



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2020

by Andrew Bremford BSc (Hons) MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L3815/D/19/3240706

**Meadows Cottage, 10 Meadows Road, East Wittering, Chichester,
West Sussex PO20 8NW**

- 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 Jaqueline Redfern against the decision of Chichester District Council.
 - The application Ref EWB/19/02039/DOM, dated 6 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as the *'demolition of existing single storey entrance area and construction of 2 storey side extension moved further from the boundary. A new oak framed front porch will also form part of the development'*.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted for the demolition of existing single storey extension to south elevation and the erection of two storey side extension and front porch at Meadows Cottage, 10 Meadows Road, East Wittering, Chichester, West Sussex PO20 8NW, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref EWB/19/02039/DOM, dated 6 August 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 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 Location Plan Drawing No. 001; 1:500 Block Plan Drawing No. 002; 'Proposed Plans' Drawing No. 05; 'Proposed Elevations' Drawing No. 06; 'Roof Plans' Drawing No. 07.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. I have taken the description of development in the heading above from the planning application form. In my decision, I have amended the description of development so that it is more concise. This still reflects the planning application proposal. Furthermore, it reflects the description of development on the appellant's appeal form and the Council's refusal notice.

3. As part of the appeal, the appellant has submitted amended plans; Drawing Reference Nos 001 and 002. In summary, the amended plans show a revised red line boundary of the appeal site. I am satisfied that the amendment is of a minor nature and does not alter the development considered at the planning application stage. Consequently, I shall accept the amended plans for the purposes of determining this appeal and do not consider that any interested party would be prejudiced from a public consultation point of view.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located within a predominantly residential area and comprises a substantial detached two-storey property, positioned on the east side of Meadows Road. The area is characterised by mainly detached properties of varying sizes, a mix of single-storey, one-and-a-half storey and two-storey dwellings, of contrasting architectural styles and constructed of a mixed pallet of external materials. Properties have varying roof forms, and some have undergone alteration and extension.
6. The proposed development would demolish the existing single-storey side extension and erect a two-storey side extension and front porch.
7. The Council's Planning Guidance Note 3 'Design Guidelines for Alterations to Dwellings & Extensions (Revised September 2009)' (PGN3) seeks to resist flat roof extensions at first floor level. The proposed side extension would include a crown roof, the design of which incorporates an element of flat roof. I did not see any other properties in the locality with crown roofs, thus this roof form is not a characteristic of development in the vicinity of the appeal site. Nonetheless, the development would not appear as a flat roof extension in views from the public domain by virtue of the roof design incorporating a pitch on all visible elevations. Moreover, the inclusion of a proposed glazed lantern would add visual interest to the roof form.
8. Although the raised eaves height of the proposed side extension would be visible within the street scene, the overall height of the roof would be appreciably lower than the ridge height of the existing building. Thus, although the footprint and overall size and bulk of the proposal would be greater than the existing single storey-side extension, taking into account that the host building is substantial, it would nonetheless be subservient to it.
9. The proposed side extension would be set-back from the strong gabled principle front elevation of the building. Therefore, notwithstanding the prominence of the side (south) elevation of the property in views from the public domain, the development with its set-back position and roof height lower than the existing building, would not represent a visually incongruous or dominant addition to the host building.
10. Taking into account the wide variety in the architectural styles and size of properties in the locality of the site, in combination with the fact that the host building is substantial and has a noticeably strong gable end design, the proposed two-storey side extension would not detract from the overall appearance of the host building when viewed from the street.

11. The proposed front porch, by reason of its modest scale and proposed pitched roof in keeping with the pitched main roof of the host building, would not be visually dominant nor would it detract from the appearance of the appeal property. The proposed porch would fit in well with the style of the host building.
12. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building or the wider area. Consequently, it would accord with Policies 33 and 47 of the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029 (LP), chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and the PGN3 which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that the design of proposals have an acceptable appearance and respect the character of existing development in the surrounding area.

Conditions

13. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard three-year time limit condition. It is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. I have therefore imposed a condition to this effect. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, it is necessary to impose a materials condition.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Andrew Bremford

INSPECTOR