The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2020

by D.R McCreery MA BA (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C3810/D/20/3244501
2 Hillview Crescent, East Preston BN16 1RD

- 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 Thomas against the decision of Arun District Council.
- The application Ref EP/74/19/HH, dated 18 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 November 2019.
- The development proposed is hip to barn hip extension and single storey rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development has been amended from that on the planning application form as it is indicated that a north dormer extension was removed from the application prior to the Council making a decision. As such, the description used in this appeal decision is from the Council's decision notice and the Appellant's appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed roof level extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area.

Reasons

4. The site is on a corner plot at the junction of Hillview Crescent and Orchard Road. It is within a residential area characterised by houses of modern suburban appearance. Semi detached bungalows with large hipped roofs, such as the appeal property, are a strong and positive feature of Orchard Road that informs the character of the immediate area. The appearance of the roofs is an important and attractive characteristic that is reinforced by and contrasts positively with the open feel of Orchard Road. The appearance of Hillview Crescent and other roads to the rear maintain some of the features evident on Orchard Road, with a greater degree of variation in built form and narrower road layout resulting in a less open feel.

5. Due to the corner plot location and open nature of the surroundings, the west and south sides of the appeal property roof are open to extensive public views. This includes longer views when travelling towards it from the west on Orchard Road.

6. The proposed roof level extension would fundamentally alter the form and appearance of the roof and the host property as seen in the views described above. This would disrupt the established character and rhythm of built forms in an area where consistency of appearance at roof level is a positive feature, particularly on Orchard Road. The extension would also unbalance the appearance of the roof, particularly in relation to the adjoining neighbouring property which would retain a hip.

7. The result would significantly diminish the appearance of the host building and the overall character of the area in what is a particularly sensitive location due to the prominence of the site.

8. Other development in the area of a similar appearance to the appeal proposal is noted. Much of this appears concentrated on Hillview Crescent and roads to the rear of the site, with isolated examples also visible on Orchard Road. Much of this development has occurred in less sensitive locations and is isolated in number, and therefore does not inform the character of the area. As such, I give limited weight to the presence of this development. Based on the evidence presented, I also conclude that similar development on the neighbouring property and others in the area is no more than a theoretical possibility and can be given only limited weight.

9. The Appellant makes reference to the existence of a fallback position where, should the appeal be dismissed, permitted development rights under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 could be exercised that would allow the construction of a roof level alteration on the south slope facing Orchard Road. I note that the existence or otherwise of the stated rights have not been formally determined by way of a Certificate of Lawful Proposed Development, but some evidence of lawfulness has been submitted by the Appellant.

10. Notwithstanding this, given the prominent corner position of the site and the views identified, the roof slopes facing Orchard Road and Hillview Crescent are of similar sensitivity. Given its prominence the alteration to the hipped roof in the appeal proposal would have an adverse impact on both the appearance of the south and west elevations.

11. Based on the evidence presented, given the significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and area that would result from the appeal proposal, I find that a roof level extension utilising permitted development rights is unlikely to be more harmful than the appeal proposal. As such, I give the presence of the potential fallback position limited weight.

12. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Consequently, I find conflict with Policies D DM1 and D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan and Policies 1 and 3 of the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan which collectively seeks to ensure that new development is of a high standard of design, including having a positive relationship with the existing building and the wider area.

Conclusion

13.For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

D.R. McCreery

INSPECTOR