Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2007

by Peter Bird BSc DipTP MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Date: 2 August 2007

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/A/07/2035519

124 Cokeham Lane, Lancing BN15 9SG

- 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 & Mrs R Jackson against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref ADC/0397/06, dated 23 October 2006, was refused by notice dated 14 December 2006.
- The development proposed is described as "Extension (to front elevation)".

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Reasons

2. The appeal property is a detached bungalow of modest size. It is within part of the built-up area of Sompting that is predominantly residential in use and is situated close to the corner of Cokeham Lane and Carnforth Road.

3. The area contains a mix of detached and semi-detached dwellings, including bungalows and houses. In my view significant influences on the distinctiveness of the character and appearance of the street scene are the grouping and layout of the dwellings; and the space between the dwellings and the footway, which contributes to the cohesive appearance of the street scene.

4. The appeal property is in a group of detached and semi-detached bungalows between Carnforth Road and Bowness Avenue that, like the wider context, incorporates a mix in type and design. Despite the variation in their siting and footprint, particularly of No.1 Bowness Avenue and No.2 Carnforth Road, and the consequent slight irregularity in the front building line of this group of dwellings, their layout and the space between them and the footway reflects the cohesive appearance of the area.

5. The proposed front extension would project some 3.0 metres from the front face of the appeal property. The appellants dispute the distance between the extension and the highway. However, on the evidence before me, it appears that there would be some 5.0 metres separating it from the carriageway of Cokeham Lane, but some 3.0 metres from the footway.

6. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: Development Control Standard No. 3 "Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings" (SPG) advises on front extensions. It explains that in the case of semi-detached or detached

dwellings, front extensions will only be allowed where the extension can be successfully integrated into the street scene and not unduly affect neighbours.

7. It seems to me that although the footprint of No.124 would reflect that of some other properties, the amount of the proposal's projection beyond the front face of the bungalow would, despite the irregularities in the front building line of this group of dwellings, be excessive. Although there would still be space between the extension and the footway along Cokeham Lane, I nevertheless consider that the proposal would not be successfully integrated into the street scene. I agree with the Council that the extension would be an obtrusive and incongruous feature, visually out of keeping and to the detriment of the street scene.

8. The Council does not appear to raise objections in relation to the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings at No.2 Carnforth Road and No.122 Cokeham Lane and I share this view.

9. The proposal's gable ended design would be in keeping with the bungalow, and, in my view, add character to the otherwise simple appearance of the dwelling. However, I consider that neither this nor the absence of objections from neighbours would overcome the harmful effect on the character and appearance of the street scene.

10. Amongst its considerations, Planning Policy Statement 1: *Delivering Sustainable Development* sets out that high quality and inclusive design should be the aim for all in the development process. However, it also makes clear that design which is inappropriate in its context should not be accepted. This is reflected by Policies CH1 and DEV1 of the West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 and Policies AG1 and AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan, which have regard for the effect of new development, including alterations and extensions, on their surroundings. I find that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the on the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with the aims and objectives of the above national and local planning policies, as well as the Council's SPG. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Peter Bird
INSPECTOR