



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 July 2019

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M3835/D/19/3226747

28 Bramber Road, Broadwater, Worthing, BN14 8QB

- 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 Zara Atanes against the decision of Worthing Borough Council.
 - The application Ref AWD/1791/18, dated 24 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 21 January 2019.
 - The development proposed was described as "*Retrospective planning for an electric gate opening onto property*".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of electric gates (set 20cm off the ground) to a height of 1.7m set within 1.9m piers to front (north/east boundary) of property and 1.8m high close board fencing to north and east boundaries at 28 Bramber Road, Broadwater, Worthing, BN14 8QB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref AWD/1791/18, dated 24 November 2018.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the development that I have used in my formal decision above is that which was given on the decision notice and which was repeated on the appeal form. This gives a more comprehensive description of the development and better reflects that which was shown on the application drawings and which has been constructed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached dwelling amongst mostly semi-detached properties arranged as an estate development around a large rectangular area of green open space. Most of the properties around the perimeter of the green have regular shaped plots and reasonably open frontages, with low boundary walls to the back edge of the pavements. But this is not exclusively the case,

and there are examples of some irregular shaped plots, or those others where the houses are set behind tall hedgerows to their front boundary. As such, I could detect no important sense of uniformity to the pattern of the street scene, finding that the area's sense of space and openness was largely due to the dominance of the extensive green rather than from any significant contribution from the front garden spaces to the dwellings surrounding it.

5. The appeal property is not typical of most other nearby dwellings, occupying a corner plot that faces onto the green. Due to its position, it has a narrow frontage to the highway. This is spanned by a pedestrian gate and a pair of inward opening entrance gates across the driveway. These are 1.7m high and constructed with horizontal timbers in a 'hit and miss' arrangement.
6. The gates do not directly reflect the type of other front boundary enclosures in the area. Nevertheless, they are domestic in size and scale, appearing low-key, fairly inconspicuous, and comparable to the visual impact of some other forms of enclosure. I found their presence to be inobtrusive.
7. The fence panels are typical means for enclosing and securing the side boundaries of a residential plot. Although they project up to the front boundary, they do not appear out of keeping within their context.
8. My overall impression is that the means of enclosure constructed at 28 Bramber Road is appropriately sited and designed, without any harm to the characteristics of the area. I therefore find no conflict with Policy 16 of the Worthing Core Strategy 2011 insofar as it relates to the quality of design for new development, or with the National Planning Policy Framework as it relates to similar matters.

Other Matters

9. I have noted some concern expressed about the impact of the development upon visibility for drivers exiting from the appeal site and from No 26a. However, I note that the Highway Authority carefully considered the works and found that the impact of the development was not severe. In the absence of any substantive evidence to the contrary, I have no reason to disagree.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, I am satisfied that the development is not harmful to the character or appearance of the area. Accordingly, and in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, the appeal succeeds.
11. As the development is retrospective, I have no reason to impose any conditions.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR