of a similar height, design and on roughly the same building line. In my view, the addition of a projecting front gable, a common feature in the Southern Road street scene, would significantly improve the appearance of the building by removing the unsightly roller shutter door. As the main bulk of the building is already in situ it cannot reasonably be argued that the dwelling would be out of keeping with the established settlement pattern or result in a loss of openness.
5. I have noted the Council's concern that the building would appear cramped. However, as I saw when I conducted my site visit, the area is not distinguished by large dwellings, plot sizes or even generous spacing between dwellings. I accept there would be some increase to the footprint of the building and some change to the existing boundary treatments. However, these would be fairly modest in their extent and thus would not fundamentally alter the spatial relationship of the building to its plot.
6. Although the amount of outdoor amenity space would be appreciably smaller than that of surrounding properties, the garden would be located to rear where views would be restricted to those from adjacent private gardens. Accordingly, the character and appearance of the area would not be impaired.
7. The layout plan shows a small garden enclosed by a new hedge to the site frontage. Off-street parking would be accommodated to the front and side of the property. Given the orthodoxy of such arrangements in the locality I am unclear how the relevant development plan policies would be offended in this instance. For similar reasons, I have seen no compelling evidence to explain why the introduction of '*domestic paraphernalia*' such as parked cars and landscaping would cause unacceptable harm in a residential area.
8. Based on the foregoing, I conclude that seen in its context, the dwelling would not appear unduly cramped and would not harm the character and appearance of the area. There would thus be no conflict with Policies 1 and 33 of the "*Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029*". Collectively these seek to promote sustainable, high quality development that is in keeping with the character of its surroundings. "*The National Planning Policy Framework*" would also be satisfied in terms of the need to ensure that development responds to local character, reflects its surroundings and adds to the overall quality of the area.

Other Matters

9. The Council allege that the amount of garden space would be substandard resulting in unsuitable conditions for future residents. However, these concerns are not reflected in the Council's refusal reasoning which refers solely to the development's effect on the character and appearance of the area. The

Council have not provided details of any local standards in relation to minimum garden sizes that might be breached if the appeal were allowed and it seems to me that potential occupiers would be able to exercise consumer choice in these matters.

Conditions

10. I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition relating to external materials to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development. Boundary treatments are shown on the submitted plans and therefore a separate condition is unnecessary. Finally, I agree with the Council that permitted development rights should be restricted to ensure the retention of an adequate amount of outdoor amenity space for future occupiers.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

D. M. Young

Inspector