The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2022

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date:25TH February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/D/22/3290295
36 Mill Hill, Shoreham-by-Sea, BN43 5TH

- 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 Ben Page against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application, Ref. AWDM/1707/21, dated 9 September 2021 was refused by notice dated 23 November 2021.
- The development proposed is a new front wall and gate 'part retrospective'.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of Mill Hill.

Reasons

3. I saw on my visit that the character and appearance of this part of Mill Hill is in large measure derived from the set back of the dwellings from the road on its eastern side and the presence of extensive open plan grass frontages. Whilst there are some hedges, shrubs and trees in front of some of the properties, these for the most part have a low profile and in any event make a positive contribution to the informal green areas.

4. However, the partially constructed walls (which are intended to provide a frame for the inclusion of grey horizontal fencing) and the hardstanding for parking project forward of the neighbouring boundary walls to within a footpath's width of the road.

5. Although not yet complete, this structure is wholly alien to the pleasingly green and rural character of Mill Hill. And with its height and formal enclosure of the frontage of No. 36 the structure would draw the eye as an inappropriate intrusion into the open, informal and green area that forms an essential element of this side of the road.

6. I have noted the comments in the officer's report as to the position of the proposed gates being an acceptable projection in an amended proposal. However, as the report says, '*this would still give rise to a prominent feature'* compared with that of the adjoining properties. I agree with this reservation and consider that in comparison with the neighbouring frontages it is both the

more urban and modernist form of the proposal in terms of wall height, design and any noticeable forward projection that would cause significant harm to the street scene.

7. For these reasons the development would be in harmful conflict with Policy 15 of the Adur District Plan 2017 and Government policy in Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

8. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR