
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2020

by John Woolcock BNatRes(Hons) MURP DipLaw MRTPI

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

Decision date: 05 October 2020.

Appeal Ref: APP/L3815/D/20/3249570

18 Cornerpiece, Coney Road, East Wittering PO20 8DA

- 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 Edwards against the decision of Chichester District Council.
 - The application No.EWB/19/02922/DOM, dated 26 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is entrance porch and loft conversion including 2 no. front dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. The appellant submitted a revised drawing during the appeal to correct a drafting error. It is this drawing, entitled Proposed Elevations & Typical Section (Drawing No.03 rev E) that I have considered in determining the appeal.
3. During the appeal the Council corrected The Site and Surroundings section of its Delegated Decision Report because this section had been erroneously copied from a report for another site.

Main issues

4. The main issues in this appeal are the effects of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the locality, along with the effects on neighbouring property concerning outlook, privacy and sense of space.

Reasons

5. Cornerpiece is a bungalow situated on a prominent corner plot at the intersection of four residential roads. The character of the wider locality is influenced by the mix of dwelling designs and materials, including single storey, chalet style and two storey dwellings, of traditional and contemporary designs. Some of the original bungalows have been altered or extended to provide first floor living accommodation, resulting in a variety of roof forms, including dormer windows and roof lights.
6. Front dormers on dwellings within the local area generally are of an appropriate scale for the roof and set down from the roof ridge. The dormer windows proposed in the appeal scheme would be large structures set high on the roof

slope, such that their roof ridge would appear close to the roof ridge of the building. This would give the building a top-heavy appearance. The front dormers would be placed symmetrically, but would not be subordinate to the main roof, and so would be contrary to the Council's Design Guidelines for Alterations to Dwellings & Extensions (Revised September 2009). The scale and siting of the dormer windows would detract from the overall proportions of the building resulting in an adverse impact on the street scene. Some of the features of the proposed development, such as the front porch and rear extension, would not appear out of place given the variety of dwelling styles in the immediate area. Nevertheless, I consider that the disproportionate size and prominence of the front dormers would result in a poor design for the scheme that would fail to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of the area. The proposal would, therefore, be at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework concerning design.

7. The existing bungalow sits within a large corner plot and the proposed upward extension would not materially intrude upon the sense of space currently experienced by neighbouring properties. The adjoining bungalow to the north of the appeal site, with which Cornerpiece shares a driveway, is set back further from Coney Road than the appeal bungalow. The juxtaposition of these buildings would mean that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable adverse effect on the neighbours' outlook. Similar considerations would apply for the relationship with the dwelling located to the rear of the appeal site, The Lookout, which faces towards Longlands Road. The proposed extension includes upstairs windows facing towards these neighbouring properties. However, the scheme proposes obscured glazing in the north and western elevations. It was apparent from my site visit that the window proposed in the southern elevation would provide oblique views of the adjoining rear garden that would be unlikely to result in an unacceptable standard of privacy for this residential area. Maintenance of the shared driveway is a private matter for the landowners.
8. Notwithstanding my favourable finding for the appellant concerning the likely effects on the living conditions of neighbours, the proposed design would harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the locality. I consider that the proposed loft conversion would be new residential development for the purposes of applying Policy 33 of the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029. The proposed development would be contrary to Policy 33 because it would not meet criteria 1. and 6. concerning design. This conflict would be sufficient to bring the proposal into conflict with the development plan as a whole. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Woolcock
Inspector