The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 March 2011

by E A Lawrence BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 March 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/D/11/2144496
2 Manor Road, LANCING, BN15 0EU

- 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 Trevor Craig against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref ADC/0319/10, dated 26 August 2010, was refused by notice dated 25 October 2010.
- The development proposed is additional roof dormers to side elevations and reducing the height of existing roof dormers.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issues

2. The first main issue is the effect of the proposal on the appearance of the host property and whether it preserves or enhances the character or appearance of North Lancing Conservation Area. The second main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 4 Manor Road, with particular regard to privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The dwelling occupies a prominent position on rising ground, on the outside of a bend and adjacent to Lancing Manor Park. As a single storey dwelling with a narrow frontage the existing dwelling appears modest in scale and generally blends in readily with the street scene. Although the existing large dormer additions are bulky and disrupt the simple lines of the roof, they are located towards the rear of the property, where they are partially screened from the street scene by the dwelling at 4 Manor Road and several trees within Lancing Manor Park.

4. Whilst the proposed dormers would be slightly lower than the existing dormers, they would be deeper and sited both to the rear and front of the property. Collectively the proposed dormers would totally dominate the roof of the dwelling and would appear prominent, top heavy and incongruous when viewed from the street scene and the surrounding area. In addition, the staggered depth of the dormers on the west side and the different sized windows in the east facing dormers would add to the awkward and incongruous appearance of the proposed additions.

5. I conclude on this main issue that the proposal would seriously detract from the appearance of the host property and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of North Lancing Conservation Area. As such the scheme would conflict with policies AG1, AB4 & AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan 1996. Together and amongst other things these policies seek to ensure that new development is to a high standard of design, is sympathetic to the original dwelling and preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the conservation area in which it is located.

Living conditions

6. The proposed dormer windows on the west facing roof-slope would face directly onto the side elevation of the dwelling at 4 Manor Road. Whilst I was unable to view the appeal site from 4 Manor Road, it was clear from my observations on the appeal site, that the proposed dormer windows would provide clear views into the two side facing ground floor windows at No.4. Given the close proximity of the windows to each other this would result in a material loss of privacy for the occupants of 4 Manor Road. Whilst I note that there is already a dormer extension on the west side of the appeal property, its glazing faces south and does not provide direct views into the ground floor windows at 4 Manor Road.

7. The Appellant has confirmed that they would be agreeable to the west facing dormer windows being obscure glazed. However this would not prevent overlooking from the windows concerned when they are open. In addition, it would mean that the western bedroom at the front of the property would have no outlook, which would result in poor living conditions within that room.

8. I conclude on this main issue that the proposal would unacceptably detract from the living conditions of the occupiers of 4 Manor Road due to increased overlooking. Accordingly the scheme would conflict with policy AH7 of the Local Plan which seeks to protect the living conditions of residents from an unacceptable degree of overlooking.

Conclusion

9. My conclusions on both main issues represent compelling reasons for dismissing this appeal, which would outweigh the benefits for the Appellant's family that would result from the provision of additional living accommodation on the site.

E A Lawrence

INSPECTOR