The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2017

by Grahame Gould BA MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27th March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/W/16/3160986
1 Hamble Road, Sompting, West Sussex BN15 0ES

- 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 and Mrs Jenner against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref AWDM/0674/16, dated 22 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 August 2016.
- The development proposed is described as 'New dwelling attached to existing property. Rear extension to existing house (No 1).

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The development would involve the construction of an end of terrace house, to the side of 1 Hamble Road (No 1), and a single storey rear extension to the rear of No 1. This development would replace existing side and rear extensions. The Council has raised no objection to the siting or appearance of the rear extension and I see no reason to take a contrary view with regard to this aspect of the development and I shall therefore make no further reference to it.

4. No 1 and the other two storey houses within Hamble Road are of uniform heights and widths, with the only variation in the appearance of these houses relating to the type of first floor cladding that has been used. The new house would be around two thirds the width of No 1 and it would have a different fenestration pattern. I therefore consider that the proportions and design of the new house would be uncharacteristic of both No 1 and the other houses in Hamble Road and that it would have the appearance of being an afterthought, which would be detrimental to the area's appearance. While this house would have a two storey rear elevation that would project beyond those of Nos 1 to 5, I consider that the degree of the additional rearward projection would be of a scale that would not look out of place.

5. The new house would occupy a prominent location within the streetscene, given its end of terrace location and, at its closest point, it would be around 1.0 metre from the back edge of the footway in Hamble Road. Hamble Road

is characterised by houses and small flat blocks that have purposefully been laid out so as to have generous setbacks from the back edge of footways, resulting in a sense of space in the streetscene. While No 1's side garden is enclosed by a wall and fencing, I nevertheless found this garden area to be contributing to the sense of spaciousness within the streetscene, given that the area above the top of the boundary enclosure is essentially free from built development and is thus open. The new house would increase the built mass within the grounds of No 1 and I consider that this would amount to an unacceptable loss of spaciousness within Hamble Road's streetscene.

6. For the reasons given above I conclude that the development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. There would therefore be conflict with saved Policies AG1 and AH2 of the Adur District Local Plan of 1996 and paragraph 2.1 of the Council's Development Control Standard No.2[1] because this infill development would not enhance the appearance of the existing urban environment, having regard to the layout of the scheme and its surroundings. I also consider that there would be conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), most particularly paragraphs 17 (the fourth core planning principle), 56 and 58 because the development would not add to the overall quality of the area and would therefore not amount to good design.

Other Matters

7. I accept that the development would not be harmful to the living conditions for the occupiers of No 1 or neighbouring properties and that it would not have an adverse highway impact. I also recognise that in transportation terms this would be a sustainable location for a house. While those matters weigh in favour of the development I find them to be outweighed by the visual harm that I have identified.

8. The development would make a very small contribution to the supply of housing in the Council's area and some very modest social and economic benefits would therefore arise from this scheme. The appellant contends that the Council cannot currently demonstrate the availability of a five year supply of deliverable housing sites (HLS). Even if I were to conclude that there is a shortfall in the HLS of the scale suggested by the appellant and that the relevant policies for the supply of housing should be considered as being not up-to-date, I consider that the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh this development's benefits. I therefore find that this scheme cannot be considered to be a sustainable development for the purposes of the Framework and that it could not be made to be acceptable by imposing reasonable planning conditions.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

Grahame Gould

INSPECTOR

[1] Development Control Standard No.2 – Space Around New Dwellings and Flats