
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 06 November 2019

by L Crouch BA (Hons) MSc IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/C3810/D/19/3232827

The Lillies, Yapton Road, Barnham PO22 0AY

- 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 Peter Butler against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref BN/11/19/HH, dated 11 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Whilst different from that on the application form, I have taken the updated property name from the appeal form.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached two storey dwelling set deep into its curtilage, with an area of hard standing and grass to the front. The existing frontage is set back from the road behind a low scale fence and planting, which allows views through to the front of the dwelling and when approaching the site from both directions.
5. The appeal site lies on a section of Yapton Road which is largely characterised by buildings of various architectural styles and positionings to the road, with a variety of open frontages and formal boundary. There are examples of garages in the immediate vicinity and these are generally set back or in-line with the front building line, appearing subservient to the main dwelling and retaining the open character to the front.
6. The proposed detached single storey single garage, by virtue of its forward positioning within the open frontage of the dwelling, would result in a significant dominating structure within the open frontage of the existing two-storey dwelling. As such it would result in an incongruous intrusion forward of the building line within the street scene. Due to the approximate 2m gap the

- garage would be seen as a detached structure rather than integrated with the main house.
7. The proposed garage would be visible from the road across the open frontage when approached from both directions, with this section of the road being generally straight, this is despite being set back from the front boundary by around 8.5m and would be particularly visually prominent when approaching from the east and subsequently not just when in close proximity. As such the proposal would be at odds with the pattern of development of the surrounding area.
 8. The appellant has brought to my attention that the garage would remain further set back from the highway than a number of properties in the locality and that the overall massing of the structure has been minimised. However, those properties which are positioned closer to the road than the proposal are generally the host dwelling rather than the more subservient ancillary structure. I acknowledge that the appellant wishes to store a classic car within it but that does not outweigh the harm I have identified.
 9. I note that the appellant states that the proposal would be in-line with several paragraphs from the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (the Framework), in terms of pursuing sustainable development and placing importance on local character and the identity of local surroundings and materials. However, for the reasons set out above, the proposal would not comply with the Framework's clear emphasis on good design.
 10. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to Policies DDM1 of the Arun Local Plan 2011-2031 adopted 2018. This policy seeks amongst other things, to ensure that development reflects the character of the site and surrounding area through good quality design and is appropriate in its scale, height, massing, details and materials.

Other Matters

11. I note that there are no objections to the proposal from the Parish Council or neighbours however no further details have been provided to me and therefore I am unable to give this significant weight.
12. The appellant has drawn my attention to Policy ES5 of the Barnham and Eastergate Neighbourhood Development Plan 2014-2029 adopted 2014, which seeks amongst other things for development to respond to the specific character of the site and its local surroundings. As the development would result in the harmful intrusion within the street scene, I consider that the proposal would not accord with this objective.
13. The appellant has also brought to my attention examples of other simple incidental structures, garages and buildings to the front of properties within the local area. However, the examples provided are generally not within the immediate vicinity of the site and are set within a different context and character to the appeal site often with mature landscaping and existing fencing providing a more enclosed character. As such these examples do not appear to represent a direct comparison with the appeal site. In any event, I must assess the case before me on its own merits.

14. The development of 38 dwellings adjacent to the appeal site has also been brought to my attention, which includes plot 1 of the development being positioned slightly forward of the building line of The Lillies. However, this does not justify the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

L Crouch

INSPECTOR