

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 February 2020

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L3815/D/20/3246037

Hollies, Broad Road, Hambrook, Chidham, Chichester PO18 8RF

- 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 & Mrs David & Philippa Wheeler against the decision of Chichester District Council.
 - The application, Ref. CH/19/02416/DOM, dated 20 September 2019 was refused by notice dated 13 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is a front porch, ground floor rear extension with first floor rear extension over, and a double garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is (i) dismissed as regards the proposed double garage and (ii) allowed with planning permission granted in respect of the front porch; conversion of the existing garage to living accommodation; ground floor rear extension with a first floor rear extension over, at Hollies, Broad Road, Hambrook, Chichester in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. CH/19/02416/DOM dated 20 September 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this Decision;
 - 2) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. BD615 LP01; BD615 BP01 Rev. A (excluding the garage); EP00,1 Rev. F; EE01,2,3,4 Rev. F; PP00.1 Rev. F; PE01,2,3,4 Rev. F;
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building unless stated otherwise on the application form.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed double garage on the character and appearance of Broad Road.

Reasons

3. The Council has raised no objections to the appeal scheme as regards the front porch; the proposed conversion of the existing garage; the ground floor rear extension, and the first floor rear extension. I have no reason to disagree with the appraisal in the officer's report. The appeal is therefore to all intents and
-

purposes against the Council's refusal of the proposed detached double garage in the front garden of the property.

4. I saw on my visit that Hollies and nearby properties on this side of Broad Road are set well back from the highway – the Council estimates this distance to be in the range of 15 to 20 metres. Most of the front garden is laid to lawn with mature planting to the front and side boundaries, albeit there is additionally a gravel driveway and turning area that at the time of my visit accommodated three cars.
5. In my view this open and green part of the plot that results from the set back of the host dwelling makes a significant contribution to the spacious and semi-rural character of this part of Broad Road. This suggests that the principle of any ancillary building forward of the house is unlikely to be acceptable. The grounds of appeal refer to an example of another garage in a nearby front garden and argue that as a result of relatively recent developments there are different building lines along sections of Broad Road.
6. However, I consider that rather than undermine the Council's case, these examples serve to reinforce the benefits of not compromising the building line at the appeal property. And even if I am wrong in terms of the unacceptability of the principle of a forward siting, I concur with the Council's view that the building's frontage of 7.5 metres so close to the highway and the garage's maximum height of over 5 metres would result in a building that would inevitably draw the eye as being too large for its context and incongruous in its siting.
7. I acknowledge that the appellants have a reasonable need for adequate garage accommodation at the property, but the scheme as a whole has prioritised additional living space at the side of the house instead of enhancing / enlarging the existing garage space. And overall, the aspirations of the appellant have to be balanced against the constraints of the site and its context.
8. Accordingly, on the main issue I conclude that the proposed detached garage to the front of the property would have an unacceptably adverse effect on the character and appearance of Broad Road. This is in conflict with Policies 33 & 45 of the Chichester Local Plan 2014-2029; Policy DS1 of the Chidham and Hambrook Neighbourhood Plan and Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.
9. I therefore dismiss the appeal insofar as it relates to the proposed garage, but as has been suggested for the appellant, I am in a position whereby I can allow the appeal for the remainder of the scheme. A condition requiring the scheme to be built in accordance with the approved plans is needed for the avoidance of doubt, whilst a condition in respect of external materials is needed to safeguard visual amenity. I have noted the Council's suggestion that the first floor extension's flank windows should be opaque glazed, but in view of the distance from the neighbouring buildings I do not regard this as being necessary.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR