The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 August 2022

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/D/22/3299611
37 Adur Avenue Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex, BN43 5NL

- 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 James Brown against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref AWDM/0377/22, dated 8 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 May 2022.
- The development proposed is the addition of first floor extension and new roof to form a two storey house.

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 locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a detached, hipped roof, bungalow with off street parking to the front and garden to the rear. It lies within a residential street which has both rows of bungalows and rows of two storey dwellings; the appeal site within the former. The locality is of established residential character and buildings and gardens come together to create a neighbourhood of pleasing appearance with an understated sense of suburbia. The appeal scheme is as described above.

4. Whilst the street does have variety in the scale and form of homes the appeal property, as noted above, is positioned within a row of bungalows. They are largely significantly unaltered at front roof level; the abutting property being an exception with its dormer albeit this is a larger semi-detached home. The scene along this row of bungalows is serene and generally visually uniform and regrettably the proposed first floor would markedly interrupt the pleasing rhythm. It would unbalance the streetscene, add inconsistency, and be an incongruous element on a roofscape which, in a good sense, is unremarkable. It cannot reasonably be compared with other two storey homes found locally which do not have bungalows to either side. In my assessment the appeal proposal would be aesthetically unfortunate, jarring on the eye, and damaging to the streetscene.

5. Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan is relevant. Amongst other matters this policy seeks quality in the built environment with schemes that respect local character and are appropriate in terms of scale, massing, height and architectural form. In all the circumstances I conclude that the appeal scheme would conflict with this planning policy.

Other matters

6. I do understand the Appellant's wish to increase accommodation, to look to family needs and adaptability, and I can see that thought has been given to materials and functionality. I appreciate that amenity impact upon neighbours and parking availability are rightly not cited by the Council. I see that the Appellant touches on what may be available via the 'permitted development' process but the fact is that I have a refused planning application which has been appealed before me and thus I need to consider this scheme via this process. I appreciate there are some other roof alterations in the locality. They do not all provide a positive contribution to the scene, they are not identical to the appeal scheme in form and certainly not in the immediate context of this run of homes, and, in any event, I must assess this case on its own merits.

7. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.

8. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered; the Council's policy which I cite mirrors relevant objectives within that document.

Overall conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable effects on the character and appearance of the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR