The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 October 2020

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/D/20/3249623
19 Grinstead Avenue, Lancing BN15 9BH

- 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 Darren Boyd against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref AWDM/1561/19, dated 13 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 January 2020.
- The development proposed is a '*Roof extension to form third floor with south facing roof terrace with metal balustrade. Replacement of existing wall tiles with navy aluminium wall tiles to North and South elevations. Associated alterations to windows and doors.*'

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue of this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area

Procedural Matters

3. As the description of development varies between the documents submitted for the purpose of this appeal, I have used the description of the development from Adur District Council's Decision Notice and the appellant's Grounds Of Appeal Statement, as it has been used by both parties and more accurately describes the proposed development.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a 3 storey flat roofed town house that is located towards the middle of a terrace of identically designed and finished properties. The houses in this terrace have had some minor alterations and ground level extensions, including to the front, however, there are no roof extensions and they retain a coherent Mid 20th Century design aesthetic. This includes a common orthogonal design with a standard height to the flat roof, strongly expressed vertical brown brick party walls that divide the houses in the terrace, identical earth coloured hung tiles to the spandrels on the front and rear facades and white brick/tile to the parapet .

5. The proposal would add an extension to the rear of the roof, which would extend the rear elevation in the same plane above the existing white parapet level, with a roof terrace towards with safety balustrade set back from the front

elevation. When combined with the proposed replacement of the existing earth tile cladding with a blue aluminium tile, the proposal would result in a significant change to the form and especially finished appearance of the appeal property.

6. Although, when considered in isolation, the proposal would update the appeal property, without shifting away from the design principles of its Mid 20th Century aesthetic, however, this would result in the appeal property appearing taller with a different roof form and with differently coloured spandrels in a different material and finish than that of its neighbours. The proposal would, therefore, stand in contrast to the currently identical properties that make up the terrace within which it sits. This would interrupt the current harmony of this row of town houses that is an important part of the contribution that these properties make to the appearance and character of the local area.

7. The proposed extension and alterations would be apparent in views of the terrace from the front, rear and obliquely when viewed near to and from within the wider townscape, from both public and private vantage points. The proposal would, therefore, not only differentiate the appeal property from its neighbours, but would also appear as an addition and alteration that would be obtrusive, overly dominant and incongruous when viewed in concert with neighbouring houses. For this reason, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the terrace and the wider street scene and townscape.

8. Consequently, the harm that I have identified would conflict with Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan, which seeks to ensure that development proposals respect and enhance the character of the site and the prevailing character of the area, with particular attention being paid to the architectural form, height and materials. Furthermore, the proposal would be contrary to paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which seeks to ensure that development is visually attractive, adds to the quality of the area and is sympathetic to its character.

Other Matters

9. I accept that the appellant wishes to modernise the dwelling and accommodate their needs into the future. The proposal would also slightly increase the size and standard of living space within the house and I do afford these matters weight. However, such matters are outweighed by the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

10. With the presumption in favour of sustainable development and paragraphs 8, 9 and 11 of the Framework in mind, I confirm that adverse impacts of granting permission in this case would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR