



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 3 August 2021

by L Douglas BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U1430/D/21/3270270

The Dream House, 115D London Road, Bexhill-on-Sea TN39 3LB

- 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 M Adams against the decision of Rother District Council.
 - The application Ref RR/2020/2165/P, dated 4 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is "Proposed second floor extension to form additional bedroom and en-suite".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a two-storey detached house located to the rear of a three storey terrace on London Road, amongst other two storey residential buildings. Industrial buildings are located to the west and south of the appeal site, creating a mixed character. The appeal building can be seen from the industrial surroundings along Beeching Road and in clear views from residential properties to the north and east.
4. The proposed second floor extension would create gable ends on the front and rear elevations, with parapets on the side elevations. Both side elevations would remain absent of any windows or detailing save for one high level window proposed on the north west side elevation. The proposal would create an oppressive building which would appear much taller than neighbouring detached buildings due to its narrow vertical emphasis. It would remain smaller than the terraces facing London Road, but on account of its poor design and siting it would appear as a prominent and obtrusive block, out of scale with, and unsympathetic to, neighbouring properties. Even in the context of its mixed surroundings, it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies OSS4 and EN3 of the Council's Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) and Policies DHG9 and DEN1 of the Council's Development and Site Allocations Local Plan (2019). These require, amongst other things, new development to be of high quality design which makes a positive contribution to the character of the site and surroundings.

Other Matters

6. The appellant has claimed that the proposed development could be carried out without planning permission. I have not been provided with any evidence, such as a certificate of lawfulness, confirming the extent of any lawful upward extension that could be carried out to the appeal building, which may act as a fallback position. I therefore apply little weight to this argument, which does not outweigh the significant harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area by the proposal.

Conclusion

7. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area in conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

L Douglas

INSPECTOR