The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2017

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

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

Decision date: 8 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/D/17/3175866
50 West Way, Lancing, West Sussex, BN15 8LY.

- 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 and Mrs C. Jenkins against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref AWDM/0215/17, dated 9 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 25 April 2017.
- The development proposed is described as conversion of roof space including front dormer (hip to gable and rear dormer to be built within Permitted Development).

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development as set out in the bullet point above is: *conversion of roof space including front dormer (hip to gable and rear dormer to be built within Permitted Development).* I have noted that the local planning authority took the view when determining the application that the hip to gable and rear dormer would fall to be considered as permitted development. However, this is not a matter for me to determine and in this respect it would be open to the applicants to make an application for a certificate of lawful use. However, drawing 17624-01 Revision A was submitted with the planning application and subsequently amended to 17624-01 Revision C, this drawing shows the entire development proposed; it is therefore on the basis of this drawing that I shall determine the appeal.

Main Issue

3. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host property, the street scene and the character and appearance of the surrounding development.

Reasons

4. The property the subject of this appeal, 50 West Way, is a semi-detached hipped roof bungalow located on the corner of West Way and Boundary Road. The property is part of a planned development of semi-detached houses and bungalows.

5. A characteristic feature of the development is that the semi-detached pairs of bungalows on corner plots, as here, are set at 45 degrees to the principal road. This makes these properties particularly prominent in the street scene. In addition, while a number of the properties have been altered and extended, this and the opposite pair of semi-detached bungalows at the entrance to Boundary Road retain, virtually unaltered, their original hipped roofs.

6. The appellants propose replacing the hip with a gable and constructing large flat roofed dormers to both the front and rear roof slopes in order to convert the roof void to additional residential accommodation.

7. The proposed front dormer and rear dormers would extend almost across the full width of the roof, as enlarged by the construction of the proposed gable, and be built up to ridge level. Due therefore to their position on the roof, form and overall mass, they would both appear as large intrusive additions.

8. As I saw there are no other front dormers in the immediate area of this property that face the street and therefore the proposal would appear as an alien form of development here. Furthermore, when considered cumulatively with the proposed hip to gable alteration, it would have a further harmful visual impact on the symmetry of the semi-detached pair and the opposite pair on the other side of Boundary Road.

9. Owing therefore to the property's prominent siting on a wide corner plot, the construction of the front dormer, when taken with the hip to gable extension and rear dormer, would constitute an intrusive addition to the street scene, out of keeping with and harmful to the established character of the surrounding development.

10. I therefore conclude, in respect of the first main issue, that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the architectural integrity of the host property and thereby the street scene along with the character and appearance of the surrounding development. It would therefore conflict with saved Policies AG1 and AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan 1996 (LP), Policy 15 of the Submission Adur Local Plan 2016, the Adur District Local Plan – Appendix 11 Supplementary Guidance - *Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings* April 1996 and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) as they relate to the quality of development and the need for new development to be sympathetic to the character of the area and not detract from the existing local urban environment.

Other considerations

11. The parties have referred me to 80 West Way, a similarly positioned semi-detached bungalow, for which the Council granted planning permission for a front dormer. I understand that permission was granted there as it was intended that the new dormer would match that in the front roof slope of the other half of the pair, thereby recreating some symmetry of design. My attention has also been drawn to a number of single front dormers and hip to gable extensions on one half of other semi-detached pairs of dwellings in the locality, but mainly to the west of the appeal site. Whatever the background to those cases, having regard to the harm that would ensue if the roof here were extended and altered as proposed, the existence of similar developments elsewhere on nearby dwellings is not to my mind an appropriate justification for

permitting another here.

Conclusions

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including the fact the Council found that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers, I conclude that the proposal would not be in accordance with the development plan, when read as a whole, and that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR