Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2009

by Doug Cramond **BSc MRTPI**

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

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
13 August 2009

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/A/09/2104323
7 Alandale Road, Sompting, Lancing, West Sussex BN15 0JU

- 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 Mrs Carol Diment against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application (Ref. ADC/0460/08), dated 16 September 2008, was refused by notice dated 11 November 2008.
- The development proposed is the removal of existing velux roof light and formation of new small, flat roof, dormer.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issue

2. I consider that the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and locality.

Reasons

3. Policy AG1 of the Adur District Local Plan (LP) seeks to prevent development from detracting from the local urban environment. LP policy AH7 is concerned with domestic extensions and alterations and aims, amongst other matters, to ensure sympathetic designs in relation to the original dwelling and the area in general.

4. This semi-detached bungalow property has a sizeable flat roofed dormer on its front elevation and the proposal would sit alongside this. The effect would be that very little of the main front slope of roof would remain and this would detract from the original qualities of the building. The dormer would appear squeezed into place not least because part of the ridge of a small hipped gable would have to be removed and a flat area created. This contrived and disproportionate scheme would not represent good design in my opinion and would be a visually unfortunate alteration in the streetscene. The proposed alteration would be obtrusive; it would be catch the eye and be visually jarring detracting from the original building and its surrounds.

5. I have considered all matters raised by the appellant. I sympathise with her wish for increased space within the relevant room and note the efforts that have been made to keep the proposed dormer relatively small in scale compared to the existing front dormer. The aggregate would, however, cover too great a proportion of the original roof form and detract from its shape. I do not consider that it would add beneficial balance. I have carefully considered

other roof alterations locally and noted design variations including some which are visually unfortunate but I did not see anything which made me consider that the proposal would sit comfortably in this locality.

6. No matters raised in support of the proposals would outweigh the fundamental concerns I have that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the appeal property and wider area. The development would be contrary to the relevant objectives within Policies AG1 and AH7 of the LP. Accordingly I dismiss the appeal.

Doug Cramond

INSPECTOR