



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 July 2025

by **S Leonard BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22ND July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L3815/D/25/3360065

11 Jolliffe Road, West Wittering, West Sussex PO20 8ET

- 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 Michael Booker and Mrs Elizabeth Booker against the decision of Chichester District Council.
 - The application Ref is WW/24/02558/DOM.
 - The development proposed is single garage connected to the main house via a covered link.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single garage connected to the main house via a covered link at 11 Jolliffe Road, West Wittering, West Sussex PO20 8ET in accordance with the terms of application Ref WW/24/02558/DOM subject to the conditions listed at the end of this Decision.

Procedural Matters

2. The emerging Chichester Local Plan 2021-2039 (the eLP) has reached an advanced stage, with the examination hearings having taken place during October and November 2024 and the consultation on the Main Modifications having ended on 29 May 2025. There is no evidence before me that there are proposed modifications to the eLP policies which are specifically referred to in the officer report as being relevant to its reason for refusal, that would alter their relevance. As such, I afford weight to these emerging policies which reflect the objectives of the relevant adopted local plan policies.
3. The site benefits from an extant planning permission¹ for alterations and enlargements, including the conversion of the existing garage into habitable accommodation. Although the approved scheme is shown on the planning application drawings, I saw during my site visit that it has not been implemented. For clarity, this Decision solely considers the proposed garage and covered link shown on the planning application drawings.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached chalet bungalow with brick walls under a tiled pitched roof incorporating dormer windows and roof lights serving the upper floor

¹ LPA Ref 23/02846/DOM

accommodation. It occupies a corner position and has a rectangular footprint with its long edge and principal elevation including the front door facing onto Southcote Avenue. Vehicular access is also from this road and this currently serves an integral single garage with forecourt parking in front.

6. Apart from the vehicular access point, the site frontages with both roads are wholly enclosed by either concrete block walling to a height of approximately 1.5m and close-board timber fencing with trellis above with a combined height of about 1.8m. This boundary treatment, together with mature hedging, shrubs and trees which lie behind much of it, result in the property having a distinctly enclosed character.
7. Moreover, directly opposite the appeal site, there is another detached chalet bungalow which occupies a similar position in relation to the road frontages as the appeal property and whose frontage onto Southcote Avenue is also heavily enclosed by a combination of mature landscaping and concrete block walling.
8. Having regard to the above, these two corner properties have a notably different street presence than those of the dwellings further east along Southcote Avenue, where frontages are considerably more open in character and defined by low walls.
9. A mature belt of coniferous trees adjacent to the eastern site boundary with no.2 Southcote Avenue further serves to visually separate the appeal site from the built development to the east. As such, having regard to the street scene, the appeal site is read within the context of forming one of two oppositely sited corner properties which are perceived as being separate from the predominantly open plan development which characterises most of Southcote Avenue, which is the street scene within which the appeal scheme would be sited.
10. The appeal scheme would be sited forward of the front building line of the property and as such there would be some conflict with the Council's design Guidance Note² which encourages garages and car ports to be set back behind the front building line. However, this note is for advisory purposes. Moreover, it does allow for such development to be sited between the house and the highway where there is sufficient space and it is of an appropriate scale and quality of design and materials and is not out of character.
11. The appeal scheme would extend up to the front site boundary resulting in the infilling of part of the front garden with built development and reducing the amount of space between the main dwelling and the street. This would be clearly evident in public views of the site when travelling past it along Southcote Avenue.
12. However, the proposal would be subservient in scale, height and mass to the main dwelling, and the variations in roof form and pitched roof design would serve to reduce its perceived bulk. As such, it would be viewed as a subsidiary element to the building as a whole.
13. Moreover, the part of the garden in which the garage would be sited is already occupied by block work walling, a small outbuilding and mature landscaping, thereby reducing the amount of space around the building that would be lost.

² Design Guidelines for Alterations to Dwellings and Extensions (September 2009)

14. Also, the appeal scheme would be almost entirely screened in views from the west and east of the property due to the presence of existing mature landscaping on the appeal site, which would significantly reduce the impact of the proposal upon the street scene.
15. With all of the above in mind, I find that given the particular circumstances of the appeal site and the details of the appeal scheme, in this instance the proposal would not appear unduly incongruous within the prevailing street scene.
16. Moreover, I saw on my site visit that there are existing outbuildings sited to the front of other nearby dwellings³ which are on sites which are more open plan in character than the appeal site.
17. Having regard to the above, I therefore conclude that the proposal would not materially harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would accord with Policies 2 and 33 of the *Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029* (2015), Policy WW1 of the *West Wittering Neighbourhood Plan 2019 – 2029* (2023) and draft Policies S1, P1, P2 and P7 of the eLP in so much as these policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development is of a high-quality design which respects local character and distinctiveness and the setting, form and character of the settlement.
18. This accords with Chapter 12 of the Framework which seeks to achieve well-designed places.

Conditions

19. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions in light of the tests set out in Paragraph 57 of the Framework and the National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). In addition to the standard implementation condition (1), it is necessary to define the plans in the interests of certainty (2), and ensure that the external materials of the development are appropriate, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area (3). A condition is necessary in the interests of preserving protected species (4). The Council's suggested lighting condition 5 is not necessary since this matter is adequately covered by the requirements of condition 4. Given the small domestic-scale of the proposed garage and its physical link with the dwelling I do not consider the Council's suggested condition 6 requiring it to be incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse to be necessary.

Conclusion

20. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should succeed, and that planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

S Leonard

INSPECTOR

³ LPA Refs WW/21/03214/DOM and WW/09/02641/DOM

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans: 28163-PD201 and 28163-PD203REVA.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall be constructed in accordance with the external materials specified within the application form and the approved plans listed in condition 2.
- 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the Preliminary Roost Assessment Report by Hampshire Ecological Services Ltd dated February 2024.