



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2020

**by John Woolcock BNatRes(Hons) MURP DipLaw MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 21 July 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/C3810/D/19/3243882**

**33 Potters Mead, Littlehampton BN17 7HY**

- 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 F Celini against the decision of Arun District Council.
  - The application Ref:LU/255/19/HH, dated 9 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 October 2019.
  - The development proposed is the construction of a two storey side extension and associated works.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises the side curtilage of an end-terrace dwelling located at the junction of Potters Mead and Courtwick Road. It lies within a planned estate in which grassed public amenity areas between buildings and at road junctions are a feature that adds a sense of openness within this suburban environment. The appeal site was formerly such an amenity area, but permission was granted in 2003 for a change of use to a private garden with 2 m high fencing. The space above the fencing no longer makes much of a contribution to the sense of openness at this junction. The flats on the opposite side of Potters Mead are set at 45 degrees to the road and set back from it, which contributes to the openness of the aspect into and out of Potters Mead. Subject to an appropriate design, I do not consider that a two-storey side extension at No.33 would necessarily be unacceptable by reason of its bulk and proximity to the road. There is potential to continue the form and simplicity of the terrace by constructing a side extension to No.33. However, I share some of the Council's concerns about the design of the proposed extension.
4. The regular repetition of distinctive flat-roofed porches to the dwellings in the terrace adds to the overall integrity of the building, which is apparent from public vantage points and a feature of the planned estate. The proposed porch in the appeal scheme would have a different configuration and roof construction, resulting in a larger structure with an inconsistent design when

compared with the other porches in the terrace. I consider that the proposed porch would appear as a discordant feature at the end of the terrace that would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the integrity of the terrace.

5. The proposed roof of the extension would not integrate well with the existing building. Setting its ridge height 0.5 m below that of the terrace would not make the side extension appear subservient to the host dwelling, particularly as the front and rear elevations of the proposed extension would be in line with the elevations of the existing dwelling. The proposed roof design would disrupt the existing consistent line of the eaves within the terrace. The extension would be neither visually subservient to the existing property nor appear as a congruent projection of the terrace.
6. The consistent features within the terrace, such as the line of the ridge and eaves, together with the distinctive porches, give the terrace much of its simple and pleasant form, which is a key characteristic of the planned estate. The proposed extension would introduce new detail and inconsistent elements that would detract from this simplicity of form.
7. Given these design considerations, I find that the proposed development would have a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its wider locality as a result of its prominent location. The proposal would conflict with Policy D SP1 of the Arun Local Plan 2011-2031 (ALP), adopted in 2018, which provides that all development proposals should seek to make efficient use of land but reflect the characteristics of the site and local area in, amongst other things, their architectural details. For similar reasons, the proposal would be at odds with ALP Policies D DM1 (1) and D DM4 (a) and (e) concerning design and form. These conflicts would be sufficient to bring the proposal into conflict with the development plan, which includes the Littlehampton Neighbourhood Development Plan 2014-2029, as a whole. The design would not accord with the clear expectations in plan policies and would fail to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of the area. The proposed development would not gain support from the National Planning Policy Framework.
8. I have taken into account all the other matters raised in the evidence, including that the scheme would increase the size of the existing dwelling in order to provide a larger family unit of accommodation. Neither this, nor any of the other matters raised, is sufficient to outweigh my conclusions on the main issue, which have led to my decision on this appeal.
9. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*John Woolcock*  
Inspector