The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2020

by J Ayres BA Hons, Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 October 2020

Appeal Ref: D/4000773
8, Collingwood Court, Shoreham-by-Sea, BN43 5SB

- 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 J Hamilton against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref AWDM/1866/19, dated 24 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 January 2020.
- The development proposed is first floor extension over existing ground floor.

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 area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is one of a pair of semi-detached dwellings and has already been subject to a side extension. The proposal would infill the first-floor recess that sits across the front elevation of both the appeal dwelling and No 7, which is the other property in the pair of semi-detached dwellings. Whilst the proposal would be relatively small in scale when considered in isolation, it would further diminish the symmetry between these two dwellings. As a result No 8 would appear as an incongruous and overbearing property in respect of its relationship with the street scene and neighbouring property. This would be particularly harmful having regard to the relationship with No 7 as the recess that would remain on No 7 would also appear as an alien and discordant element of the design due to its retention.

4. Nos 5 and 6 Collingswood have been subject to a similar extension, namely the infilling of the recess. However, this is materially different as both properties were extended and therefore the element of symmetry on the front elevation at this point was retained.

5. The surrounding area is mixed with regards to the scale and mass of development which encompasses a mixture of flatted developments and dwelling houses. However, the physical intimacy is a distinct feature of the appeal property and No7, which is reinforced through the semi-detached nature of the houses. As such a varied character within the area generally does not justify harm to the character of the appeal dwelling and its neighbour.

6. I find that the proposal would result in an overbearing and discordant development that would be materially harmful to the character of the dwelling houses. As such it would conflict with Policy 15 of the Adur Local Pan 2017 which requires development to respect and enhance the character of the site. It would also conflict with Development Management Standard No. 2 "Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings" which requires extensions to be designed to successfully assimilated into the street scene and not unduly affect neighbours.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons above the appeal is dismissed.

J Ayres

INSPECTOR