



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 July 2020

by J E Jolly BA (Hons) MA MSc CIH MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C3810/D/19/3239651 44 Aldwick Felds, Aldwick PO21 3TU

- 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 Mrs J Strudwick against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref AW/228/19/HH, dated 5 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is the re-siting of boundary wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in a residential area of brick and tile dwellings. The area is typified by properties that have open-plan or low-walled front gardens behind footways. There are a number of landscaped setbacks and verges to the front and side of some of the dwellings, including that of No 44 Aldwick Felds, that help to provide a sense of spaciousness in the surrounding area.
4. The proposal for the corner plot dwelling at 44 Aldwick Felds is to replace an existing side boundary wall and fence with a brick and timber, gated boundary treatment. The proposal would be approximately 1.8m in height and border the relatively narrow footway that passes the side elevation of No 44. The new boundary would enclose the adjacent landscaped set back and extend forward of the side extension to No 44, and the front elevation of No 46 Aldwick Felds.
5. However, while there may well be neighbouring dwellings with garden walls or fences that extend to their boundaries, on this specific corner plot location, which can be seen for some distance along Aldwick Felds, including from the junction at 'Kenlegh', the proposal would be located forward of the host dwelling and neighbouring property at No 46. As such, the proposal would be overly prominent, and hence at odds with its immediate setting.
6. Moreover, notwithstanding the use of sympathetic materials, the scale, height and positioning of the boundary treatment would be incongruous with the prevailing street-scene which is characterised by boundary treatments set back from the highway or behind pathways or landscaped verges .

7. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and be contrary to Policy DDM1 of the Arun Local Plan which says, amongst other things that proposals must make the best possible use of the available land by reflecting or improving upon the character of the site and the surrounding area.
8. For similar reasons, the proposal does not meet the aim of Paragraph 127 of the *National Planning Policy Framework* which requires that proposals are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment.

Other Matters

9. I acknowledge that the proposal is supported by interested parties but this does not outweigh the harm I have found to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusions

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

J E JOLLY

INSPECTOR