The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 October 2012

by Michael Evans BA MA MPhil DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 1 November 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/D/12/2182351
25 Riverside Road, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex, BN43 5RB

- 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 A Whitehead against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref AWDM/0302/12 was refused by notice dated 31 May 2012.
- The development proposed is raising the roof, front and rear dormers and an enlarged front projection.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the streetscene and the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Reasons

3. Dwellings on both sides of the street in the vicinity often form small clusters of properties of a similar design. That at the appeal site is one of five adjacent bungalows that form such a group. These have a particularly consistent appearance, reflected in matters such as their roof form and height, making a positive and harmonious contribution to the streetscene. The main roof and front projection of the enlarged dwelling would have gabled ends. This would abruptly contrast with the hips of the neighbouring bungalows, in relation to which it would also be noticeably taller.

4. The extended property would reflect the variety of designs and heights found in the wider locality. However, it would be located in the middle of the grouping of similar properties in relation to which it would therefore most readily and immediately be appreciated. In consequence, it would unacceptably disrupt the cohesion and uniformity of the group of dwellings, appearing as a jarring and discordant feature. Vegetation, street furniture and parked vehicles, as observed at the site visit, would not have a sufficient physical presence to prevent this undue impact being readily apparent in views from the street.

5. The rear dormer extension would have a fairly minimal gap to the ridge, with those to the eaves and sides also being unduly restricted. It would have noticeably less space around it and appear appreciably bulkier than the illustration of an acceptable addition under paragraph 3.14 in Adur District Local Plan Appendix 11, Supplementary Planning Guidance, April 1996 (SPG),

Development Control Standard No. 3 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings. As a result the rear roof addition would appear unacceptably dominant, giving rise to a top heavy box-like appearance. This would conflict with the advice in the SPG where it is also indicated that a large amount of the original roof should still be clearly visible.

6. As a consequence of these factors, the streetscene and the character and appearance of the host dwelling would be harmed. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the aim of saved Policy AG1 of the Adur District Local Plan, originally adopted in April 1996, to prevent development detracting from the local urban environment.

7. The scheme that it is claimed could be implemented under permitted development rights would result in the enlarged dwelling being lower than now proposed without a forward gabled projection. Consequently, it would be noticeably less intrusive and have a significantly less detrimental impact on the streetscene. Therefore, the potential fallback position would not be as harmful and does not weigh in favour of the appeal as a significantly more damaging scheme might.

8. None of the other cases referred to by the Appellant concern properties within the group of similar bungalows and only two are in Riverside Road, one of which remains a hipped roof bungalow. None of these developments have therefore affected the group of similar bungalows, which provides the context against which the harm to the streetscene would occur. Furthermore, the full background and details of these cases have not been provided so that no meaningful comparison can be made with the current proposal, which must be considered on its own merits anyway.

9. It is intended that the development would incorporate measures to reduce the carbon footprint of the property such as a high standard of insulation and an air source heat pump. However, the improvement in relation to the existing property has not been quantified and there is no evidence that these improvements could only be achieved with such detrimental additions.

10. There have been no objections to the proposal from local residents but this is not a factor that in itself confers acceptability. No undue precedent for additional development would be set as any other proposals would need to be assessed in relation to their precise circumstances.

11. Taking account of the above and all other matters raised, because of the harm that would arise the appeal fails.

M Evans

INSPECTOR