



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2024

by N Perrins BSc (Hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26.02.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L3815/D/23/3331284

Linden Lea, 49 Salthill Road, Fishbourne, West Sussex PO19 3QD

- 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 & Mrs Huggett against the decision of Chichester District Council.
 - The application Ref: FB/22/02347/DOM, dated 14 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 24 July 2023.
 - The development is for the demolition of existing detached garden store, construction of two storey side extension and lean-to, and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing detached garden store, construction of two storey side extension and lean-to, and associated works at Linden Lea, 49 Salthill Road, Fishbourne, West Sussex PO19 3QD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: FB/22/02347/DOM, dated 14 September 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) Other than the materials used in the construction of the external surfaces, the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans ref: DPA-01 Revision 02.
 - 2) Within two months of the date of this decision, the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The materials shall match as far as possible the existing materials used on the host dwelling. The external materials agreed shall be installed within three months of the date of the local planning authority's formal written approval.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description of development on the Council's decision notice is different to that on the planning application form. I have used the Council's description in the heading above as it more accurately describes the development, albeit have omitted reference to a garden store / garage as this is not included on the plans before me.
4. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in December 2023. I have not considered it necessary to invite observations from the main parties as regards any relevance, this is in view of the determining issues at play.

5. I note from the information before me, and as observed on the site visit, that the development has already been constructed and the planning application sought retrospective planning permission.

Main Issues

6. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and wider area.

Reasons

7. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling located on the corner of Salthill Road and Newport Drive. The character of the area is residential comprising a wide range of dwelling types, sizes and styles.
8. The development as built comprises a two storey side extension with hanging tiles and a gable end pitched roof. I have reviewed the planning history including a previous planning permission for a two storey side extension with a hipped roof ref: FB/20/01576/DOM. This is a material consideration that establishes the principle of a two storey side extension. Whilst it included a slight set back from the host property, I am satisfied that the appeal development is not materially different in terms of its scale, bulk and mass up to eaves level and therefore acceptable in this regard in terms of impact on the character and appearance of the area.
9. The key difference in terms of scale, bulk and mass is, therefore, the roof design. In this regard, the host property has a gabled ended roof, which the extended part replicates albeit with a lower ridge height. The appeal development is, therefore, subservient to the host dwelling. This subservience results in a development that does not appear as unduly large or out of place with the host dwelling in terms of scale, bulk and mass.
10. Whilst twin gabled properties are not prevalent in the area, the roofscape character in the locality comprises a wide and eclectic mix of styles and types; the prevailing character of roofscape is therefore a distinct lack of uniformity. In this context, the twin gable design is no more visually intrusive in terms of scale, bulk and mass than what already exists in the area, even with it being on a relatively open corner plot. Accordingly, the development's scale, bulk and mass does not result in material harm to the character and appearance of the area.
11. I do, however, find that the materials that have been used with terracotta colour hanging tiles creates an unduly discordant relationship with the host property and how it appears in the street scene. This discordance is highlighted by the property's position on a corner plot, which can be seen from public views in the immediate vicinity of the site. I note the appellant has highlighted that hanging tiles were approved under the previous planning permission. However, that was a different scheme to the development before me and proposed a less tiled area than what has been used on the extension as built. I, therefore, conclude that the materials on the external surfaces of the extension as built should match as far as possible the original dwelling in order for a visually acceptable development to be achieved. This could be secured by condition.

12. For the reasons given above, the development does not cause unacceptable harm to the character or appearance of the existing building or the wider area. Consequently, the development accords with Policies 2 and 33 of the Chichester Local Plan 2014-2029 and Policy D1 of the Fishbourne Neighbourhood Plan 2014-2019, which expects development to have the highest standards of design, respect and respond to the character of the surrounding area and site and use good quality materials that complement the existing palette of materials used in Fishbourne.
13. The development is also consistent with Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Council's Planning Guidance Note 3: Design Guidelines for Alterations to Dwellings & Extensions (Revised September 2009), which seek to ensure that developments are designed to be sympathetic to local character.

Conditions

14. I have considered which planning conditions are required having regard to the tests contained in Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). As the development has been substantially completed it is not necessary to include the standard time limit condition. However, it is necessary to include a condition that specifies the approved plans in order for clarity and precision over the scale, type and form of development that is approved by this decision.
15. It is also necessary to require that the external surface materials match the host property to ensure an acceptable visual appearance of the development. I have included a condition to require these details to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority so they can retain control over the quality of materials to be installed. I have included time limits for both the submission of the details and subsequent installation following the local planning authority's approval to ensure the development can be completed as soon as possible.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, the development subject to conditions is consistent with the policies of the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that would lead me to a different conclusion. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

N Perrins

INSPECTOR