



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 January 2021

by **P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 February 2021.

Appeal Ref: D/4001367

55 Kingston Lane, Southwick, Brighton BN42 4SJ

- 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 Jon Lee against the decision of Adur District Council.
 - The application Ref AWD/0583/20, dated 29 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two storey rear extension with second floor wrap around on southern boundary; basement excavation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene.

Reasons

3. The two storey dwelling on the appeal site is of individual design being of a symmetrical L shaped form with deep feature windows and constructed of red brick with a tiled hipped roof. The dwellings sits parallel with the side boundaries such that the left hand side of the building is further forward in the plot. A feature porch is located within the 'corner' of the front elevation with a projecting element at first floor level. There is an existing flat roofed rear extension.
4. The dwelling occupies a large plot with close boarded fence and mature trees to the front boundary such that only the upper part of the dwelling is readily visible in the street scene of Kingston Lane. However, the upper part of the dwelling can also be seen above the rear garden fence where it adjoins an area of open space that is located between the three storey flatted blocks in Meadway Court to the south.
5. The proposed extensions would be of flat roofed design with a low 'false' pitched edge. This would appear awkward and unsympathetic viewed against the hipped roof design of the host dwelling. The low false pitch design and lack of set back of the proposed side extension from the main built form of the dwelling would also serve to accentuate the width of the proposed side extension. As a result it would not appear as well-proportioned addition and would unbalance the pleasant symmetry of the existing dwelling.
6. The unsympathetic flat roofed design would continue over the whole of the rear element of the extension where it would be clearly visible from the adjoining

Meadway Court. In this context the proposed extensions would fail to complement the design and appearance of the existing dwelling, resulting in significant additions that would detract from, rather than be subservient and complementary to, the individual design and proportions of the host dwelling.

7. Overall, I consider that the proposals would appear as unsympathetic extensions that would fail to complement the unique and symmetrical design of the host dwelling. As a result it would fail to accord with Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan (2017) which seeks development of high architectural quality that respects and enhances the character of the site and its surroundings in terms of, amongst other things, proportion, form and detailed design.
8. It would also fail to satisfy the Council's Adopted Development Management Standard No. 2 (Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings) (2017) which provides detailed design guidance to support the above policy and which states that extensions should be designed to closely match the existing dwelling and its proportions and set back so as to appear subordinate.
9. I consider that the proposal would also fail to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), in particular paragraph 127 which seeks to ensure that development adds to the overall quality of the area, is visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

Conclusions

10. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR