

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2021

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C3810/D/21/3284040

19 Botany Close, Rustington, Littlehampton, BN16 2BJ

- 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 Philip Goulder against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref R/126/21/HH, dated 25 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is a carport.
-

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 large rectangular plot which runs from a private road towards the sea and is in an area of high quality established residential character with generous detached homes prevailing. House styles vary, the appeal property is of a modern idiom. The dwellings along with the generous garden areas come together to create an area of pleasing appearance, generally with a sea-side influenced informality and an air of landscaped spaciousness. The appeal proposal is to erect a sedum roofed car port in the front garden area.
 4. Botany Close does have a varied front building line but spacious front gardens are almost always the common denominator and it is landscape and openness which set the scene not forward positioned structures. The sizeable appeal proposal would thus be an anomaly and it would be regrettable in the street scene. I take the Appellant's point that existing garden landscape would obscure views from some angles and note the willingness to retain this planting although I'm not convinced a planning condition to this end would be enforceable or satisfactory in the long term. I also recognise that the front gates when closed and the pillars would block a large part of the structure from one direction. However, it would still be evident and ironically the gates and pillars, even without the car port, are fairly strident and not themselves the norm for this locality with its informal aesthetic. I am further troubled by not being convinced that the side boundary vegetation, whether on the Appellant's or neighbouring side, would remain or survive in full given the planned
-

proximity of the structure to the side boundary. It would be unfortunate visually for this greenery to be markedly reduced.

5. In summary the siting and scale of the proposal would run contrary to the character of the area and would be visually detrimental.
6. Policies D SP1, and D DM1 of the Arun Local Plan are relevant. Taken together and amongst other matters, they seek to ensure that development is well designed and reflects or improves the character of the local area having regard to siting and its other aspects. I conclude that there would be conflict with these policies.

Other matters

7. 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