
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2021

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U1430/D/21/3283401

43 Jameson Road, Bexhill, TN40 1EG

- 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 Daniel Phipps against the decision of Rother District Council.
 - The application Ref RR/2021/730/P, dated 25 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of roof space with dormers and change hipped end to gable ends front & rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the conversion of roof space with dormers and change hipped end to gable ends front & rear at 43 Jameson Road, Bexhill, TN40 1EG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref RR/2021/730/P, dated 25 March 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) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan Drg No 20/195/04, Block Plan Drg No 20/195/05 and Drg Nos 20/195/01, 20/195/02, 20/195/03 Rev B, 20/195/04 Rev A and 20/195/06 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces for the roofs of the dormer extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of 43 Jameson Road and the wider street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached bungalow with a hipped roof orientated with its ridge running perpendicular to the road. Jameson Road is entirely residential in character comprising an eclectic mix of mostly detached and

semi-detached properties. Although there are groups of similar styled dwellings there are equally as many others that are individually styled and unique. As such there is no sense of uniformity or regimentation to the street scene. The proposal would include altering the hip ends of No 43 to create gables to the front and rear, with gabled dormers to one side.

4. No 43 is unique amongst the mix along Jameson Road. The insertion of a gabled elevation within the street scene would merely reflect similar features that are prevalent on other properties. The newly formed front gable would undoubtedly be more dominant within the street scene than the current hipped roof form, but the building would maintain its forward building line consistent with others on this side of the road. It would not appear intrusive or alien within its setting.
5. The proposal would include a contemporary styled window within the apex of the front gable. In my assessment this would appropriately reflect the remodelled style of the dwelling, as would the use of horizontal cladding. This would simply add to the mix of facing materials in the area which ranges from tile hanging, painted render, brick, glazed coloured tiles, and even horizontal cladding to the gable at No 25, none of which struck me as incongruous or out of keeping.
6. The dormer windows would be reasonably large additions. However, they would be clearly subordinate within the side roof slope. Moreover, they would be deeply recessed behind the front elevation of the building such that they would not be seen as dominant within the street scene. The creation of an alternative roof shape would not be out of step with others nearby, many with recessed side projections in a variety of forms, albeit that in these other cases they are two or three-storey.
7. There would be some loss of space at first floor level between Nos 41 and 43. However, despite the large scale of some properties along Jameson Road, there is little separation between individual buildings in most cases. No 43 would not physically encroach nearer to the neighbouring dwelling and the space between them at first floor would remain typical of the gaps between many other properties in the immediate area. Although there are windows to the side of No 41, there is no suggestion or evidence to show that living conditions within the adjoining property would be adversely impacted.
8. Overall, whilst the proposal would remodel the form and appearance of No 43, the changes would be proportionate to the size and scale of the existing dwelling resulting in a building that would sit comfortably within the mixed context of its setting. As such, I find no conflict with criteria (i), (iii) or (vi) of Policy DHG9: *Extensions, Alterations and Outbuildings* of the Council's Development and Site Allocations Local Plan, which require, amongst other things, extensions and alterations to dwellings to avoid harm to the amenities of adjoining properties, to not detract from the character or appearance of the street scene, and to be physically and visually subservient to the building. The proposal would comply with parts (i), (vi) and (vii) of Policy OSS3: *Location of Development* and part (iii) of Policy OSS4: *General Development Considerations* of the Council's Core Strategy (CS) insofar as these relate to an area's character. I am also satisfied that there would be no conflict with CS Policy EN3: *Design Quality* which requires high quality design or with the

National Planning Policy Framework's objectives for achieving well-designed places.

Conditions

9. A condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary as this provides certainty. Given my findings relating to the use of cladding, a materials condition is only necessary to ensure that the tiles used for the dormer extensions match the existing roof, which is necessary in the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, I conclude that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of No 43 or the wider street scene. Accordingly, having regard to all other matters raised, and in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR