



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 23 September 2021

by J Reid BA(Hons) BArch(Hons) RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L3815/D/21/3277260

8 Beach Road, Selsey PO20 0LU

- 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 Bradley Frost against the decision of Chichester District Council.
 - The application Ref SY/21/00218/DOM, dated 26 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is Front Two Storey Extension with Pitched Roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for Front Two Storey Extension with Pitched Roof at 8 Beach Road, Selsey PO20 0LU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref SY/21/00218/DOM, dated 26 January 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) Notwithstanding drafting errors in the roof and west facing wall on the Proposed West Elevation and Proposed Roof Plan, the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: location plan, block plan, 2021052/PL/1, and 2021052/PL/2.
 - 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 dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect that the proposed development would have on the street scene in Beach Road.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is on the roughly south side of Beach Road, near where it divides to meet Manor Road. The semidetached appeal dwelling is situated at the roughly west end of a row of similar pairs of semidetached dwellings, although there is a detached infill type dwelling at 24 Beach Road. There are other dwellings of different types and styles to roughly west and opposite the site, but further east, beyond the tall well-vegetated strip on the opposite side of Beach Road, is another row of similar dwellings. The similar dwellings are mainly characterised by their simple hipped roofed form with a prominent shared front gable and a lower catslide roof.

4. The similar dwellings are generally set well back from Beach Road in front gardens (with or without parking spaces) beyond the footpath and its deep grass verge on the south side and in deeper front gardens on the north side. The appeal dwelling includes a gabled 2 storey side extension that is roughly half the depth of the dwelling and set well back from its front, so it has little visual impact in the street scene.
5. Along with several similar dwellings on both sides of Beach Road, the appeal dwelling has a recessed front facing porch with a circular window above it, below its catslide roof. However, instead of a porch facing the street, other similar dwellings include a modest flat roofed, or occasionally pitched roofed, single storey front extension, and there are gabled 2 storey front extensions at 22, 28, 36 and 38 on the same side of Beach Road, and at 47, 51 and 53 on the opposite side. Because all the similar dwellings are set well back from the road, and due to their generally modest depth and compact form, it makes little difference to the important spaciousness in the Beach Road street scene whether the dwellings have a single storey or 2 storey front extension or no extension at all.
6. The proposal includes a 2 storey gabled front extension in place of the recessed porch and catslide roof. Its ridge would be lower than the ridges of the main roof and shared front gable, so the proposal would be subservient to the existing dwelling. Whilst there are minor drafting errors on the plans that show otherwise, its west facing roof slope would be a continuation of the dwelling's west facing main roof slope, so the roof of the extension would be successfully integrated with the present roof, and its roof form would harmonise with the appearance of the dwelling. The compact form and siting of the extension would sustain the important spaciousness at the front, and the circular front facing first floor window would reflect the detailed design of the existing dwelling. Because there is a single storey front extension at 10, the largely balanced appearance of the semidetached pair would be respected.
7. The proposal would not be overly prominent in the Beach Road street scene because the building next door to roughly west includes a sizeable single storey part flat part pitched roofed front element. Also, as there are several other dwellings in the row on the same side of Beach Road with modest 2 storey front extensions, and there are similar 2 storey front extensions on the opposite side, the proposal would be readily assimilated into the street scene. So, due to its scale, form, siting, and detailed design, the gabled front extension would respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, and it would be sympathetic to the street scene in Beach Road. Moreover, the front extension would sustain the important spaciousness in the Beach Road street scene that contributes positively to the sense of place.
8. I consider that the proposed development would not harm the street scene in Beach Road. It would satisfy Policy 33 of the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029 and Policy 001 of the Selsey Neighbourhood Plan 2017 which seek a high standard of design and respect for the character of the surrounding area, chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) which seeks good design and sympathy for local character, as well as advice in the Chichester District Council Planning Guidance Note 3 Design Guidelines for Alterations to Dwellings & Extensions (Revised September 2009) which aims for front extensions to fit into the street scene, and for their impact on the character of the area, the property and neighbouring buildings to be assessed.

Conditions

9. The Council's suggested conditions have been considered in the light of the guidance in Framework paragraph 56 and Planning Practice Guidance. The condition identifying the approved plans is necessary for certainty, but it has been reworded to deal with the minor drafting errors on the plans. The condition to control external materials is reasonable and necessary to protect the character and appearance of the locality.

Conclusion

10. I have found that the proposed development would satisfy the Development Plan when taken as a whole. The other considerations in this case, including the Framework, do not indicate a determination otherwise.
11. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be allowed.

J Reid

INSPECTOR