The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 May 2017

by Claire Victory BA (Hons) BPl MRTPI

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

Decision date: 26 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/W/17/3169736
Site adjacent to 57 Boundstone Lane, Sompting BN15 9QR

- 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 John Hunt against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref AWDM/1619/16, dated 9 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 December 2016.
- The development proposed is the erection of a three bedroom detached dwelling with new vehicular crossing.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in the appeal are:

    - The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
    - The effect of the development on the living conditions of adjacent occupiers with regard to outlook and loss of light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site forms part of the garden of No 57 Boundstone Lane, and lies to the north of the host property, with a frontage to the road. Although there are some flats opposite the junction with Cokeham Road, properties within the road are generally bungalows, interspersed in places with two storey dwellings.

4. No 57 forms a group of five bungalows in a row, with two 2 storey houses to the north of the appeal site. The plot width of No 59, the adjacent two storey house is 11.5 metres and plot width of No 57 excluding the appeal site is 13.5 metres. The appeal site would have a much narrower plot width of around 6.5 metres, and there would be only about 1 metre separation to each side boundary. Whilst the appellant contends that the dwelling would be modest in size and that there is no dominant style or scale of properties on Boundstone Lane, the narrow plot and vertical emphasis of the two storey dwelling would result in a cramped appearance, and thus the dwelling would not be in proportion with the scale of other properties in the street. Consequently it would be out of character with the surrounding area.

5. I therefore conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would be contrary to policies AG1 and AH2 of the Adur District Local Plan (LP) (1996), which require, amongst other things that proposals should create a pleasant place in which to live, in keeping with and which would enhance the local environment. It would also be contrary to Policy 15 of the submission Adur Local Plan (2016).

Living Conditions

6. There would be a gap of approximately a metre between the flank wall of the proposed dwelling and the properties on either side. This would be consistent with the requirements set out in the Council's *Development Control Standard No 2 – Space around new dwellings and flats* for a two storey house. Nonetheless, there is a window in the southern flank elevation of No 59 at first floor level which serves a bedroom, and the proximity of the proposed dwelling to this window and the height and depth of the dwelling means that it would appear unacceptably overbearing when viewed from this habitable window.

7. As the proposed dwelling would be located to the north of No 57, there would not be a significant reduction in light to windows within the flank wall of that property. However, the side projection of No 59, which serves a kitchen, has a sloping glazed roof along its length facing broadly south. Based on the evidence before me, including my observations at the site visit, the close proximity of the two storey dwelling would result in a material loss of light to this room, to the detriment of the living conditions of its occupants.

8. For the above reasons I conclude that the proposed dwelling would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 59 with regard to outlook, contrary to LP policies AG1 and AH2, insofar as they permit residential infill development providing it does not have an unneighbourly effect on existing dwellings.

Conclusion

9. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Claire Victory

INSPECTOR