St. Reg

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 December 2008

by Wm C Cunningham BSc(Hons) MA MCP 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:
26 January 2009

Appeal Ref: APP/M3835/A/08/2084104
93 Wiston Avenue, Worthing, West Sussex, BN14 7PS

- 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 Gavin Bashford against the decision of Worthing Borough Council.
- The application Ref WB/08/0503/FULL, dated 12 May 2008, was refused by notice dated 7 July 2008.
- The development proposed is to remove front and side walls of front garden to allow a cross-over from Wiston Road onto the front garden of Number 93 to allow for off-road parking.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the impact the formation of a fully hard surfaced frontage to the appeal property and the removal of existing garden walls would have on the street scene.

Reasoning

3. The appeal site is within an area that is characterised by similarly designed semi detached houses arranged in a regular pattern and set back between about 6m and 8m from the highway. Most of the front boundaries in the vicinity are defined by low brick walls that are broken only by regularly spaced pedestrian gates and shared vehicular driveways.

4. As clarified at my site inspection, the proposed development would include removing the existing low brick wall on the front boundary of the appeal site together with a similar wall that separates the front garden area of the appeal property from the shared vehicular drive between it and the adjoining premises to the west (No 95). Although details are not shown on the application plans, I understand the intention would be to pave the front garden area to provide parking space. Given the need to retain adequate space to allow pedestrian access to the front of the property, I consider the forecourt area would provide parking space for one car.

5. The proposed removal of the section of wall fronting the appeal property would reduce materially the enclosing impact made by the wall and would introduce a significant break in the regular pattern of walled frontage that is a characteristic of this part of Wiston Avenue. The proposed paving of the

forecourt to the appeal property would also remove the existing area of front garden, a landscape feature that is again a characteristic of the area. In this respect the proposed development would not comply with Policies DEV1(a(2(iii))) and CH1(a) of the West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 and the thrust of Policies BE1 and H16 of the Worthing Local Plan 2003 and would be unacceptable.

6. The appellant's objective to allow the family car to be parked off the highway is already met by the presence of a garage to the rear of the property. Extending the existing dropped kerb for the shared access a further 6m as proposed would result in the loss of an on street parking space that is currently available for all road users. I do not therefore consider the case made in favour of the proposal would outweigh the detrimental visual impact the appeal proposal would have on the street scene.

Other Matters

7. All other matters raised in the written representations have been considered. These include that details of how surface water from the proposed hard standing would be dealt with have not been provided as part of the appeal proposal. No evidence has however been presented to demonstrate that a sustainable means of disposing of surface water could not be provided as part of the proposed development, a matter that could be controlled by condition. These other matters do not outweigh the main considerations that have led to my decision.

Wm C Cunningham

Inspector