The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 November 2021

by Guy Davies BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/D/21/3281305
63 Ingleside Crescent, Lancing BN15 8EW

- 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 and Mrs Williams against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref AWDM/0905/21, dated 15 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 August 2021.
- The development proposed is a two storey side extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Ingleside Crescent is characterised by bungalows and two storey houses of similar design and materials, with a regularity to the lines of buildings fronting the road and the spacing between them. The appeal property is typical of the design of buildings in the Crescent, and it and its neighbours conform to the spacing and alignment of others in the road. The regularity in layout and spacing are key features in defining the character of the area.

4. The proposed 2 storey extension would fill all of the space at the side of the house, bringing it up to the boundary with the neighbouring property at both ground and first floor level. This conflicts with the advice in the Council's Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and alterations to dwellings' supplementary planning guidance, which advises that side extensions should be set back at least 1m from the side boundary, and that this is particularly important in the case of 2 storey extensions since, if adjacent dwellings were both extended up to the side boundary, it would create a 'terracing' effect which would destroy the character of the area.

5. I consider that advice to be pertinent to this case. The proposed extension would close the gap between the pairs of semi-detached houses. If a similar extension were to be built at the neighbouring house it would create a terracing effect that would be uncharacteristic of the area and harmful to its appearance. While there are only 2 pairs of semi-detached houses on the northern side of the Crescent at this point, because the appeal property forms one of the 'inner' properties, the risk of terracing occurring is a real one. It would also set a

precedent for similar extensions between other pairs of semi-detached houses on the opposite side of the road.

6. An extension of a similar form and design to that proposed has been built at 72 Ingleside Crescent. It is understandable therefore why the appellants consider a precedent has already been set that supports the appeal proposal. However, according to the Council this extension was built before adoption of the current policies and guidance which provide a framework for considering such proposals. The adoption of the relevant guidance is an important material change in circumstances that carries greater weight than the precedent set by the extension at no.72.

7. There is a 2 storey side extension at 84 Ingleside Crescent, but this is set back on a corner plot and does not have the same risk of terracing as the appeal proposal. There are also some single storey side extensions in the area that extend up to side boundaries, but these do not have the height or visual impact of the appeal proposal and are therefore not directly comparable.

8. I note the other arguments advanced on behalf of the appellants relating to their personal needs, similarity in design and materials, the benefit of making the property more secure, the lack of any harm to neighbouring amenities, reprovisioning parking space by hardstanding part of the front garden, and the lack of any practical alternative for extending the property. However, none of these mitigate the harm that would be caused to the character of the area that I have identified above. The absence of harm on other issues is not sufficient reason to allow a development that is otherwise unacceptable.

9. I conclude that the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the area by closing the gap between existing buildings, leading to a risk of terracing. The development would therefore conflict with Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan and the guidance in Development Management Standard No.2, which require new development to respect and enhance the character of the site, and the prevailing character of the area.

Conclusion

10. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Guy Davies

INSPECTOR