
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 July 2020

by S J Papworth DipArch(Glos) RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T1410/D/20/3253795
93 Percival Road, Eastbourne BN22 9JW

- 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 Gabor Novak against the decision of Eastbourne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref PC/200078, dated 31 January 2020, was refused by the Council by notice dated 24 March 2020.
 - The proposal is a retrospective application for car port and upvc windows with built in security shutters.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Reasons

2. The main issue is whether the car port meets the standard of design sought in local and national policies, with particular regard to the effect on the street scene. Policy UHT1 of the Eastbourne Borough Plan sets out criteria that all development is required to meet including harmonising with the appearance and character of the local environment, respecting local distinctiveness, and being appropriate in scale, form, materials (preferably locally sourced), setting, alignment and layout
3. Paragraph 124 of the 2019 National Planning Policy Framework states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.
4. The appeal property is one of row of semi-detached 2-storey houses built along a very regular line, and whilst many have parking provision in the front garden, the effect is of open frontages to an orderly line of dwellings built using a limited palette of materials and utilising a limited but pleasing variety of styles. Later changes have added variety, but the strong front building line remains a positive feature of the road.
5. The car port was in place at the time of the site inspection and consists of a timber frame with cross bearers, similar to a garden pergola as asserted by the appellant, but over-wide to fully justify that description, and the addition of the corrugated transparent roof sheets laid over the bearers takes away the impression of a garden structure for plants to grow on.

6. The structure and sheets are close to the front ground floor bay windows lining part-way down from the window head and the visual effect is of an unattractive structure that disrupts the frontages along the road and the presentation of number 93 in particular. The structure is inappropriate to its location in scale, form, materials, setting, alignment and layout, contrary to Policy UHT1.
7. The length of time that the structure is said to have been in place and the support of local residents is acknowledged, but those considerations do not outweigh or justify the harm. The proposal does not reach the standard of design sought in national and local policy, and for the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

S J Papworth

INSPECTOR