Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 March 2010

by C J Anstey BA(Hons) DipTP DipLA MRTPI

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

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
19 March 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/D/10/2121185
21 First Avenue, Lancing, West Sussex, England, BN15 9QG.

- 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 & Mrs Pacifico against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref ADC/0405/09, dated 13 October 2009, was refused by notice dated 25 November 2009.
- The development proposed is to build above an existing flat roofed garage to provide an additional bedroom and a second toilet.

Decision

1. For the reasons given below I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

2. The effect on the appearance of No 21 First Avenue and on the street scene.

Reasons

3. No 21 First Avenue is an end of terrace, two-storey, hipped-roof house, with an attached flat-roofed, single-storey garage to the side. At present the property has a pleasing appearance and positively contributes to the street scene. The appeal proposal, however, would create a sizeable and prominent two-storey, flat-roof extension to the side of the house. In my view the proposed flat roof would not sit comfortably with the existing hipped-roof of the dwelling and would appear awkward and incongruous. As a result the overall appearance of No 21 would be changed for the worse. Furthermore the lack of harmony between the existing house and the new addition would detract from the street scene of this part of First Avenue. The set-back of the proposal from the front and rear elevations and the use of matching render and fenestration would not disguise the harm identified. Although I am aware of other similar extensions in the area to my mind they only serve to demonstrate the unfortunate visual impact of extending houses in this manner.

4. I conclude, therefore, that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the appearance of No 21 First Avenue and on the street scene. Consequently the scheme is in conflict with the objectives of *Policy AH7* of the *Adur District Local Plan* which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that extensions are sympathetic to both the original dwelling and the area in general. In addition it is contrary to the Council's *Development Control Standard No 3: Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings* which indicates that the roof of a side extension needs to be in keeping with the existing dwelling which, in most cases, will

mean a pitched roof. These findings constitute compelling grounds for dismissing the appeal. None of the other matters raised, including the personal benefits that would accrue, local support, energy efficiency arguments, or the unavailability of matching roof tiles, outweigh the considerations that have led to my decision.

Christopher Anstey

Inspector