



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 April 2026

by Stewart Glassar BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th April 2026

Appeal Ref: 6004897

95 Manor Road, Lancing, West Sussex BN15 0HG

- 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 Stacey Pickett against the decision of Adur District Council.
 - The application Ref is AWDM/1473/25.
 - The development proposed is proposed front extension and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the wider area and host property.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a bungalow, with front and rear dormers allowing for the roof space to provide living accommodation. Dwellings on this section of Manor Road are generally single storey buildings and of a slightly different size and shape to that of the appeal property and so do not have accommodation in the roof space.
4. Within the wider street scene there is a greater variety in the size, shape and appearance of dwellings. Nonetheless, by virtue of its position and size and given the absence of a uniform building line, the appeal property is prominent in certain views on Manor Road, particularly from the west. Its size, shape and front roof dormers distinguish it from the other buildings immediately around it, with the setback positions of the nearest two storey dwellings reinforcing the appeal building's prominence in the street scene.
5. The proposed extensions to the front of the dwelling will not increase the building's height but the asymmetrical front gable and side dormer would give the dwelling a more obvious two-storey appearance. This will also noticeably increase its overall bulk and scale when compared to that of the neighbouring dwellings. The proposed external materials seek to achieve a contemporary aesthetic. Whilst there is a variety of building styles and sizes within the wider area, the proposal as a whole would not be reflective of the prevailing environment.
6. Whilst variety and difference does not necessarily lead to harm, in this particular instance the cumulative effect of the scale and design choices would result in a

highly prominent and dominant front addition that would fail to integrate sensitively with the host dwelling or the surrounding built environment.

7. The officer report notes the rear extension to be acceptable and the reason for refusal relates only to the works to the front of the dwelling. I see no reason to disagree with the Council's conclusions regarding the extension to the rear of the building. Nonetheless, this does not overcome the harm the front extension would cause to the character and appearance of the wider area and host property.
8. Overall, I find that the proposal would be contrary to Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan 2017 which advises that development should respect and enhance the character of the site, and the prevailing character of the area, in terms of proportion, form, context, massing, siting, layout, density, height, size, scale, materials, detailed design features and landscaping.

Other Matters

9. I understand that a single storey front extension has previously been approved for the dwelling although I have not been provided with full details. Regardless of that, it does not absolve me from making an assessment as to the effects of the scheme which is currently before me.
10. The proposal would not significantly change the size of the building's footprint in relation to the overall size of the plot, nor would it unduly affect the wider pattern and grain of development in the area. These would represent an absence of harm and so are neutral factors in my decision.
11. The proposal is said to positively contribute to the wellbeing of existing and future residents. Nevertheless, any weight I could attribute to this matter would not overcome the harm I have identified.
12. I note that there is no objection from neighbours and the parish council, but this in itself does not mean that the current scheme is acceptable, as a lack of objection is not necessarily indicative of a lack of harm.

Conclusion

13. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and host property and so would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.
14. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Stewart Glassar

INSPECTOR