



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2024

by J Reid BA(Hons) BArch(Hons) RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/C3810/W/24/3348407

Land to the Rear of 1 The Heathers, Arundel Road, Angmering BN16 4LE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Woods against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref is A/39/24/PL.
 - The development proposed is Re-use and extension of an existing storage building to form a 1-Bedroom holiday cottage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated within a mainly residential area within the built up area boundary of Angmering. The site includes an area of land about as wide as the far end of the back garden at 1 The Heathers including a narrow storage building (store), a garage, part of a garage court and its lengthy access from Lansdowne Way, and part of a twitten. The twitten is part of the public right of way (PRoW) that links Lloyd Goring Close with Lansdowne Way.
4. Close by, the area is mainly characterised by the pattern of well-spaced mostly 2 storey terraced and semidetached dwellings set in front gardens facing the streets with moderate back gardens, and garage courts beyond or by their back gardens. There are some detached dwellings and bungalows further south in Lansdowne Way, but they have little impact on the site's immediate surroundings. The spaciousness between the pairs and rows of nearby dwellings, and over their gardens and the low-key garage courts, contributes positively to the local suburban character, and to the sense of place.
5. The single range pitched roofed store is sited towards the roughly north east corner of the site, which lies between the backs of 2 rows of garages in 2 garage courts, which are set well back from Lloyd Goring Close by Claremont Close, and well back from Lansdowne Way. Whilst the narrow store is a little taller than the low pitched and flat roofed garages, its scale and alignment respects the low-key surroundings in the courts.
6. The height of the store's front gabled roof would be increased, and its side gabled extension would be as tall. As the proposal would almost fill the space

between the backs of the garages, its bulk would dominate the views from its surroundings including the PRow. So, the proposal would be out of keeping with the nearby garage blocks and the low-key outbuildings by the far ends of back gardens, and its single storey form would contrast starkly with the taller and wider 2 storey terraced and semidetached dwellings nearby.

7. Due to its height and bulk, the proposal would harmfully intrude into the important openness beyond the backs of the dwellings in Arundel Road. Whilst the dwellings at Claremont Cottages are set back from Lloyd Goring Close, their form, scale and siting respects those of the nearby dwellings, and they provide a welcome sense of enclosure in southward views along the nearby part of Lloyd Goring Close. By contrast, as the taller single storey proposal would be squeezed in side-on between 2 rows of garages, it would disrupt the established pattern of development.
8. The street scene in the nearby part of the PRow is mainly characterised by the openness in the garage court to roughly north of the site and the sense of enclosure in the narrow tall fenced route between the roughly south court and private gardens. As the proposal would include a front garden, space for bins, and a front door and windows facing the PRow, the character and appearance of the holiday cottage would be akin to that of a dwelling. For the same reasons, the proposal would conflict with the service character of its surroundings, so it would be incongruous.
9. Due to its poor relationship with the nearby streets, the proposal would not be a welcoming place in which to stay. Energy and water saving measures are normal requirements for development, so the potential for 'off grid' living attracts little weight, and as almost no details of the 'Red Admirals' scheme have been put to me, it cannot be considered. Whilst the proposal aims to make efficient use of the site, which is within an accessible location, its economic benefits would be modest. Moreover, all of the proposal's benefits would not outweigh the harm that it would cause to the sense of place.
10. Therefore, I consider that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policies D SP1 and D DM1 of the Arun Local Plan 2011-2031 which aim for proposals to reflect or improve upon the character of the site and local area, and Policy HD5 of the Angmering Neighbourhood Plan 2014-2029 which aims for development to reflect the local character of its setting and local surroundings.

Conclusion

11. I have found that the proposed development would be contrary to the Development Plan when taken as a whole. The other considerations in this case, including the Framework, do not outweigh that conflict.
12. For the reasons given, the appeal should be dismissed.

J Reid

INSPECTOR