Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2010

by Sheila Holden
BSc MSc CEng TPP MICE MRTPI FCIHT

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:
6 October 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/D/10/2133678
81 Old Fort Road, Shoreham, West Sussex BN43 5HA

- 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 Steve Roddis against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref ADC/0164/10, dated 26 April 2010, was refused by notice dated 3 June 2010.
- The development proposed is a two storey extension to east flank.

Decision

1. I allow the appeal and grant planning permission for a two storey extension to the east flank of 81 Old Fort Road, Shoreham, West Sussex BN43 5HA in accordance with the application Ref: ADC/0163/10, dated 26 April 2010 subject to the following conditions:

   1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.

   2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the layout and details shown on the following approved plan: Drawing No 11,432 dated April 2010.

   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.

   4) The windows in the eastern elevation of the extension hereby permitted shall be fixed shut and fitted with obscure glazing and shall be permanently retained in that condition thereafter.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Old Fort Road is a long straight road characterised by residential dwellings which vary from modest blocks of flats and small bungalows, typical of the early and mid 20th century, to very modern and highly individualistic homes. With the exception of the distance that most of the properties are set back from the road there is little uniformity or rhythm to the street scene.

4. No 81 has some fine and distinguishing features. These include a pitched and hipped roof with glazed cobalt-blue roof tiles, an attractive front balcony and arched ground floor windows. The house has already been extended with a small two-storey addition attached to the side and rear which has a pitched roof whose tiles match the main dwelling. There is also an entrance portico on the western side of the house which has a pitched and hipped roof with the distinctive roof tiles. The appeal proposal, which is a revision of a previously refused scheme (Ref: ADC/0323/09), is a two storey extension on the eastern side of the house.

5. The Council's Development Control Standard No 3: *Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings* (DCS) sets out guiding principles to ensure that extensions are in keeping with the character of the existing dwelling. In particular it suggests that two-storey extensions on dwellings with a pitched roof which are visible from the street should also have a pitched roof. However, in this case there is already an extension which does not integrate with the host property in the way envisaged by the DCS due to its position towards the rear of the building. The flat roof of the extension proposed for No 81 would sit alongside the main roof of the house. The pitched roof of the existing extension would be visible to the rear of the new construction. In these circumstances the use of a flat roof to link together the different parts of the building is an appropriate design solution since it would avoid the need to disrupt either of the existing roof forms.

6. The inclusion of an arched window the ground floor and the decorative pilasters, which would mirror the profile of those on the front balcony, would also assist the integration of the extension with the host property. The proposed extension would be set back from the front elevation and set in 1m from the boundary with No 83. It would therefore appear subordinate to the main dwelling and the gap between it and the adjoining bungalow would, in my view, be sufficient to avoid it appearing cramped or creating a terracing effect.

7. In addition to these factors it seems to me that the proposed individualistic style of the appeal proposal is acceptable in the context of the surrounding varied street scene and where flat roofs feature in a significant number of the dwellings. For these reasons I conclude that the proposed extension would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area and would comply with saved Policies AG1 and AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan which seeks to ensure that development respects it setting.

Other matters

8. The neighbours at No 83 have expressed concerns about the effect of the proposal on their living conditions, particularly in relation to loss of light and privacy. As the extension would be set in from the shared boundary and the front elevation there would be no adverse effect on the amount of daylight reaching No 83. In my view the position of the extension in relation to the windows of habitable rooms would not result in it appearing overbearing.

9. I note the appellant's intention to provide obscure glazing in the windows facing No 83. This can be secured by an appropriate condition and would overcome the neighbours concerns about overlooking. The plans do not

indicate any intention to provide access to the flat roof and to do so would require alterations to the roof which would in all likelihood require planning permission. I consider concerns about the use of the roof as a balcony are therefore unfounded. Matters relating to the effects of the construction of the extension on the foundations of other dwellings are not matters for me to consider in the context of this appeal.

Conclusions

10. The Council has not suggested any conditions other than the standard time limit and matching materials. Otherwise than as set out in this decision and conditions, it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of good planning. I have also imposed a condition to secure obscure glazing in the windows of the eastern elevation of the extension to protect the living conditions of the occupants of No 83.

11. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

Sheila Holden
INSPECTOR