PB

The Planning Inspectorate

Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Direct Line:
Customer Services:
0303 444 5000

Email:
despatch.admin@pins.gsi.gov.uk

www.planningportal.gov.uk/planninginspectorate

Your Ref: AWDM/1483/14
Our Ref: APP/Y3805/D/15/3007550

Mrs D Johnson
Adur District Council
Planning & Development Services
Department
Civic Centre
Ham Road
Shoreham By Sea
West Sussex
BN4 6PR
14 May 2015

ADUR & WORTHING
19 MAY 2015
PLANNING SERVICES

Dear Mrs D Johnson,

Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Appeal by Mrs A Whitehead
Site Address: 25 Riverside Road, Shoreham-By-Sea , West Sussex, BN43 5RB

I enclose a copy of our Inspector's decision on the above appeal(s).

If you have queries or feedback about the decision or the way we handled the appeal(s), you should submit them using our "Feedback" webpage at http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/planninginspectorate/customerfeedback/feedback.

If you do not have internet access please write to the Quality Assurance Unit at the address above.

If you would prefer hard copies of our information on the right to challenge and our feedback procedure, please contact our Customer Service Team on 0303 444 5000.

Please note the Planning Inspectorate is not the administering body for High Court challenges. If you would like more information on the strictly enforced deadlines for challenging, or a copy of the forms for lodging a challenge, please contact the Administrative Court on 020 7947 6655.

The Planning Inspectorate cannot change or revoke the outcome in the attached decision. If you want to alter the outcome you should consider obtaining legal advice as only the High Court can quash this decision.

Yours sincerely,

Steve Adgey
Steve Adgey

Where applicable, you can use the internet to submit documents, to see information and to check the progress of cases through the Planning Portal. The address of our search page is - www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/appeals/online/search

The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 April 2015

by P Jarvis Bsc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 14 May 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/D/15/3007550
25 Riverside Road, Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex, BN43 5RB

- 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 Mrs A Whitehead against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref: AWDM/1483/14 dated 19 October 2014 was refused by notice dated 16 December 2014.
- The development proposed is the enlargement of roof with hips to gables and rear dormer.

Procedural Matter

1. The description used by the Council more accurately reflects the development proposed, therefore I will use their description "enlargement of roof with hips to gables and rear dormer and new front porch."

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the enlargement of roof with hips to gables and rear dormer and new front porch, in accordance with the terms of application ref: AWDM/1483/14 dated 19 October 2014, 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 hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1:1250 site plan; 1:500 block plan; drawing no. 12/717/01 (existing floor plans and elevations) and drawing no. 12/717/02B (proposed floor plans and elevations).

   3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external faces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host property and wider area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within an area which displays a variety of dwelling types and sizes. The dwelling on the appeal site is, however, one of a small row of six similarly designed and aged detached bungalows, which have steeply

sloping hipped roofs. However, the wider area displays a variety of roof styles, including gable ends and 'barn' hip ends.

5. The proposal would introduce a noticeably different roof shape within the group. However, the appellant argues that the group of existing bungalows are not of identical design nor are they of the same height, the dwelling on the appeal site being the lowest one. Detailed information has been provided to demonstrate this and to show that the relatively small increase in ridge height of 300mm would not exceed that of the highest in the group. In addition, I note that the site benefits from a lawful development certificate relating to the exercise of permitted development rights. This would enable the roof of the dwelling to be substantially altered to include the addition of full gable ends though would not involve the raising of the ridge height.

6. I have been referred to an earlier appeal on the site[1] but that appears to relate to a different design incorporating a greater increase in ridge height, fully pitched gable ends and larger rear dormer as well as a front dormer and large gable. The Inspector in that decision noted the consistent appearance of the group of bungalows and the positive and harmonious contribution made by them to the streetscene and concluded that the proposed gable ends would abruptly contrast with the hips and would be noticeably taller.

7. However, as noted above, the current scheme is a different design and whilst introducing a deeper roof, the 'half hip' ends would reduce the bulk such that overall the additional bulk would not be significantly different from the lawful scheme. The ridge height would be maintained at a height consistent with that of the highest bungalow in the group and the proposed design retains the subservient front projection. Overall, I do consider that it would be so disruptive to the appearance and character of the group as to be unacceptable. Nor given the variety of roof designs that exist in the immediate and wider area would it be detrimental to the visual amenities of the locality.

8. I therefore find that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or wider streetscene. It would thus accord with Policies AG1 and AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan (1996) which seeks to ensure that development does not detract from the local urban environment and that extensions and alterations to existing bungalows are of sympathetic design to both the existing dwelling and to the area in general. It would also meet the guidance in the Council's Development Control Standard No. 3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' which provides more detailed guidelines to ensure that extensions are in keeping with the appearance, scale and design of the existing dwelling and the area.

9. In addition to a condition to relate to the approved plans, the Council has suggested a condition to ensure the use of matching materials which I consider is necessary in the interests of visual amenity and good design.

10. I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR

[1] APP/Y3805/D/12/2182351