The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2012

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15 June 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/D/12/2172460
2 Park Lane, Southwick, BRIGHTON, BN42 4DL

- 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 Anthony Kennedy against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref AWDM/1035/11 was refused by notice dated 10 February 2012.
- The development proposed is two storey extensions and rear dormer over first floor bedroom.

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 whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Southwick Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. Two storey detached and semi-detached period dwellings, with uncluttered hipped and gabled roofs, together with staggered building lines, wide roads and Southwick Green contribute to the character and appearance of the heritage asset, the Southwick Conservation Area. The Appeal dwelling, with its traditional features and modest and uncluttered proportions and appearance is consistent with and contributes positively to this character and appearance.

4. Policy AB4 of the Adur District Local Plan 1996 states that extensions within conservation areas will be required to be of a high standard of design, such as to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the particular conservation area. Policy BE6 of The Southeast Plan has similar objectives. These policies are consistent with the advice in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance – *Southwick Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Strategy 2009* (SPGSCA) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

5. The Appeal dwelling occupies a prominent position adjacent to the junction of Park Lane and Victoria Road and close to Southwick Green. The dwelling projects closer to the highway than the adjacent dwellings to the west and there is a wide gap between the Appeal dwelling and the dwelling at 4 Park Lane. Due to these factors the southern and western elevations and roof-

slopes of the Appeal dwelling are particularly prominent within the street scene.

6. The two modest sized extensions on either side of the projecting westerly wall would respect the building lines and the catslide roof of the existing dwelling. As a result they would blend in satisfactorily with the host dwelling and the street scene.

7. Conversely the proposed dormer extension would interrupt the catslide roof and would appear awkward and cramped sited so close to the chimney. It would appear bulky, out of scale and totally out of character with the roof of the existing dwelling and is not a characteristic feature in this part of the conservation area. The resultant roof would appear cluttered, unbalanced and would seriously harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings.

8. I conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Southwick Conservation Area, contrary to policy AB4 of the Local Plan, policies CC6 & BE1 of The Southeast Plan, SPGSCA and the NPPF. It would also conflict with policies AH7 and AG1 of the Local Plan and the Council's SPG Development Control Standard No.3 – *Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings*. Amongst other things these policies and advice seek to ensure that new development is sympathetic to both the host dwelling and the area in general.

Other matters

9. The proposed extension would be lower than the main ridge of the dwelling and would not project further into the garden than the existing projecting westerly wall. At the same time there is an open gap between the Appeal dwelling and the dwelling at 4 Park Lane. As a consequence the proposal would not have a materially adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of 4 Park Lane due to loss of sunlight, daylight or privacy.

10. The concerns relating to parking, highway safety, noise, smell, the intensity of the development and health issues have been taken into consideration, but do not add to the conclusion on the main issue.

Conclusion

11. Whilst I have found in favour of the Appellant on some points, the conclusion on the main issue amounts to a compelling reason for dismissing this Appeal, which could not be satisfactorily addressed by the imposition of planning conditions.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR