# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 March 2008

**by Michael Hetherington** BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI

**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:**
**26 March 2008**

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/A/07/2060745**
**21 Halewick Lane, Sompting, BN15 0ND**

- 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 K Fuller against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application ref. ADC/0363/07, dated 15 June 2007, was refused by notice dated 31 July 2007.
- The development proposed is: demolition of existing bungalow and erection of 4 three bedroom houses.

## Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

## Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effects of the proposal on:
   (a) the area's character and appearance; and
   (b) highway safety, with regard to its intended parking arrangements.

## Reasons

3. While there are a number of terraced properties in the site's wider vicinity, this side of Halewick Lane predominantly contains semi-detached dwellings. The terraced nature of the new houses would therefore appear out of keeping with the line of properties in which the proposal would be located. The resulting effect would be discordant and incongruous. Furthermore, the new block's proximity to the side boundaries of the appeal site would contrast awkwardly with the more generous separation distances that characterise development on this side of the road. This would appear cramped – an effect that would be amplified by the intended use of full height gables on each end elevation, in contrast to the mainly hipped roofs of the nearby semi-detached properties. For these reasons, I conclude that the area's character and appearance would be unacceptably harmed, contrary to relevant development plan policies, notably policies AG1 and AH2 of the Adur District Local Plan and policies LOC1, CH1 and DEV 1 of the West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 (SP).

4. Although not classified, Halewick Lane serves several residential areas and is used by buses. However, there are many existing accesses onto the road that require vehicles to either reverse into or out of driveways. I have seen no evidence that either their use, or the use of the appeal site's existing access, has created safety problems. Visibility in the site's vicinity is generally good and a nearby traffic calming scheme acts to reduce vehicle speeds.

Accordingly, and notwithstanding the site's proximity to the junction with Meadowview Road, I conclude that the scheme would not materially harm highway safety. It would accord with SP policies DEV4 and DEV5.

5. While I accept that the appeal site represents previously-developed land within an urban area, Planning Policy Statement 3: *Housing* (PPS 3) resists design which is inappropriate in its context or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area. In the present case, I consider that any benefits in respect of the more efficient use of land would be overridden by the harm outlined above.

6. I have concluded above that the proposed development would not materially harm highway safety. However, this is outweighed by the unacceptable harm that would be caused to the area's character and appearance. This is a compelling objection. I have considered all the other matters raised, but none change my overall conclusion that the appeal should not succeed.

*M J Hetherington*

INSPECTOR