
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2020

by Andrew Bremford BSc (Hons) MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y9507/D/19/3237889

Pailin House, 6 Kings Ride, Alfriston BN26 5XP

- 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 Paul Goble against the decision of South Downs National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref SDNP/19/02654/HOUS, dated 30 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would constitute good design in the context of the surrounding area with particular reference to its location within the South Downs National Park.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached two-storey dwelling situated in a predominantly residential area of Alfriston, within the South Downs National Park (the NP). The area is characterised by mainly large detached properties of varying architectural design, some of which have been extended, set back from the road frontage on reasonably generous sized plots. The extensions to properties in the surrounding area vary in size but are mostly sympathetically designed to remain subservient in appearance to their respective host building, which is a strong characteristic of the street-scene.
4. The supporting text to Policy SD5 of the South Downs Local Plan 2014-33 (2019) (SDLP) states that the purpose of the policy, amongst other things, is to ensure that all development is of the highest possible design quality which reflects and respects the exceptional quality of the built environment of the NP. It goes on to state that proposals should adopt a landscape-led approach and seek to enhance local character, noting that the definition of landscape encompasses all types and forms including townscape which refers to areas of buildings.
5. The proposed development would extend the existing first floor above the garage. Although the height of the roof would be a little lower than the host building, it would be pitched in design and extend across the full width of the proposed extension. Notwithstanding that the front elevation would be set

level with the garage wall thus ensuring that the proposed pitched roof would be set back a little from the roof line of the host building, by virtue of its overall scale the development would not appear a subordinate addition. Thus, the proposal would be out of character with the predominant subservient design of most other extensions in the surrounding area.

6. The proposed windows in the front elevation of the extension are sized and spaced to reflect the size and spacing of the existing windows at first floor level. However, the repetition of their design and spacing, in combination with the design of the roof and the overall scale of the development, would amplify the impact of an extensive front elevation, two-storeys in height, across a substantial width of the plot, which would be out of keeping with the appearance of most other dwellings in the surrounding area.
7. The resultant extensive front elevation of the property, which would be apparent from the public domain, would have a significant adverse influence on the street-scene. As a result, the development would be significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the street-scene.
8. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposal would not constitute good design in the context of the surrounding area and the NP. Consequently, in this regard, it would be contrary to Policy SD5 of the SDLP which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure development proposals adopt a landscape-led approach and respect the local character, through sensitive and high quality design that makes a positive contribution to the overall character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, the development would not reflect or respect the exceptional quality of the built environment of the NP, thus, in this regard, would neither conserve or enhance local character.

Other Matters

9. I have taken into account the examples of other extensions in the area referred to by the appellant, including the hipped roof first floor extensions at Nos 2 and 4 Kings Ride and the ground floor extensions at Nos 10 and 12 Kings Ride. However, these developments are not directly comparable in so far that the design of the appeal proposal is different from all the extensions referred to by the appellant. In any event, I am not aware of the full circumstances of these other cases. I have determined the appeal proposal based on the circumstances of the site and the evidence before me. The existence of the other extensions referred to by the appellant does not alter or outweigh my conclusions on the main issue.
10. There are no other matters raised which would lead me to reach a different conclusion on the main issue.

Conclusion

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

Andrew Bremford

INSPECTOR