Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 July 2010

by J M Trask **BSc (Hons) CEng MICE**

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:
9 July 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/D/10/2129881
Cobwebs, 7 St Nicolas Lane, Shoreham BN43 5NH

- 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 Les Baker against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref ADC/0135/10, dated 15 April 2010, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2010.
- The development proposed is a side conservatory.

Decision

1. I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission for a side conservatory at Cobwebs, 7 St Nicolas Lane, Shoreham BN43 5NH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref ADC/0135/10, dated 15 April 2010, subject to the following conditions:

   1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

   2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan;477/01.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the house and area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached house that has been designed to incorporate local features and there is a garage to the side. The proposed conservatory would be between the house and the garage and would wrap around the bay on the side of the house. While it would not be a particularly sensitive addition to the property there is a high brick wall and a shed on the boundary with Upper Shoreham Road which would shield it from view and little of it could be seen from St Nicolas Lane. Accordingly, it would not be unduly prominent in the area and therefore would cause little harm to the local environment and would not conflict with the requirements of the development plan.

4. The Council has suggested a condition requiring the use of materials matching those used in the existing house. However, little of the conservatory could be seen from the surroundings and I do not consider this to be necessary in the public interest. Otherwise than as set out in this decision, it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan for

the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning and I shall impose a condition to that effect.

5. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J M Trask

INSPECTOR