



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 October 2021

by J Somers BSocSci (Planning) MA (HEC) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C3810/D/21/3277542

15 The Plantation, East Preston, BN16 1LD

- 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 Carl Merrett against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref EP/22/21/HH, dated 2 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear extension and loft conversion with rear dormers and side gables.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appeal proposal contains a number of elements. As the reason for refusal only concerns the proposed additions and alterations to the roof, I have only addressed these elements within this letter.

Main Issue

3. On this basis, the main issue is the effect of the proposed alterations to the roof on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding locality.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located along The Plantation, a small estate of formally laid out speculative housing which appears to date from the late twentieth century. The dwellings within the estate are detached and are one and a half stories in height with some dwellings having accommodation within the roof space. The dwellings contain many similar design elements with hipped roof forms, brick construction which presents a symmetry within the estate in terms of design, placement and use of materials which presents a characteristic low scale form of development.
5. Travelling along The Plantation the vegetated setbacks and gaps in and around dwellings places an emphasis of greenery and spaciousness in and around dwellings. This green and spacious experience extends to the road edge with hedges being the predominant front boundary treatment leading onto a grass verge which has no footpaths that widens the carriageway and adds to the sense of spacious, well vegetated, and low scale character. These positive qualities reinforce the elements that make up the local character and distinctiveness of the locality. Whilst there is evidence in the surrounding area of dormer roof extensions, I disagree with the applicant's Statement of Case

- (SoC) that these limited examples are part of the positive qualities and characteristics of the area.
6. The appeal site displays a number of positive qualities which are experienced within the street scene, and appears to be one of the original properties of the estate. The building has the characteristic low scale form and hipped roof design of the locality and there remains a sense of spaciousness with visual gaps around the property which together with the design of the appeal building help in retaining the low scale and spacious character of the area.
 7. In undertaking extensions to existing buildings, the LP Policy D DM1 lists a number of design principles to be taken into account such as appearance, impact, innovation, and adaptability, amongst others. LP Policy D DM4 is specific to alterations and extensions and requires that development has a number of characteristics that enable the proposed scheme to sympathetically integrate with its surroundings, being visually subservient to the main building, and respecting visual gaps where these are part of the characteristics of the area, amongst others. Policy 3 of the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan (NP) seeks that a consideration is given to massing, height, scale, density and also seeks that when new rooms are created in the roof space, that the height and basic form of the roof is not altered.
 8. The proposal would elongate the ridge to both sides of the property in order to 'square-off' the hipped roof and contain two large dormers to the rear of the roof. The proposed extensions could not be considered to be subservient and would remove much of the original component of the roof form which would introduce a large amount of visual bulk and massing which would subsume the existing roof form of the building.
 9. The applicant's SoC notes examples of dwellings¹ in the vicinity where dormer windows and hip to gable extensions have taken place and in the applicant's opinion make these elements characteristic of the area and form a precedent for the proposed scheme. Whilst I have not been presented with the details of each of the cases and how the considerations are similar to the appeal scheme, the noted schemes do not appear to present the same overall width or visual bulk as the appeal proposal. The presence of these scheme are rather limited and are not characteristic of the area. The examples do however illustrate how such schemes can disrupt and cause harm to the positive qualities of the area and would not be sufficient justification to cause additional harm to the character and appearance of the locality as a result of the appeal proposal.
 10. I also note discussion in the applicant's SoC with regards to a potential fallback position where roof alterations could be undertaken under permitted development rights. Whilst this may be the case, what could be constructed under permitted development rights is materially smaller, and would not present the same massing and visual bulk as the proposed scheme. As such, I do not consider the fallback scheme would provide sufficient comparisons or justification for the acceptability of the proposed scheme.
 11. The proposed scheme would not be subservient to the host dwelling which is a specific consideration of LP Policy D DM 4 and would be overly large and inauthentic to the architectural authenticity and integrity of the host building. The scheme would subsume the existing dwelling and erode much of the

¹ No. 32 Vermont Drive; No.s 5 & 14 The Plantation, No.1 The Croft; 14 Hazelmead Drive;

characteristic roof form and would be disproportionately large when viewed within the street scene which is a specific consideration of LP Policy D DM1 and Policy 3 of the NP. Taken as a whole, and in conclusion of this matter, the proposed alterations and extensions to the roof would cause unacceptable detriment towards the architectural authenticity and integrity of the existing building and cause harm towards the character and appearance of the surrounding locality. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to the LP Policies D DM1 and D DM4, as well as Policy 3 of the NP as described previously.

Other Matters

12. I note comments from interested parties with regards to matters such as parking of cars in the cul-de-sac, and detriment caused to living conditions of surrounding occupiers as a result of loss of privacy from overlooking, noise, dust, strain on drainage system, and loss of light. Given that the scheme failed the development plan policies for reasons of design, there was no need to delve into any potential issues surrounding these additional matters.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

J Somers

INSPECTOR