The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 April 2016

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPl MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13 April 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3805/D/16/3143966
3 Erringham Road, Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex BN43 5NQ

- 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 Darren Saxby against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref AWDM/1482/15, dated 7 October 2015, was refused by notice dated 18 January 2016.
- The development proposed is 2 storey side extension, and new loft conversion with rear dormer.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 2 storey side extension, and new loft conversion with rear dormer at 3 Erringham Road, Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex BN43 5NQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. AWDM/1482/15, dated 7 October 2015, subject to the following conditions:

   1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later three years from the date of this decision.

   2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan, 15171/P102 Revision P4 and 15171/P103 Revision P3.

   3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated within a residential street comprising a variety of dwelling types and designs. No 1, adjoining, has been extended to the side with alterations to its roof which currently unbalances the pair of semi-detached properties as a whole. I noted on my site visit that both nos 5 and 7 Erringham Road have also been extended to their sides in different ways.

4. I acknowledge that the extension would be constructed right up to the boundary with no 5, but then both nos 1 and 5 have also been built up to their respective

boundaries and, therefore I consider this to form part of the prevailing pattern of development in the immediate area.

5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Residential Extensions Development Control Standard No. 3 – Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings (1996), highlights that side extensions should be set back at least 1m from the side boundary. It goes on to state that this is particularly important in the case of two storey extensions, since if adjacent dwellings were both extended up to the side boundary, it could create a terracing effect which would 'destroy' the existing character of the area. In this particular case, the adjacent dwelling at no 5 is stepped significantly back from the appeal property and, therefore, no terracing effect would be created as a result of the proposal.

6. I acknowledge that the sense of space between the two properties would be reduced and that the proposal would extend the roof to form a gable, which would bring the house right up to the boundary at full two storey height. However, by virtue of the staggered relationship between the two dwellings, I find that the proposal would not have an unacceptably harmful impact upon the character of the area and would certainly not be destroyed by the proposal. In addition, I consider the set-back and setting-down of the extension's roof would not cause an awkward junction with the main roof of the host dwelling, as extended, and would ensure a degree of subservience in its appearance.

7. Therefore, I consider that the proposal would not be unduly harmful to the character and appearance of the area and the proposal complies with Saved Policy AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan (1996) which requires extensions to existing houses to be designed so that, amongst other things, the design and materials are sympathetic to both the original dwelling and the area in general. I also find that the proposal complies with one of the core planning principles as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 17), which is to always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Other Matters

8. I note the concerns raised by the third party with regard to the construction of a roof terrace along the back of the property, but this feature was removed as a result of amendments to the drawings and do not form part of the proposals that are now before me.

Conclusion and Conditions

9. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

10. Other than the standard time condition, the Council has suggested a condition requiring the external materials to be used in the construction of the extensions to match those of the existing building. In the interests of the character and appearance of the surrounding area, this is an appropriate condition. In addition, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, a condition requiring that the development is carried out with the approved plans is imposed.

C J Tivey INSPECTOR