The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 19 October 2021

by William Cooper BA (Hons) MA CMLI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/D/21/3280618
22 Havenside, Shoreham-by-Sea BN43 5LN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Miss Samantha Brown against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref: AWDM/0830/21, dated 7 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 July 2021.
- The development proposed is a roof extension over existing flat roof single storey rear extension incorporating two side dormers clad in light blue composite cladding and an inset rear balcony.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a roof extension over existing flat roof single storey rear extension incorporating two side dormers clad in light blue composite cladding and an inset rear balcony, at 22 Havenside, Shoreham-by-Sea BN43 5LN in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: AWDM/0830/21, dated 7 May 2021, and the plans submitted with it, 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 drawings: 22H.BP Proposed Site Block Plan; 22H.EP Existing Floor Plans, Roof Plan and Elevations; 22H.LC Rev 2 Proposed Floor Plans, Roof Plan, Section and Elevations; 22H.LP Location Plan.

    3) The south-western side dormer windows and the secondary bedroom window in the north-eastern facing dormer shall be fixed and obscurely glazed and non-opening below 1.7 metres from finished floor level on installation, and retained as such thereafter.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are the effect of the proposed development on:

    - The character and appearance of the area; and
    - The living conditions of neighbouring residents, with particular regard to outlook, light and privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site comprises a detached bungalow with pale rendered walls, tiled hip roof and flat roof side extension, and its garden areas.

4. While hip roofed bungalows are relatively common in the neighbourhood, there is some variation in building and roof form with one, one and a half and two storey dwellings in the locality. A variety of hip and gable roof forms, and dormer styles contribute to this variety. Solar panels and dormer cladding further add a contemporary twist to the neighbourhood's evolved character. Garden landscaping also draws the eye. The above elements contribute to the architectural variation of the site's neighbourhood context.

5. The proposed dormers would sit appreciably below the ridgeline of the host bungalow's main roof, and above its eaves. On the south-western side, the existing side extension would help visually dilute the smaller gap between the dormer base and the building's eaves, and the larger of the dormer masses. Furthermore, the combined ground floor bulk of the bungalow and its extension would help to visually 'root' the proposed enlarged building mass, without it appearing discordantly top-heavy. The positioning of the dormers on the rear half of the building would limit their presence in the streetscene. Also, much of the original roof would remain visible. Together these factors would help the proposal assimilate within its architecturally varied context.

6. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would not conflict with Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan (LP) and the guidance in the Adur Development Management Standard No.2 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG). Together the policy and guidance seek to ensure that development complements local character.

Living conditions of neighbouring residents

7. The architecturally assimilating factors identified above would furthermore help the proposed extension to avoid appearing overbearing on outlook from neighbouring properties.

8. Moreover, given the orientation, separation gaps and garden space between the detached bungalows, light to neighbouring properties is not likely to be significantly reduced.

9. The proposed north-eastern facing side dormer windows would face towards the neighbouring bungalow at No 24. The south-western facing side dormer windows would face towards the neighbouring bungalow at No 20. Given the proximity of the properties, fixed obscure glazing to the proposed side dormer windows, to be secured by planning condition, would preserve the privacy of neighbouring residents. Clear glazing elsewhere in the extension would provide some outlook from within, without harming neighbouring privacy.

10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring residents, in terms of outlook, light and privacy. As such, it would not conflict with Policy 15 of the LP and the guidance in the SPG, which together seek to ensure that development safeguards residents' living conditions.

Conditions

11. The conditions suggested by the Council have been considered against the tests of the Framework and advice provided by Planning Practice Guidance. I have found them to be broadly reasonable and necessary in the circumstances of this case. I have made some minor drafting changes to suggested conditions in the interests of precision.

12. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, in order to provide certainty. A condition regarding glazing is attached to safeguard the privacy of neighbours.

Conclusion

13. The proposed development would adhere to the development plan and there are no other considerations which outweigh this finding. Accordingly, for the reasons given, the appeal succeeds.

William Cooper

INSPECTOR