

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 August 2022

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C3810/D/22/3300474

111 North Lane, East Preston, BN16 1HB

- 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 Edward Hobson against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref EP/34/22/HH, dated 24 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 23 May 2022.
 - The development proposed the erection of a two storey side/rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on living conditions for neighbours.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached two storey house of rendered elevations under a tiled roof with good sized front and rear gardens. It is in an established and fairly spacious residential area with this part of North Lane having a mixture of detached and semi-detached dwellings varying in form, scale and design, all accentuated by inconsistent building lines to front and rear. The appeal proposal is as described above.

Living conditions

4. There is clearly scope with a property and garden as found here for significant extension work without harm to character and appearance or residential amenity. However, in one part this particular scheme would not be acceptable to my mind; that is the first-floor addition in the south eastern corner. It would be close to the boundary and because of the disposition of properties it would project excessively beyond the rear main wall and too far along the garden of No 109 to the east. I accept there is already an 'over-run' but this would simply take it too far at first floor level. I am in no doubt that sunlight, daylight and outlook would be lost and that neighbours would feel unduly hemmed-in. Within a neighbourhood such as this, residents would reasonably expect an air of openness and spaciousness and this development would unduly impinge upon those attributes. There will always be some interference
-

with sunlight and partial blinkering in a row of staggered houses but regrettably the appeal scheme would take that to excess.

5. Policies D DM1 and D DM4 in the Arun Local Plan are pertinent. Taken together and amongst other matters, they seek to ensure that new development would protect standards of residential amenity for neighbours. Given the foregoing I would conclude that the appeal scheme would conflict with these policies.

Other matters

6. I do understand the Appellant's points about updating and improving the property and adaptability e.g. re working from home. I note the incorporated sustainability features and that the Council rightly did not raise concerns on a number of technical and aesthetic factors. I recognise that there would be some economic and social gains forthcoming from the scheme. I appreciate that the Parish Council and neighbours did not object although I have to protect the amenity of a property for the long term and future residents. I have carefully considered these and all the other points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
7. 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

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on living conditions for neighbours. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR