The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2017

by R J Marshall LLB DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 17 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/D/16/3164560
6, Rooksacre Cottages, West Street, Sompting, BN15 OAX

- 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 J Ariaman against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref AWDM/1330/16 dated 30 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 18 October 2016.
- The development proposed is first floor extension to consist of 2 bedrooms and shower room.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area which lies within the Sompting Conservation Area.

Reasons

Main issue

3. In the vicinity of the appeal site the Conservation Area is characterised by a mix of large two-storey detached houses and two-storey terraced properties along with flint/mortar walls along some of the frontages.

4. The appeal property is an end of terrace house in a row of 3 two-storey terraced properties. Over time the terrace has undergone a number of changes. The property at the other end of the terrace has been extended to the side and rear and has had various changes to the fenestration including a casement window on the ground floor. The middle terrace house has had a sizeable entrance porch constructed and a parking area created in the frontage. The appeal property has had a single story side garage extension erected with a hipped roof. Despite these changes the terrace retains an attractive appearance with its white rendered walls, slate roof and 2 distinctive chimneys.

5. The proposal is to build above the existing garage to provide a two-story extension with a hipped roof. There would be no direct connection between the pitched roof of the main house and that of the proposed extension other than by means of a narrow flat roof structure. As such the proposed extension

would have the appearance of an awkwardly freestanding element at odds with the character and appearance of the appellants' house and of the terrace as a whole. The extension at the other end of the terrace has a roof form far better integrated into the property to which it is attached. The harm I have found in relation to the proposed development is not lessened by it being of a lower height to the main building and thus subservient to it.

6. It is concluded that the proposed development would detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such it would be contrary to Policies AH7 and AB4 of the Adur District Plan (1996) which require extensions to be sympathetic to the original dwelling and which broadly reiterate the statutory test that in CAs new development should preserve or enhance their character or appearance.

Other matters

7. The neighbour of the adjoining house to the east is concerned that the proposed development would result in loss of light to his west elevation windows facing onto the appeal site. However, given the distance of the proposed extension from this property, and the absence of any shading diagrams, I am not convinced that such harm would result. However, lack of proven harm on this ground does not make the proposal acceptable given the harm found on the main issue.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

R J Marshall

INSPECTOR