

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 March 2021

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 May 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C3810/W/20/3263729

31 Albert Road, Rustington, Littlehampton, BN16 3JT

- 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 K Walker against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref R/156/20/PL, dated 14 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is the extension and alteration of existing residential dwelling and subdivision to form 2no. two bedroom residential dwellings, together with formation of new vehicular access and entrance drive.
-

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 locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is a corner plot with a detached bungalow and attached flat roof garage. The principal frontage of the property lies along the side road, Albert Road, and enclosed gardens sit to either side of this. The relationship to the rear is a tight one to the adjoining house (23) which fronts Mill Lane, the B2140. The appeal site lies within an area of residential character with a variety of house types and garden arrangements which come together to form an area of pleasing appearance. The proposal is as described above.
 4. The present arrangement on the appeal site is a visually comfortable one. This is because the low-key property sits harmlessly in the verdant and spacious Mill Lane scene whilst on turning the corner the bungalow leads to a line of other single storey homes on the first stretch of Albert Road. Although relatively tight to some of its boundaries the present arrangement does not appear cramped.
 5. Regrettably the proposal would have a direct negative impacts on the attributes which I touch on above. The bulk of building would become a dominant form in the scene from both roads. The layout would not draw on any abutting arrangement and would look ill at ease. Plot sizes would be small
-

and awkwardly positioned. The development would lack a suitable degree of subtlety by reason of bulk, elevational treatment, proximity to boundaries and relationship to other homes and it would jar in the street scene. In summary this scheme would display the characteristics and appearance of inappropriate cramped over-development.

6. Policies D SP1, D DM4 and D DM1 of the Arun Local Plan and Policy 2 of the Rustington Neighbourhood Plan are relevant. Taken together and amongst other matters, they seek to ensure that development protects and ideally makes a positive addition to the character and street scene of an area, incorporates suitable layout and landscape, reflects local spatial arrangements, and is of high design quality generally. I conclude that there would be conflict with these policies.

Other matters

7. I recognise the thought which has gone into the scheme's plans not least in terms of functionality and protection of neighbouring amenity, albeit my views on the aesthetics are as above. I have considered other examples of development drawn to my attention but found none to be directly comparable by reason of form, scale or location. I appreciate the research which has been presented but I am not persuaded one should directly take matters such as site coverage ratios and use these as straight precedent arguments for the appeal proposals on a different plot. I must determine the case before me on its own merits. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
8. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered; the Council's policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within that document.

Overall conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR