The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2022

by Michael Evans BA MA MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date:18TH January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M3835/D/21/3283568
3 Lavender Hill, Shoreham-By-Sea, BN43 6JB

- 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 Mel Humphrey, M J Humphrey Ltd, against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref AWDM/1113/21, dated 14 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 July 2021.
- The development proposed is described on the planning application form as: 'proposed extension to front dormer'.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect on the character and appearance of the locality and the pair of semi-detached dwellings including the host property.

Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a semi-detached chalet style dwelling. The pair of properties have front dormer additions extending across the overall building and set in from the side walls by a similar distance, giving a noticeably balanced and harmonious appearance with a pleasantly symmetrical character. Such houses are a common feature in the locality and give a significant degree of cohesion to the built environment, contributing positively to the streetscene.

4. The front dormer would be extended to the side, particularly close to the flank wall at no. 3, resulting in an undue contrast with the noticeably greater gap to the other end at the attached house. As a result, the development would unbalance the appearance of the pair of dwellings, comprising a discordant and disharmonious feature. Moreover, this adverse impact would occur in a fairly prominent position, relatively close to the footway and the junction of Lavender Hill with Rosemary Drive.

5. The Appellant contends that within the locality there are numerous other examples that show extended front dormers are not an unusual feature. However, only three cases are specifically identified. Furthermore, I saw at my site visit that these are relatively isolated and unusual instances and most similar pairs of dwellings have retained their original balanced appearance. I note that the example at 17 Rosemary Drive was built using permitted

development rights. This means that this is not a case where the Council has been shown to be unreasonably inconsistent in granting planning permission. In such circumstances these examples should not be afforded any significant weight in favour of the appeal and would not justify accepting such detrimental development.

6. For the above reasons, it is concluded that the character and appearance of the locality and the pair of semi-detached dwellings would be harmed.

7. Adur Local Plan 2017, Policy 15 intends, among other things, that development should be of a high architectural quality and respect and enhance the character of the site and the area in terms of matters such as proportion, form, size, scale and massing. Due to the above factors, there would be clear conflict with this policy.

8. The development would also be at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework. This indicates that decisions should ensure that developments add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character, which would not be achieved in this case.

9. Due to the harmful effects that would arise, it is determined that the appeal fails.

M Evans

INSPECTOR