The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 October 2018

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th October 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/D/18/3207894
28 East Meadway, Shoreham-by-Sea BN43 5RF

- 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 Dave Radford against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application, Ref. AWDM/0508/18, dated 3 April 2018, was refused by notice dated 12 June 2018.
- The development proposed is the raising of the front pitched roof with a side dormer.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the raising of the front pitched roof with a side dormer at 28 East Meadway, Shoreham-by-Sea in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. AWDM/0508/18, dated 3 April 2018, subject to the following conditions:

   1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision;

   2) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. 01; 02 & 05;

   3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the street scene of East Meadway.

Reasons

3. I saw on my visit that the street scene of East Meadway has no clearly definable pattern or rhythm, as it is comprised of a wide range of dwelling types, designs, sizes, materials and sitings. The appeal dwelling is one half of a semi-detached pair with projecting front gables and there is currently a pleasing balance and overall symmetry between the two halves of the building. (The roof extension to accommodate the existing rear loft conversion at No. 28 is only glimpsed in side views from the east).

4. The Council's concern is that the proposal would have an adverse effect on this symmetry and be unsympathetic with the existing building, the proposed dormer in particular considered as being too dominant and an alien feature in

the street scene. I acknowledge that in a road of such variety, the preservation of a contrast in the form of a symmetrical pair of dwellings is a worthwhile and legitimate planning objective.

5. However, in this case the appeal scheme has two different elements and the precise effect of each on the host building merits closer scrutiny. Firstly, there is the raising of the roof of the gable to match the height of the rearward part of the dwelling and the introduction of a front window facing the road. In my view, the increase in roof height would be slight, and sufficiently modest not to be noticeable in comparison with that of the front gable to the other dwelling in the pair. The new front window will clearly be seen but again this would not materially affect the overall symmetry, especially as there is already a difference between the two dwellings in the form of the four roof lights in the front roof slope of No. 28.

6. Turning to the proposed dormer, I acknowledge that it would be of a substantial size and take up much of the most forward half of the flank roof slope. However, it would only be seen in the context of the bulkier and higher gable end of the large detached house at No. 30 next door, and I consider that this would significantly alleviate any harmful perception of a roof extension too large for its immediate setting.

7. As regards the symmetry with the other half of the semi-detached pair, because the dormer would be on the eastern roof plane it would be difficult to read with the currently unaltered projecting front gable of the paired neighbour. Indeed, when approaching from the east it would be impossible to see the equivalent area of roof of the neighbouring dwelling, and the same applies in the approach from the west. Furthermore, opposite the front of the pair of dwellings it is doubtful whether there is any vantage point from which the eye would be drawn to the fact that one of the outer roof planes had had a dormer added and the other had not. Even if I am wrong on this point, the front view of the small area of the side of the dormer relative to the whole of the building (both dwellings) would be insufficient to harmfully affect the otherwise pleasing perception of a largely symmetrical pair.

8. Overall, I conclude that the appeal scheme would not have a noticeably adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the street scene of East Meadway. There would therefore be no harmful conflict with Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan 2017; DM Standard No. 2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' and Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

9. I shall therefore allow the appeal. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is needed for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. A condition requiring matching external materials will safeguard visual amenity.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR