The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 November 2019

by L J O'Brien BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th November 2019.

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/D/19/3233901
13 Upper Kingston Lane, Shoreham-By-Sea, Sussex BN43 6TG

- 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 Neil Bradford against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref AWDM/0494/19, dated 25 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 May 2019.
- The development proposed is a two storey front extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider street-scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, No 13 Upper Kingston Lane, is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling situated on a residential street which hosts a variety of different dwellings as well as a park and community hall. However, in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site a number of very similar pairs of semi-detached dwellings, and some detached, are prominent. These dwellings appear largely unaltered at the front and all have an attractive, distinctive, flat roofed element set back from a brickwork double bay window with a hipped roof. No 13 is one such property and forms an integral part of the street-scene's distinctiveness in this regard.

4. The proposal is to extend the flat roofed element of the front elevation so that it projects in front of the bay window. This is to provide a larger bedroom and porch area.

5. The proposal would extend beyond the established building line of the semi-detached pair, unbalancing the appearance of the pair and eroding the symmetry which characterises the design of these buildings and the wider street-scene. The two-storey forward projection would alter the proportions of, and relationship between, the two distinct elements of the front elevation of the property by visually competing with the double storey bay window. The proposal would, therefore, appear as a discordant addition which would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider street-scene.

6. Whilst the appellant makes reference to the existence of other extensions to properties nearby, no specific details have been provided. No such examples are present on the semi-detached pair of which No 13 is part or the other similar properties nearby and, as such, any examples would be part of a different visual context. In any event, each case must be determined on its individual merits and the circumstances in each case are likely to be different.

7. I note that the dwelling is not listed or in a conservation area and acknowledge the appellant's efforts to create a sympathetic scheme by amending a previous proposal with the aim of ensuring the extension would respect the existing dwelling, particularly by incorporating a flat roof. I also appreciate the appellant's requirement for the improvements to their home in respect of the need to replace the flat roof, increase the size of the bedroom and improve privacy. Additionally, I recognise that no objections from neighbouring residents appear to have been received.

8. I have given careful regard to all of the above considerations. However, none are sufficient to dissuade me from the conclusions I have reached regarding the harm to local character and appearance.

9. For the reasons outlined above the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider street-scene. As such, the proposal would conflict with Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan 2017 (LP) which, amongst other things, states that development should respect and enhance the character of the site and the prevailing character of the area. The proposal would also fail to accord with guidance set out within the Adur District Council Development Management Standard No. 2 – Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings which states that in the case of semi-detached dwellings front extensions will only be allowed where the extension can be successfully assimilated into the street-scene.

10. The proposal would also be at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework which promotes high standards of design and states that developments should be visually attractive and sympathetic to the character of the area.

Conclusion

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

L J O'Brien

INSPECTOR