Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 March 2009

by E C Grace DipTP FRTPI FBEng PPIAAS

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 2009

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/A/08/2091881
36 Bramber Close, Lancing, West Sussex BN15 0JA

- 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 R Remington & Ms M Kemp against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref ADC/0380/08, dated 25/7/08, was refused by notice dated 29/8/08.
- The development proposed is enlargement of existing front dormer.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

2. I consider the main issue in this case is whether the size and design of the enlarged dormer would result in harm to the appearance of the host dwelling and/or the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a bungalow situated in a prominent position on elevated ground at the end of a cul-de-sac. It already has a flat roofed dormer in the front elevation, but the appellants seek to enlarge it to provide a better proportioned bedroom. Having viewed the property internally, I can fully appreciate the need for this, having regard to the extent of sloping ceilings, whereby the bed is effectively within an alcove in the roof space.

4. The proposal would increase the width of the dormer from about 2.75m to 4.5m, whereby it would align with the outer edges of the two ground floor windows. It would also project forward in the roof slope by approximately 0.85m and thus increase in height by about 0.6m. It appears that the existing window would remain in place

5. Even though there are few dormers within Bramber Close, I saw that there is widespread use of flat roofed dormers throughout the area and indeed several of the size sought here or even larger. I therefore regard such features as forming part of the established character of the locality. However, I consider some are more aesthetically acceptable than others. In the case of the appeal proposal, the resultant dormer would have a high proportion of its external surface tile hung compared to the relatively small area of glazing. I note several of the examples of wide dormers referred to by the appellants incorporate two windows which assists in breaking up their bulk and reflects the rhythm of ground floor fenestration.

6. The Council's Supplementary Guidance relating to dormer extensions indicates they should respect the scale, character and appearance of existing dwellings and provides examples of dormers that are regarded as acceptable. Given that the proposed dormer would extend the full width of the two ground floor windows, I consider the utilisation of a single, relatively small central window would emphasise a lack of symmetry in the bungalow's fenestration. This, when combined with the extensive area of tile hanging beside and below the window would confer it with an appearance of undue bulk and top-heaviness that would be visually harmful to the dwelling.

7. Consequently, in view of the bungalow's prominent position, I find the size and design of the enlarged dormer would result in harm not only to the appearance of the host dwelling but also to the street scene.

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposal contravenes advice in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance and Policy AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan and that the appeal should be dismissed.

Edward Grace

Inspector