The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2019

by R J Jackson BA MPhil DMS MRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/D/19/3237192
3 Tarragon Way, Shoreham-by-Sea BN43 6JG

- 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 Richard Moore against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref AWDM/0952/19, dated 16 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 August 2019.
- The development proposed is roof alterations including raising the roof and rear dormer.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. The appellant in describing the proposal effectively used bullet points including reference to a "Rear Extension (PD)". The Council in its decision notice revised this to sentence text, omitting reference to the rear extension. The appellant used the revised description on the appeal form although expanding it to set out a justification for the proposal.

3. The proposed plans show, in addition to the raising of the roof and dormer, a single storey rear extension. The application drawing indicates that as "proposed rear extension under permitted development". This appeal is not the forum to determine whether this would be, on its own, permitted development. Given the description upon which neighbours will have been consulted and the discussions on this appeal only relate to the raising of the roof ridge and dormer I do not intend to consider the rear extension further.

4. In light of the above I have used the Council's revised description in the heading.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a semi-detached two-storey dwelling. It is one of five pairs of such buildings on the western side of Tarragon Way. Tarragon Way forms part of a wider area of housing built at a similar time to the north of this part of Upper Shoreham Road. There are other similar properties in the local area. While there are a number of different house types and styles the

properties are all constructed from similar materials. There is a consistency in the area in that the original roof styles and ridges remain.

7. The proposal is to raise the ridge of the property, alter the pitch of the roof and install a flat roofed dormer in the rear elevation across the vast majority of the roof plane.

8. The Council has referred to its Adopted Standard No 2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' (DMS2). This sets out the principles used by the Council in assessing planning applications for this type of development. It stresses that any extension should be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and character of both the existing dwelling and the street scene generally. As these principles are in accordance with Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan 2017, which requires development to respect and enhance the character of the site and that of the area, and DMS2 was adopted at the same time as the Local Plan, I am able to give DMS2 significant weight.

9. The raising of the roof, even by the relatively small amount proposed, and the changing of the pitch of the roof would harmfully unbalance the pair of properties, detrimentally altering the consistent rhythm and appearance of buildings in the area, harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

10. Furthermore, the rear dormer, due to its size and form, would result in the building being top-heavy with a large box-like appearance. It would dominate the rear elevation harmful to the appearance of the dwelling and the area generally. Consequently, the proposal would represent poor design.

11. The appellant has referred to other large dormers further to the north along Tarragon Way. However, the properties are of a different style with their large roof-forms down to the top of the ground floor windows being part of the original design. These dormers at first floor level are part of the original design and do not provide a justification for this proposal.

12. As such the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan 2017 and DMS No 2 as set out above. It would also be contrary to paragraphs 127 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework which indicate that planning decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities for improving the character of an area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R J Jackson

INSPECTOR