



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 June 2021

by J E Jolly BA (Hons) MA MSc CIH MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 JUNE 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M3835/W/21/3270840

4 May Close, Castle, Worthing, BN12 6HW

- 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 Thomas Colbourne against the decision of Worthing Borough Council.
 - The application Ref AWD/M/1387/20, dated 28 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is a retrospective application for the retention of shed to front (East) garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. For clarity and brevity I have used the description of development described on the Council's decision notice which more accurately reflects the proposal before me.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located in an established residential area that is typified by brick and tile dwellings that are set behind open-plan type gardens or on-plot parking areas. The dwellings in May Close are characterised by simple vertical elevations and open style porches that look onto a cul-de-sac courtyard. A similar layout and design is seen in the nearby Bridge Close, and the properties on the intersecting Maybridge Square are also of a comparable appearance. No 4 May Close is a two-storey dwelling with a paved parking court to the front of the property. When viewed from the road the host dwelling has a low wall to the left-hand side, and a metal gate to the right-hand side which provides access to the rear of the property.
5. The felt-roofed shed type development has already been completed and retrospective planning permission is now sought. The brown timber-type structure is located on the paved parking area to the left-hand side of the host dwelling next to the low wall, and forward of the front building line of the dwellings on this side of May Close. The shed has padlocked double-doors to the front which face towards the dwellings on the other side of the cul-de sac.

6. The development is sited in a well-established residential area. As such, the general principle of development on the appeal site is not at odds with the surrounding area. However, I noticed at my site visit, notwithstanding the muted colour of the structure or close proximity of a low wall, that the position of the development to the front of the host property affords views of the shed not only in May Close, but also from Maybridge Square and Bridge Close. Indeed, notwithstanding the addition of some limited landscaping in the surrounding area in more recent times, the development appears as a bulky and highly prominent timber addition to this predominantly open plan location to the front elevation of the brick and tile host dwelling. I conclude therefore, that the scale, mass and positioning of the development is incongruous with the surrounding area which is typified by relatively unfettered front brick elevations, and hence is at odds with the prevailing street-scene.
7. Therefore, the development is contrary to saved Policy H16 of the Worthing Local Plan, 2003 and Policy 16 of the Worthing Core Strategy, 2011 which say, amongst other things, that proposals should not adversely affect the appearance of the street-scene by occupying space between buildings which should remain open.
8. For similar reasons, the development does not meet the aim of Paragraph 127 (c) of the *National Planning Policy Framework*, which requires that development is sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.

Other Matters

9. Whether there is adequate access to the rear of the host dwelling by means of a side gate or not, I acknowledge that the Appellant is seeking to find an economic solution for storing a motorcycle and bicycles in a secure manner. Moreover, that the development is unlikely to erode highway safety or the daylight and sunlight available to the occupiers of the host and neighbouring dwellings. However, this does not outweigh the harm I have found to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusions

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

J E JOLLY

INSPECTOR