Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 March 2010

by C J Anstey BA(Hons) DipTP DipLA MRTPI

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

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
19 March 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/D/10/2122576
13 Springate Road, Southwick, West Sussex, BN42 4LF.

- 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 Darren Tanner against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref ADC/0459/09, dated 30 November 2009, was refused by notice dated 27 January 2010.
- The development proposed is a roof extension with rear gable to provide roof-space accommodation.

Decision

1. For the following reasons I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

2. The effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 11 Springate Road, with particular regard to immediate outlook, sunlight and daylight.

Reasons

3. No 13 Springate Road is a detached, hipped-roof bungalow with a sizeable, flat-roofed, single-storey extension across the rear elevation. The appeal proposal involves the construction of a new roof above the rear extension to provide living accommodation in the roof space (i.e. two bedrooms and a bathroom). I consider the design and appearance of the new roof would be in keeping with the existing dwelling and the surroundings and would not be prominent in the street scene.

4. I am concerned, however, about the impact of the proposal on the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of the adjacent semi-detached dwelling to the north, 11 Springate Road. In particular the only window serving No 11's kitchen is not far from the common side boundary and faces towards the single storey extension at the rear of No 13. In my view the proposed extensive roof area would unreasonably dominate the immediate outlook from this kitchen window and would be likely to reduce the amount of sunlight and daylight entering the kitchen. This would create an oppressive and unsatisfactory living environment in No 11's kitchen to the detriment of its occupiers.

5. I conclude, therefore, that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 11 Springate Road. Consequently the scheme is in conflict with the objectives of *Policy AH7* of the *Adur District Local Plan* which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that extensions and alterations do not result in the loss of natural light or have an overbearing

effect on neighbouring dwellings. These findings constitute compelling grounds for dismissing the appeal. None of the other matters raised, including the use of matching materials and the removal of an area of flat roof, outweigh the considerations that have led to my decision.

Christopher Anstey

Inspector