The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 August 2018

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 August 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/D/18/3204650
17 Ullswater Road, Sompting, Lancing BN15 9UF

- 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 Hedgecock against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref: AWDM/0023/18 dated 4 January 2018, was refused by notice dated 8 May 2018.
- The development proposed is side and rear extensions and formation of new gabled end roof to include two number side dormers to provide accommodation in roof void.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (Framework 2018) came into force on 24 July 2018 and from that date policies within the Framework 2018 are material considerations which should be taken into account in decision making. The Council's decision notice referred to the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 extant at the time of the decision, and both the Appellant and the Council have referred to it in their documentation. From reading all the information before me from the Appellant and the Council, I am satisfied that the revised Framework 2018 carries forward the main policy areas from the earlier Framework, as relevant to this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The proposal includes for extensions to the existing property together with raising of the roof and installation of side dormers. The Council's decision notice only refers to the proposed side dormers and the Officer's report confirms that it raises no objection to the other parts of the proposal, including the raising of the main roof. From my site visit and all the information before me I have no reason to take a different view. Accordingly, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed side dormers on the character and appearance of the existing property and on the street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a modest, detached bungalow in a predominantly residential area, mainly comprising detached and semi-detached bungalows, some of which have been altered and extended at roof level to include the

addition of dormer windows and rooflights. With a small number of exceptions, the orientation of the properties to the street frontage is either gable fronted, including the appeal property, or more predominantly, with front facing roof slopes and gable side elevations.

5. Whilst front dormers are found on a number of the properties with front facing roof slopes within the local area, I do not agree with the Appellant's contention that dormers on side roof slopes are also a characteristic feature and part of the general street scene. Indeed, from my site visit, I noted that the properties similar to the appeal property with gable fronts appear generally to have had limited alterations at roof level. The Council similarly commented that side dormers are not typical in the local area.

6. Although the proposed dormers on the appeal property would be set in from the roof edges, their scale in terms of both width and depth on both sides of the roof would, in my view, result in bulky and visually intrusive features and a top-heavy roof structure in relation to the modest scale of the property. The addition of dormers to both side roof slopes would maintain some symmetry to the property, but they would, and even taking into account the raised roof form, create a strong and dominant horizontal emphasis at roof level which would appear discordant with the more modest form and proportions of the property. The dormers would harm the character and appearance of the property. They would also be visually intrusive and incongruous in street scene views, including when approaching the property from either direction along Ullswater Road.

7. I therefore conclude that the proposed side roof dormers would harm the character and appearance of the existing property and the street scene. It would conflict with Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan 2017, the guidance in the adopted Development Management Standard No.2 *Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings* (DMS No.2) and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018, all of which seek a high quality of design which respects the local context. I have noted the Appellant's comments regarding the weight to be given to DMS No.2. I have not been provided with any information regarding its formal status but I agree with the Appellant that its content provides guidance to applicants and that is the basis upon which I have considered it.

8. The Appellant has contended that the side dormers could be constructed under permitted development rights and has provided elevations illustrating what he considers could be achieved. This may indeed be the case although there is no specific confirmation of this before me. However, there is no dispute that the scheme the subject of this appeal does require planning permission, and this is the scheme that I have considered on its planning merits. On the limited information before me in respect of the fallback position, I am not persuaded that planning permission should be granted for the scheme before me, given the harm I have concluded.

9. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including in representations, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR