



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2025

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L3815/D/25/3373514

31 South Bank, Chichester PO19 8DX

- 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 Simon & Karen Maskrey & Arnold against the decision of Chichester District Council.
 - The application Ref is CC/25/01446/DOM.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey rear extension and erection of replacement outbuilding and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of single storey rear extension and erection of replacement outbuilding and associated works at 31 South Bank, Chichester PO19 8DX, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: CC/25/01446/DOM, subject to the conditions set out at the end of this decision letter.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Simon & Karen Maskrey & Arnold against Chichester District Council and this is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. Since the date of the Council's decision notice, the replacement Chichester Local Plan 2021 – 2039 (Local Plan) has been adopted. The refusal notice refers to policies in the Emerging Local Plan and these policies now form part of the adopted Local Plan.
4. I have corrected the spelling of the Appellants' surname as requested.
5. The proposal relates to both a single storey rear extension as well as an outbuilding at the rear of the garden. The reason for refusal is specific to the single storey rear extension, and the Council has indicated that it would have no objection to the outbuilding, taken on its own. From all the information before me as well as my site visit, I have no reason to take a different view.
6. The Council has referred to Article 4 Directions applying in this area but has not been specific as to what these cover.

Main Issue

7. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed single storey rear extension on the character and appearance of the existing property and on the character and appearance of the Chichester Conservation Area.

Reasons

8. The appeal property is an end of terrace residential dwelling on the south side of South Bank, a no through road that leads from Stockbridge Road in the west to the Chichester Ship Canal at its eastern end. The dwelling is two storeys with accommodation in the roof. The front elevation is brick with quoin detailing, there is a bay at ground floor together with small gable roofing details; the design is repeated along the short terraces on this side of the road, whereas the pattern of development on the northern side is much more varied. The site lies within the Chichester Conservation Area and the Singleton and Cocking Tunnels SAC and within the Chichester settlement boundary.
9. The proposal seeks to remove the existing external store and extend and reconfigure the existing outrigger to provide a single storey rear extension under a flat roof across the full width of the rear of the property.
10. Section 72 (1) of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.
11. The Chichester Conservation Area is extensive and extends to cover most of the historic core of Chichester and its immediate environs including the development of the City away from the Centre. I understand that South Bank was added to the Conservation Area after the Conservation Area Appraisal was adopted in 2016. The significance of the Conservation Area relates to the historic core of the City Centre and the development of the City outwards from the centre. The terrace of houses which includes the appeal property is an attractive example of early 20th century brick terraces with their architectural detailing and make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. However, I consider that the contribution that the terrace makes to the significance of the Conservation Area is primarily from the uniformity and attractiveness of the front elevations which are seen from the street and when passing along South Bank towards the Canal.
12. At the rear of the terraces, there has been a much greater array of alterations particularly at roof level with the addition of dormers, and changes and alterations at ground floor level. Although the pattern of rear outriggers is largely unaltered along the terrace, I do not consider that this pattern of development is of particular significance in respect of this terrace and the Conservation Area and is commonly found in respect of terraced houses of this period. Furthermore, the Appellant has drawn my attention to another example of where a ground floor rear extension has recently been allowed in the same terrace under the Ref: 24/01578/DOM whereby the side passageway at the rear would be built over. Although I have limited information before me in respect of that proposal and from the submitted material, it would appear to be different to the proposal before me, it would nonetheless infill the side passageway and therefore alter the earlier form of layout.

13. I am satisfied that the scale of the proposed extension would be in keeping with the scale and form of the existing property. It would not extend the depth materially beyond the varied rear building line along the terrace and its height would be appropriate for a ground floor rear extension and in respect of the proportions of the dwelling. Furthermore, although the earlier form of the ground floor at the rear would be altered, the shape and form of the original building would still be seen at first floor level and above. Designation within a conservation area does not mean every building will be preserved and that no changes should be allowed but instead helps to ensure changes respect the area's character and appearance. Given its small scale and form, as well as its siting to the rear of the terrace, it would not harm the significance of the Chichester Conservation Area.
14. I therefore conclude that the proposal would respect the character and appearance of the existing property and would preserve the character and appearance of the Chichester Conservation Area. There would be no conflict with Policies P11, P2 and A1 of the Chichester Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular Sections 12 and 16 all of which amongst other things seek a high quality of design which respects the local context and the significance of designated heritage assets.

Conditions

15. A condition is required to list the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of good planning. The external materials should accord with the information provided on the application forms and on the approved plans to respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the local area, including the Conservation Area.
16. Conditions are required in the interests of protecting biodiversity and wildlife and to secure biodiversity enhancement although I have amended some of these from the ones proposed by the Council to take account of the content of the ecological assessment submitted with the application.
17. I shall also impose a condition to require the outbuilding to remain in use for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling house, to reflect the terms of the application.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
2. The materials to be used on the external elevations of the development hereby permitted shall accord with those set out on the application forms and on the approved plans.
3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: C9/0320/00; C9/0320/01; C9/0320/03; C9/0320/04; C9/0320/05; C9/0320/06; C9/0320/07; C9/0320/02 Rev A.
4. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in full accordance with the Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment dated July 2025 by Imprint Ecology, including mitigation and enhancement measures. The ecological enhancements shall be completed prior to the development hereby permitted being first brought into use and thereafter be retained and maintained.
5. In addition to the enhancement measures set out in the Imprint Ecology Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment as referenced under Condition 4, the development hereby permitted shall not be first brought into use until the following ecological enhancements have been implemented:
 - a) The integration of a bat box into the extension hereby approved, or within the dwelling, or a tree sited within the rear garden. The bat box shall face a south/ south westerly direction and positioned 3-5m above ground.
 - b) The provision of at least one hedgehog nesting box within the site.The ecological enhancements shall thereafter be retained and maintained.
6. Notwithstanding the provision of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order, the outbuilding hereby permitted shall only be used for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling house and for no other purpose.

End of Schedule