The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 March 2014

by E A Lawrence BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21 March 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/D/14/2212959
109 Old Fort Road, Shoreham-By-Sea , West Sussex, BN43 5HB

- 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 D Vandyke against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref AWDM/1410/13 was refused by notice dated 13 December 2013.
- The development proposed is first floor extension over existing ground floor.

Preliminary matter

1. On 6 March 2014 the Planning Practice Guidance (planning guidance) was published by the Department for Communities & Local Government. In relation to this Appeal the planning guidance refers to the design statements set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which are addressed in this decision.

Decision

2. The Appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the scheme on the host property and the locality.

Reasons

4. The site is located in a mixed residential area, which includes a diverse range of bungalows, one and half and two storey dwellings. The Appeal site is located in a prominent position adjacent to the junction of Old Fort Road and Winterton Way. The site comprises a particularly wide plot, which benefits from its open junction location and the open aspect to the coast to the south. The existing dwelling is part single and part two storey in height and there are a number of two storey dwellings within the immediate locality.

5. Having regard to these factors, in principle, the site could accommodate some form of two storey development. The acceptability of any scheme would however be dependent on the quality of the design of the resultant development and how the scheme physically related to the host property and the adjoining properties.

6. As stated in the NPPF new development should be visually attractive, respond to local character and reflect the identity of local surroundings. Consistent with

this, policies AG1 and AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan 1996 collectively require the design of extensions to be sympathetic to the original dwelling and that they should not detract from the local environment.

7. The Appeal dwelling comprises a traditionally designed bungalow with large flat roofed dormers on either side and a long single storey extension on the northwest side of the main dwelling. The eaves height of the single storey extension matches that of the original dwelling and it has a hipped roof, which minimises its scale and mass within the street scene.

8. With the Appeal scheme the proposed ridge height of the extension would sit between the ridge of the main roof and the flat roof of the adjacent dormer extension. More importantly the eaves height of the resultant side extension would be irregular and would fall between the eaves heights of the ground and first floor elements of the original dwelling. The juxtaposition and relationship between the proposed eastern eaves line, the adjacent dormer and the rear roof slope of the original dwelling would appear awkward.

9. The asymmetrical position of the proposed south facing balcony doors would exacerbate the unbalanced and contrived relationship between the proposed extension and the host dwelling. To the rear, the proposed first floor window would be out of alignment with and disproportionate in size to the existing rear first floor window.

10. All of these elements of the proposed extension and its relationship to the host dwelling would be clearly visible within the street scene. Overall, above ground floor level, the resultant dwelling would appear cluttered, badly proportioned and visually awkward.

11. The Appellant has referred to other two storey developments in the locality, although none are directly comparable to the Appeal scheme in relation to their design and appearance. Rather than setting a precedent for the Appeal scheme they highlight the need to assess each scheme on its individual merits and in light of the prevailing planning policies.

12. For these reasons I conclude that the proposed scheme would materially harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the locality. It would therefore conflict with policies AG1 and AH7 of the Local Plan and the NPPF.

Other matters

13. The proposed first floor extension would be sited close to and immediately to the south of 2 Winterton Way (No.2). There would be direct views from the proposed bedroom window into the front garden of No.2 and oblique views towards the front room windows. As a result the proposed extension would dominate the outlook from the front garden and be prominent in views from the front windows at No.2. This adds to my concerns in relation to the main issue.

14. Finally, I have taken into account the benefits that would result from the scheme for the Appellant and their family. The extension would provide additional habitable accommodation and outdoor amenity space. However these benefits would fail to outweigh the visual harm that would result from the scheme.

Conclusion

15. The conclusion on the main issue represents a compelling reason for dismissing this Appeal, which could not be satisfactorily addressed through the imposition of conditions.

E Lawrence

INSPECTOR