
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2021

by S D Castle BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C3810/D/20/3264683

2 Meadow Way, Littlehampton BN17 6BW

- 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 Darren Burchell against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref LU/257/20/HH, dated 21 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey brick side extension under tiled roof.
-

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 surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to a two-storey, semi-detached, pitch-roofed dwelling located on a corner plot at the junction of Esher Drive and Meadow Way. No 2 fronts southwards onto Meadow Way and has a gable-ended side elevation with a small single-storey conservatory facing onto Esher Drive to the east. The dwelling's elevations are set back from the highway on both its front and side aspects. A low brick wall encloses the parking area to the front of no.2 and a high closed boarded fence encloses the garden, immediately abutting Esher Drive. Closed boarded fencing extends from the appeal site along the western side of Esher Drive northward to the junction with Southfields Road. The northern side of Meadow Way in the vicinity of the site is characterised by similar semi-detached dwellings, set back from the highway along a consistent building line. Dwellings in the wider area, including along Esher Drive, are generally arranged in cohesive groupings, along relatively consistent building lines behind open frontages.
4. Turning to the proposed two-storey extension, whilst it would appear subservient to the host dwelling and would match existing materials, it would also project significantly beyond the predominant building line of dwellings on the western side of Esher Drive. This would not reflect the established pattern of development in the surrounding area.
5. I note that some separation distance between the extension and the highway boundary would be retained. I have also had regard to the existing conservatory, high boundary fencing and the existing extensions to other

dwellings in the area. Nevertheless, the close proximity to the highway of the proposal's largely blank two-storey flank elevation would provide minimal visual relief and would not be typical of the western side of Esher Drive. Given the corner plot location of the extension, the proposal would be prominent in views from the public highway and it would appear harmfully out of kilter with existing development in the area, incongruously protruding towards Esher Drive. As such, the development would represent a discordant feature in the street scene, harmful to the more uniform character and visual cohesiveness of the surrounding area.

6. The development would, therefore, be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area contrary to Policies D DM1 and D DM4(e) of the Arun Local Plan 2011-2031 (adopted 2018). Taken together, these policies seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development does not compromise the established spatial character and pattern of place. Moreover, the development would be inconsistent with paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework as it would not add to the overall quality of the area and would not be sympathetic to the local character.

Other Matters

7. I have taken into account all the other matters raised in the evidence, including that the scheme would provide a more adaptable family unit of accommodation and that some short-term economic benefit would be derived from construction. I acknowledge the importance of good quality and energy efficient housing to meet the needs of current and future residents within the district and these matters attract some limited weight in support of the proposal.
8. Overall, however, there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, of sufficient weight to outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area and the subsequent identified conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons above, the appeal is dismissed.

S D Castle

INSPECTOR