The Planning Inspectorate

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 September 2013

**by E A Lawrence BTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 27 September 2013**

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/D/13/2203545**
**8 Fishermans Walk, Shoreham Beach, BN43 5LW**

- 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 Justin Huxtable against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref AWDM/0606/13 was refused by notice dated 25 July 2013.
- The development proposed is two storey side extension & replacement porch.

## Decision

1. The Appeal is dismissed.

## Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the scheme on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the adjoining terrace.

## Reasons

3. The Appeal site is located in an area which is characterised by uniformly designed terraced houses, which are visually uncluttered and have predominantly flat roofed porches. The Appeal property is consistent with this pattern, being located at the end of a row of uniformly designed terraced houses. The dwellings within this terrace each have a large bow window at ground floor level and modest sized flat roofed front porches. Whilst the front and rear building lines of the terrace are staggered, the ridge and eaves heights of the terrace are consistent, as are the spacing and form of the fenestration.

4. It is noted that a number of properties within Fisherman's Walk have replacement porches with pitched roofs. They are all very similar in design and have small gable features, with their roofs hipped away from the adjacent bow windows. Their eaves lines are consistent with the flat roof of the adjacent bow windows and the width of the porches reflects the width of the original porches. In addition, they have single front doors, which is consistent with other properties along the road. As a result they blend in satisfactorily with the host buildings and the street scene and do not look cluttered alongside the adjacent bow windows.

5. From the drawings submitted it would appear that the roof of the proposed single storey front extension would be taller than other replacement porches in the road and its eaves line would be lower than the roof of the adjacent bow window. Its long mono-pitched roof would project close to the bow window

and the porch would have double entrance doors, as opposed to a single door. The front extension would be more than twice the width of the existing front porch and it would have an uncharacteristic strong horizontal appearance. Overall the proposed front extension would appear incongruous and totally out of keeping with the host dwelling, the terrace and the street scene as a whole.

6. The Appellant has referred to the front extension at No.1. However that extension has a fully pitched roof over its porch and the width of the porch is comparable to the original. Whilst there is a mono-pitched roof to the front of the garage, the area under it is open and the garage doors are set back and in line with the main front elevation of the house. As such, that addition is not directly comparable to the Appeal scheme.

7. As pointed out by the Appellant, it would be possible to construct a replacement porch in accordance with the current permitted development tolerances. However, any such porch would be materially smaller than the proposed front extension. Accordingly the availability of permitted development rights has not influenced this decision, which is based upon the individual merits of the Appeal scheme and in light of the prevailing planning policies.

8. The Council's Development Control Standard No.3 – *Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings* advises that extensions should normally be set back from the main front wall of the dwelling, to provide a visual break and to ensure the extension is subordinate to the main dwelling. However the flexibility in its wording reflects the need to consider each scheme on its individual merits. In this instance, due to the consistent building lines and roof lines of this part of the terrace, the form of the proposed side extension would be read as part of the original terrace and would be readily assimilated into the street scene. This is subject to appropriate design details and the use of matching materials, which can be dealt with by condition.

9. The proposed first floor front window would be consistent with the adjacent two pane first floor window and the gap between these windows would respect that of other such gaps at first floor level within the terrace. As a result this aspect of the scheme would be seen as a logical continuation of the existing terrace and would blend in satisfactorily with both the host building and the terrace as a whole.

10. It is noted that the proposed first front window would not follow the rhythm of the first floor fenestration along the terrace, where two and three pane windows are alternated. However, the extension is located at the end of the terrace, where it would have a negligible impact on the rhythm and uniformity of the terrace as a whole. In addition, it is noted that first floor fenestration at No.1 Fisherman's Walk is almost identical to that proposed and it blends in appropriately with that dwelling and the street scene.

11. Whilst the upper part of the proposed extension would respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the terrace as a whole, the proposed ground floor front addition would be totally out of keeping with both the host dwelling and the terrace. It would dominate the front elevation of the property and the relationship between the extension and the existing bow window would appear cramped and incongruous.

12. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would materially harm the character and appearance of the host building and attached terrace and would therefore conflict with policies AG1 and AH7 of the saved Adur District Local Plan. Together and amongst other things these policies seek to ensure that new development, including extensions are sympathetic to the host dwelling and its surroundings and do not detract from the existing local urban environment.

*E Lawrence*

INSPECTOR