



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February 2017

**by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 27 February 2017**

---

### **Appeal Ref: APP/P1425/D/16/3165220**

### **62 East View Fields, Plumpton Green, Lewes BN7 3EF**

- 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 L Evans against the decision of Lewes District Council.
  - The application, Ref. LW/16/0840, dated 29 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 24 November 2016.
  - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
- 

### **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 surrounding area.

### **Reasons**

3. I saw on my visit that the western end of East View Fields is a cul-de-sac but in the form of a loop that creates a central island accommodating half a dozen pairs of semi-detached houses. The appeal property forms half of one of these pairs with No. 60 and has its south western flank set well back from the highway footpath.
  4. When travelling along this part of East View Fields in either direction the openness as a result of the absence of two-storey development combined with the boundary hedges and greenery of the side gardens plays an important part in the spacious and verdant character and appearance of the area.
  5. The proposed extension would leave only a minimal gap to the south western site boundary. I acknowledge that the extension would be set down and set back to achieve the required element of subservience. This is a point in the scheme's favour and I have also noted the disadvantages for the appellant of the previously agreed extension.
  6. However, the absence of any meaningful gap between the two-storey side elevation and the boundary means that the proposed addition would represent a harmfully intrusive incursion into this relatively open area. With its position towards the middle of this side of the loop the eye would be drawn to a building that is uncomfortably close to the road, especially as the extension would then be read with the original dwelling and No. 60 as a single building mass.
-

7. As an incongruous projection into the street scene, the loss of symmetry with No. 60 would also become more apparent, notwithstanding the modest element of subservience. Furthermore, if the appeal is allowed it would be difficult for the Council in all fairness to refuse permission at some point in the future for a similar extension to the facing property.
8. I acknowledge that there are a variety of house types nearby, in particular the eye catching chalet style houses with high mansard roofs on the south side of the road. However, this variety does not to my mind justify what I consider to be the harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area as a result of the proposal.
9. This effect would conflict with Retained Policies ST3 and RES13 of the Lewes District Local Plan 2003, as included in the Lewes District Council & South Downs NPA Lewes District Local Plan Part 1 Joint Core Strategy (JCS) 2010-2030 adopted in May 2016. It would also be contrary to Section 7: 'Requiring Good Design' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
10. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

*Martin Andrews*

INSPECTOR