The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 December 2020

by Guy Davies BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/D/20/3258136
4 Cheal Close, Shoreham-by-Sea BN43 5RQ

- 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 Chris McLelland against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application AWDM/0967/20, dated 24 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2020.
- The development proposed is front extension to provide study to allow quiet working from home.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a front extension to provide study to allow quiet working from home at 4 Cheal Close, Shoreham-by-Sea BN43 5RQ in accordance with the terms of the application AWDM/0967/20, dated 24 June 2020, subject to the following conditions:

    1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

    2) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: CH1011/001, CH1011/002, CH1011/003, CH1011/004 and CH1011/005.

    3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The area around the appeal site is characterised by detached bungalows and semi-detached chalet bungalows of post-war design fronting grass verge lined, concrete surfaced roads. The area has a low density, suburban character and appearance. The appeal property is typical of the area being a chalet bungalow with its front garden largely given over to hardstanding.

4. While the bungalows and chalet bungalows in the area have pitched roofs, I noted on my site visit that they are juxtaposed to a significant degree with flat roofed elements, mainly garages and front porches, at the sides and fronts of

the dwellings. These flat roofed elements, which are original or in some cases later additions, form part of the character and appearance of the area.

5. The main difference between the existing flat roofed elements and that proposed is that the appeal scheme would extend out from the front of the building. However, due to the chalet bungalow being set back in its plot, the proposed extension would be seen against the neighbouring bungalow, which sits further forward than the appeal building. This would reduce the prominence of it in public views from Cheal Close. Because of that relationship, I consider that the proposed extension would be no more prominent than some of the other flat roofed elements in the immediate vicinity.

6. The flat roof of the proposed extension would be a little higher than the eaves of the chalet bungalow. I accept that this might appear a little awkward, but there are examples where that has occurred, for example the side extension at 38 Cheal Close, which appears inoffensive. I consider the difference in height between the roof of the proposed extension and eaves line of the existing building would therefore not appear harmful.

7. I conclude that, due to it being viewed against the neighbouring bungalow and the significant presence of other flat roofed elements in the vicinity, the proposed extension would not harm the character or appearance of the area and would therefore comply with policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan, which requires new development to respect the character of the site and the prevailing character of the area.

Conclusion

8. I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Guy Davies

INSPECTOR