
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2021

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 October 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/L3815/D/21/3276062

Sea Shanty, Charlmead, East Wittering PO20 8DN

- 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 A Tarrant against the decision of Chichester District Council.
 - The application Ref EWB/20/02714/DOM, dated 22 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is for dormer windows to north and south roof slopes.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a gable-fronted chalet bungalow which forms part of a recently constructed pair with Halcyon next door, located within a private residential estate. The existing architecture of the host property is quite simple yet pleasing to the eye and I consider that along with its sibling add value to the street scene.
4. Dormer windows have been constructed on a few properties within the locality and Brambles to the north east is one such example. Whilst it is not for me to comment on the appropriateness of these, or otherwise, ultimately each case must be assessed on its own merits.
5. I note that the site is within the settlement boundary of East Wittering and Bracklesham whereby the principle of residential development is acceptable. However, I have been provided with no evidence to demonstrate that the policies which are most important for determining the application are out of date. Consequently I consider that the 'tilted balance' in favour of sustainable development pursuant to paragraph 11.d) of the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') is not engaged.
6. I accept that the dormer windows have been designed in a manner that would not harm the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring dwellings, in terms of overlooking or overshadowing, and I note that the Parish Council raised no objection to the proposals. It is also quite clear that the appellant

sought to work with the local planning authority, by removing a balcony feature from the front elevation prior to their determination of the planning application.

7. I acknowledge that the insertion of the pair of dormers would allow for a good-sized master bedroom with en-suite shower room and dressing area at first floor level, however, with respect, I consider that this a case of form following function. I accept that the dormer on the northern elevation would be set back slightly from the principal elevation, nonetheless, it would still remain highly visible within the street scene and together their construction would run counter to the aforementioned simple architecture of the host dwelling. I say this notwithstanding that the dormers would be clad in materials to match those currently utilised on Sea Shanty.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed dormers would result in a visually incongruous development that would detract from the host dwelling and would give rise to harm to the character and appearance of the area. I find the proposal contrary to Policies 33 and 47 of the Chichester Local Plan 2014 – 2029 which together state that planning permission will be granted for new residential development where proposals meet high standards of design and that development should respect distinctive local character and sensitively contribute to creating places of high architectural and built quality. The proposal also conflicts with the advice as set out within the Council's Planning Guidance Note 3 – Design Guidelines for Alterations to Dwellings & Extensions (2009) which specifically states that dormer windows should normally be restricted to the rear elevation of a dwellinghouse where they have less visual impact, they should also not dominate the roof and that large flat roof dormers will rarely be acceptable.

Conclusion

9. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR