Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 June 2025

by JJ Packman MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/D/25/3365139
81 Hillrise Avenue, Sompting, BN15 0LT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mrs Denise Woollard against the decision of Adur District Council
- The application Ref is AWDM/1583/24
- The development proposed is first floor side and rear extensions

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter

2. The description of development on the application form does not appear to reflect the development applied for. For clarity I have taken the description of development from the Council's decision notice. The appellant's appeal form also makes reference to the updated description of development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property comprises a three bedroom, semi-detached chalet bungalow with accommodation in the roof space. The property has already been significantly extended with front and rear dormer windows, and a single storey rear extension with roof lanterns.

5. The property is situated in an established residential area. The surrounding area is characterised by semi-detached and detached residential properties with a variety of roof forms. There is some commonality in terms of materials and building heights, but also some variety as properties have been adapted and extended over time. There are numerous examples of front and rear dormer windows, front porch extensions and rear extensions, but the examples I saw appeared broadly in proportion to their host dwellings.

6. The proposal is to create an additional bedroom and a larger bathroom at first floor. A dormer extension is proposed that would wrap around the rear and side of the dwelling at first floor level. The bedroom would project from the current dormer and over the single storey extension (necessitating the removal of some of the roof

lanterns), the bathroom would be partly accommodated within the existing dwelling with the remainder over the ground floor porch. The rear projection would be off centre.

7. The proposal will appear awkward and glaringly unbalanced. The proposed rear dormer extension will protrude from the existing dormer to create a significant expanse of flat roof, visible from the side elevation and partially visible from the street. The total length of flat roof from the front elevation through to the rear will be longer than the footprint of the original dwelling, subsuming its original form. The projections created by the proposed extension will result in a disjointed and incohesive design, especially when viewed from the rear.

8. Given this, it is considered that the proposed extension would have an unacceptably harmful effect on both the host dwelling and the street scene, contrary to Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan (2017) which requires development to be of a high architectural quality. Neither would the proposal accord with Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings Supplementary Planning Guidance which requires roof extensions to respect the scale, character and appearance of existing dwellings or the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture.

Other Matters

9. I note the appellant has provided examples of other developments locally, none of these appear to be directly comparable. The proposal should therefore be determined on its own merits.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

JJ Packman

INSPECTOR