The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 April 2017

by C Jack BSc(Hons) MA MA(TP) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19th May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/D/16/3167787
48 Sedbury Road, Sompting, Lancing, West Sussex BN15 0LN

- 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 and Mrs Gill against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref AWDM/1359/16, dated 2 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 November 2016.
- The development proposed is a loft dormer extension and internal alterations.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. 48 Sedbury Road (No 48) is a semi-detached bungalow located in a predominantly residential area. Most other properties in the road are semi-detached bungalows, a significant number of which have accommodation in the roof facilitated by a wide variety of dormer extensions to the front and/or rear. No 48 has existing accommodation in the roof with a relatively modest, centrally positioned, flat-roof dormer at the front, and a wider dormer at the rear.

4. It is proposed to widen the front dormer almost to the edge of the roof on one side and set a little further in on the other side, adjacent to the attached property. By the Council's measurements, the width of the front dormer would increase from approximately 2.2m to 7m. A small increase in the width of the rear dormer is also proposed however, the Council's concerns principally relate to the proposed front dormer.

5. The proposed front dormer would be nearly full width and set, as the existing dormers are, only very marginally down from the main ridge. It would be of flat-roofed, boxy design and would be sufficiently large that it would be the dominant feature of No 48 when viewed from the road, obscuring a large amount of the original roof. For these reasons, the new dormer would be inconsistent with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) 'Development Control Standard No 3 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' and would fail to respect the scale, character and appearance of the existing dwelling.

6. I note that the existing roofscape of Sedbury Road and other roads nearby is varied, including multiple roof extensions of differing scales, types and materials such as at Nos 27 and 52. I further note that a number of examples are larger or more prominent than the dormer proposed, and I accept that roof extensions, including front dormers, form an element of the general visual character of the area. Notwithstanding, dormers similar to, or larger than, that proposed not represent a majority presence on buildings in the locality and therefore do not form an overriding component of the existing character and appearance of the area.

7. Therefore, I consider that these other examples, whether permitted development, subject to historic or recent consents or otherwise, do not constitute a precedent of any significant weight in favour of allowing this appeal. Moreover, I consider that the presence of such dormers at nearby properties serves to demonstrate that large box dormers are, generally, unsightly and harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with saved Policy AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan 1996 (LP), which among other things seeks to ensure that extensions to houses and bungalows would be sympathetic to the original dwelling and the area in general. It would also conflict with saved Policy AG1 of the LP, which among other things sets out that within built-up areas development will normally be permitted subject to other LP policies and where it would not detract from the existing local urban environment. The proposal would also conflict with the SPG, the relevant requirements of which are set out above.

9. The proposal would further conflict with emerging Policy 15 of the Submission Adur Local Plan 2016, which seeks to ensure high quality development that among other things would respect and enhance the character of the site and the prevailing character of the area and , where relevant, accord with relevant criteria set out in the SPG. I have afforded Policy 15 moderate weight in light of its emerging status.

Conclusion

10. For these reasons, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Catherine Jack

INSPECTOR