
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2020

by Andrew Bremford BSc (Hons) MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C3810/D/20/3262104

11 Westingway, Bognor Regis PO21 2XU

- 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 Paul Hellyer against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref BR/149/20/HH, dated 22 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is extension of existing garage, to be an oak framed garage with pitched tiled roof including 2 skylight windows, clad in non combustible treated wood cladding or composite cladding, entrance enclosed within existing garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted for the extension of existing garage, to be an oak framed garage with pitched tiled roof including 2 skylight windows, clad in non combustible treated wood cladding or composite cladding, entrance enclosed within existing garden at 11 Westingway, Bognor Regis, PO21 2XU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BR/149/20/HH, dated 22 June 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1:1250 scale site location plan; 1:500 scale 'Proposed Block Plan – Garage Extension'; 1:100 scale 'Proposed garden summerhouse'; and 1:50 scale 'Floorplan and window placement'.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials described on the planning application form and shown on the following approved plans: 1:100 scale 'Proposed garden summerhouse' and 1:50 scale 'Floorplan and window placement', and shall be maintained as such thereafter.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The proposal is to extend an existing detached garage sited to the rear of No 11 Westingway, a detached dwelling located on the corner of Westingway and Parkway.
4. The existing garage faces towards Parkway and is set back from the road frontage by around 7.0 metres. The extended garage would infill the gap to the road frontage so that the resultant outbuilding would be flush with the footpath along Parkway. It would also be flush with the boundary with No 6a Parkway.
5. While outbuildings in the area are mostly set back behind the established development line there are exceptions. An outbuilding is positioned flush to the footpath at the corner of Parkway and Crescenta Walk and, a short distance away, I observed that an outbuilding within the plot at the corner of Crescenta Walk and Nelson Road is positioned significantly forward of the building line along Crescenta Walk. Thus, outbuildings sited forward of the established development line are visible within the street scene in the vicinity of the appeal site. Consequently, although the extended garage would be significantly forward of the building line along Parkway, it would not be materially at odds with the position of some other outbuildings within the vicinity of the appeal site.
6. The extended garage would be an oak framed structure with walls constructed of wood cladding and a pitched roof with a part hipped feature at the elevation that would front onto the road. The roof would be covered in tiles in a colour to match the existing dwelling. Therefore, taking into account its design and modest scale, the development would not represent an unduly prominent feature within the street scene in the context of the prevailing substantial built form of the detached two storey dwellings in the vicinity of the site.
7. Owing to the existence of a large mature eucalyptus tree and other established vegetation along the boundary of the site, the development would be well screened in views looking north-east along Parkway. Due to its siting it would be visible within the street scene in views looking south-west along Parkway. However, given that the outbuilding would be a modest wooden structure and would be seen against the backdrop of the large eucalyptus tree and other foliage, the development would not be seen as a jarring addition to the street scene.
8. There is no evidence to indicate that the development would require the removal of the large mature eucalyptus tree or indeed any of the established vegetation along the boundary. Even if it did require the removal of some of the planting, owing to the fact that the extended garage would be clad in wood and so essentially match the tall wooden boundary fence that marks the boundary with the footpath, the development would not represent an unduly dominant feature as it would assimilate well into the street scene.

Conditions

9. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions in accordance with paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
10. In addition to the standard three-year time limit condition, I have specified the approved plans so as to provide certainty.

11. In respect of the proposed external materials, I have considered these to be acceptable as they have been described on the planning application form and submitted plans. So, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area, I have also included a condition requiring the materials described on the planning application form and the approved plans to be used for the development and maintained as such thereafter.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Bremford

INSPECTOR