The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 June 2013

by Simon Miles BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 June 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/A/13/2192187
26 Roman Road, Southwick, Brighton BN42 4TP

- 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 Peter Lahaise of Griston Cross Lahaise LLP against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref AWDM/1450/12, dated 22 November 2012, was refused by notice dated 7 January 2013.
- The development proposed is a single storey detached two-bedroom bungalow and associated parking and gardens.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a proposal to develop the rear garden of 26 Roman Road to provide a detached bungalow. Roman Road is characterised mainly by single and two storey housing of moderate size. Along the adjacent Old Shoreham Road development is built at a somewhat larger scale and includes an adjacent modern block of flats. However, although it is clear that the area has been subject to redevelopment over recent years, there is no evidence of backland development along this section of Roman Road, which retains a traditional linear street frontage with open rear gardens.

4. The introduction of new residential development into the rear garden of No 26 would disrupt this well-established character. Moreover, the layout of the proposed new dwelling would suffer from a small and confined plot. The resulting development would appear cramped in the context of the existing garden plots, giving a most undesirable impression of town cramming. The fact that the development would clearly be visible from nearby properties and from Roman Road when looking across the parking court only adds to my concern about the inappropriate form and layout of the proposal.

5. This leads me to conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. It follows that the proposal is contrary to saved Policy AH2 of the adopted Adur District Local Plan 1996 insofar as this seeks to ensure that infilling or redevelopment, whilst acceptable in principle in built-up areas, avoids harm to the local environment.

6. This policy is dated and I am mindful that the National Planning Policy Framework is concerned to increase the supply of housing. However, the Framework attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Furthermore, the inappropriate development of residential gardens should be resisted where, as here, it would cause harm to the local area.

7. Given my findings, the balance in this case weighs against approval. Accordingly, for the reasons given, the appeal does not succeed.

Simon Miles

INSPECTOR