The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 17 June 2021

by J Reid BA(Hons) BArch(Hons) RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/D/21/3274374
59 Downsway, Southwick, Sussex BN42 4WE

- 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 Mrs Annie Clarke against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref AWDM/0038/21, dated 11 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 March 2021.
- The development proposed is single storey lounge extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect that the proposed development would have on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is the southern 'half' of a pair of semidetached dwellings (the pair). The pair are part of a consistently planned estate where a range of dwelling pairs including some with shallow hipped and gabled projections are set back similar distances from the roads, and so they respect the established front building lines. Seen from the nearby streets, the symmetrical pair have the same form and fenestration pattern but with some different colours and finishes. Their projecting part tile hung gables are an important feature, and there are other pairs of similar design close by.

4. Due to the openness around the grassy space where the southern stretch of the Summersdeane loop splits to meet Downsway, the sloping landform, and their siting on the outside of the gentle bend in Downsway, between the handed pairs on either side, the appeal dwelling and the pair are prominent in the Downsway street scene and in the nearby roughly south westerly views down Summersdeane. Thus, the appeal dwelling, and the pair, are important to the sense of place.

5. The proposed flat roofed single storey extension would be set in from the common boundary with its pair at 61 and it would project in front, and to one side, of the gabled projection. Because the windows in the proposal would wrap around its south east corner, they would be misaligned with the first floor gable window in the upper floor. So, due to its unsympathetic form, siting and design, the proposal would unacceptably disrupt the form, character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and the pair. Because it would look

discordant and incongruous, the proposal would harmfully erode the sense of place.

6. As 2 and 4 Summersdeane are an asymmetrical pair, and the front extension at 2 Summersdeane predates current Development Plan policy, it provides little support for the harmful proposal before me. All other points in favour raised by the appellant including the aim to upgrade the existing dwelling have been considered. However, they do not alter the planning considerations that have led to my findings.

7. I consider that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and the surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan 2017 which seeks development of a high architectural quality and to respect and enhance the prevailing character of the area, guidance in the Adur District Council Development Management Standard No 2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings', and the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that development adds to the overall quality of the area and maintains a strong sense of place.

Conclusion

8. I have found that the proposed development would be contrary to the Development Plan when considered as a whole. The other considerations, including the Framework, do not outweigh that conflict.

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Reid

INSPECTOR