

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2022

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C3810/D/22/3303677

101 Clun Road, Wick, Littlehampton, BN17 7EG

- 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 Steven Peace against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref LU/78/22/HH, dated 12 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 June 2022.
 - The development proposed the erection of part single, part two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the locality and on living conditions for neighbours.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a two storey end of terrace home with a side driveway width gap to a common side boundary beyond which lies a similar, albeit semi-detached, house with a comparable gap alongside. The properties are on an extensive residential estate of mainly short terraces and semi-detached homes and the design and siting of the generally hipped-roof dwellings along with their generous garden sizes creates a locality of established character and pleasing appearance. The appeal proposal would provide for lounge, kitchen, bedroom and bathroom space within a primarily two storey structure to the side of the host property and about 0.3m off the shared side boundary.
 4. Part of the character and visual qualities of the area arises from the fact that almost without exception two storey extensions do not sit on the side of homes up to or close to side boundaries where another property is alongside. This gives a sense of spaciousness and, particularly combined with the hipped roofs, allows very good separation of properties at upper level. This is a particularly noticeable attribute along this stretch of street and beyond. Within this context it would be a retrograde visual step to allow a two-storey extension such as that proposed. The scheme would look out of kilter as an incongruous anomaly and lead towards a terracing effect with a sizeable upper level of 'air space' filled by build development. In summary the siting, scale and massing of the
-

proposal would run contrary to the character of the area and would be visually detrimental.

5. Policy D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan (LP) is relevant. Amongst other matters, it seeks to ensure that extensions are well designed, with suitable siting, massing and spacing given the character of the local area. I conclude that there would be conflict with this policy. The scheme would also run contrary to the objectives for good quality design within the Arun Design Guide (DG).

Living conditions

6. I take the Appellant's points about orientation and also lack of over-looking. However, I mention above the two-storey wall running alongside the boundary. Given this the appeal proposal would be an excessive bulk of building which would simply be uncomfortably and unacceptably over-bearing for adjacent residents. Openness would be lost to the side of the neighbours' plot and I also note a side door exit would face the new structure. Those living within this local environment would rightly expect to enjoy a degree of sense of spaciousness and this development would unduly detract from that.
7. LP Policy D DM4 is also pertinent here. Amongst other matters, and in parallel with relevant objectives in the DG, it seeks 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 this policy and the parallel aims of the DG.

Other matters

8. I do understand the Appellant's wish to extend this property, albeit the scheme would be unusual in that there is no internal link between the extension and host property, and I can see that thought has been given to the selection of materials and window design. There is an attempt to appear subservient with some set back and lower roof but as I say above I am concerned aesthetically and in residential amenity terms, with a two storey wall running, effectively, on the boundary. I appreciate that existing neighbours did not object to the scheme but I have to protect amenity for the long term and for future residents. I do note that there would be a number of energy saving, and waste and water reduction measures incorporated. However, as the appeal scheme has environmental and social failings I would not deem this to be sustainable development.
9. The photographs of extensions provided do not appear to me to reflect comparable cases. From what I can see they are 'end of rows' rather than on common boundaries between proximate blocks. In any event I must assess the present case 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 issues identified above.
10. 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

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the locality as well as on living conditions for neighbours. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR