The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 February 2015

by P Jarvis Bsc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 5 March 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/M3835/D/14/2228797
13 Griffiths Avenue, Lancing, West Sussex, BN15 0HW

- 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 Smith against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref AWDM/1306/14 was refused by notice dated 21 October 2014.
- The development proposed is a two storey rear extension with pitch/crown roof, front dormer and loft conversion to provide 3 first floor bedrooms and additional ground floor kitchen diner with utility.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. The main issues are the effect on (a) the character and appearance of the host property and streetscene and (b) the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining properties.

Reasons

Effect on character and appearance

3. The property on the appeal site is a modest semi-detached bungalow, one of a number of similar semi-detached properties in the immediate area although there is some variation in their design. There are also some detached properties but they are predominantly of single storey height. Many have been extended and altered particularly at roof level to provide first floor accommodation.

4. The appellant has provided photos to illustrate various roof extensions that have been carried out to nearby properties. Whilst these include large front and side box dormers, which have completely changed the roof shape and are therefore unsympathetic and poorly related to the original dwellings, the majority of the roof alterations in Griffiths Avenue, which provide the more immediate context of the appeal site, consist of more modest sized dormers which are contained within the roofslope. In addition, the pitched roof front dormer on the attached property sits below the ridge and above the eaves leaving a good proportion of the original roofslope visible.

5. The proposed front dormer on the appeal property would be substantial in size, extending across almost the whole width of the roofslope and to the same height as the ridge. Whilst a small area would be retained above the eaves, I

consider that overall it would introduce an unduly dominant and overbearing addition that would fail to relate satisfactorily to the design and character of the existing dwelling. There is a property further to the south with a box dormer, but that is smaller and well contained within the roofslope such that the original form of the dwelling is not compromised.

6. The proposed rear addition is also substantial in size, and although it would be of reasonable depth, it would extend across the whole of the width of the dwelling to include a new barn hip at the end of a central flat 'crown roof'. These are features that are not characteristic of the host dwelling and the overall size and bulk of the rear extension would not reflect nor would it be sympathetic to the design and proportions of the original dwelling.

7. I note that the attached property has been altered with the addition of front and rear dormers and enlarged side gable with barn hip. The proposed alterations to the roof of the appeal property include a similar gable enlargement and thus whilst not entirely in keeping with the original hipped roof form, it does result in some symmetry with the adjoining property and thus would not be unacceptable.

8. However, overall, the proposed extensions would have a significantly harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and streetscene. This would conflict with Policy AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan (1999) (LP) which seeks to ensure that extensions and alterations to existing houses and bungalows are designed so as to be sympathetic to the original dwelling and area in general. For these reasons the proposal would also not satisfy policies of the National Planning Policy Framework which seek good design that adds to the overall quality of the area.

Effect on living conditions

9. The proposed rear addition would extend to the same depth as an existing rear conservatory on the attached property, No. 15. This conservatory has high level obscurely glazed windows in the flank elevation on the common boundary and a translucent flat roof. I was able to visit this property and viewed the appeal site from both inside and outside to assess the potential impact.

10. In my opinion, the proposed rear extension would be likely to have some effect on the light received by this conservatory as it would be to the south of it and sited right up to the common boundary with a higher roof. However, the extension would be of single-storey height, with eaves level to match the existing dwelling, and the roof would slope away from the common boundary. Therefore, in my opinion, this impact would not be significant. There would be rooflights in the roofslope facing towards this property, but with a finished internal height of 1.6 metres would not in my view allow any overlooking.

11. In terms of outlook, given that the nearest affected windows, including at the upper floors, are obscurely glazed and that the extension would not project beyond the rear elevation of the conservatory, I consider that it would not be unduly overbearing. The majority of the rear garden would not adjoin the proposed extension and therefore the impact would not be significant.

12. The other adjoining property to the south, No. 11, is set away from the common boundary and whilst there is an existing window in the flank facing elevation, it is my view that the impact would not be significantly harmful.

13. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining properties. There would thus be no conflict with LP Policy AH7 which seeks to ensure that extensions and alterations do not result in an unacceptable loss of natural light or have an overbearing or overlooking effect on neighbouring dwellings.

Conclusions

14. I acknowledge that the proposal would provide improved accommodation for the appellant, but for the reasons set out above I conclude that it would be unacceptable and therefore that this appeal should be dismissed.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR