



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 February 2022

by G Roberts BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10TH March 2022

Appeal A - Ref: APP/L3815/D/22/3290268

60 James Street, Selsey, PO20 0JG

- 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 & Mrs Chris and Karene Lambert-Gorwyn against the decision of Chichester District Council.
 - The application Ref. SY/21/03111/DOM, dated 22 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 December 2021.
 - The application sought planning permission for a two storey side extension over and beyond existing garage incorporating extension of existing rear balcony and introduction of new dormers.
-

Appeal B - Ref: APP/L3815/D/22/3290270

60 James Street, Selsey, PO20 0JG

- 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 & Mrs Chris and Karene Lambert-Gorwyn against the decision of Chichester District Council.
 - The application Ref. SY/21/03112/DOM, dated 22 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 December 2021.
 - The application sought planning permission for a two storey extension over and beyond existing garage and loft conversion incorporating extension of existing rear balcony and introduction of new rear mansard roof and new dormers.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A and Appeal B are dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. There are two appeals that differ only, I understand, in that Appeal A proposes four dormers on the rear elevation, whereas Appeal B proposes one dormer with a mansard roof extension on the rear elevation. I have considered each proposal on its individual merits. However, to avoid duplication I have dealt with the two schemes together except where otherwise indicated.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on the southern side of James Street close to where the road reaches a dead end and turning circle. The host property forms part

- of a small cul-de-sac of two storey detached properties. The front elevation to the host property faces onto the cul-de-sac, with its rear elevation and small rear garden facing onto the seafront. Beyond the boundary wall to the rear garden of the host property is a large grass bank and the promenade, which comprises a wide public footpath that runs parallel to the seafront.
5. Whilst the scale, form and design of the properties on James Street varies, the host property forms part of a small development that is relatively uniform in terms of its design, although the adjoining property to the southwest, 58 James Street (No.58) has been extended with a different pallet of materials. The host property, as with other properties on the seashore, is highly visible and very prominent from various public vantage points specifically from the promenade which on my site visit was very popular with walkers.
 6. The appeal proposal involves the construction of a two storey side extension over and above the existing garage that would incorporate an extension to the existing rear balcony. The proposed front elevations, in both appeals, shows the provision of three new dormers. On the proposed rear elevation to Appeal A four new dormers are shown, compared to one new dormer and a mansard roof extension shown on the rear elevation to Appeal B.
 7. Whilst, from the Council's Delegated Reports and their reason for refusals, its position in relation to the proposed two storey side extension (incorporating the extension to the existing rear balcony) is unclear, in my judgement, this aspect of the appeal proposal is broadly acceptable. The proposed extension is set back marginally from the main front wall to the host and marginally below the existing ridge to the main roof, and would be constructed from a similar pallet of materials to existing. Whilst I note that the extensions to No.58 have a greater set back and sit at a lower height relative to the main ridge, and in that respect are more subservient, on balance, I am satisfied that the design of proposed side extension would be acceptable.
 8. The size, width, scale and overall proportions of the proposed dormers on the front elevation, in both appeals, would, however, be excessive. They would dominate the front roof plane to the host, occupying a large part of the roof. The appearance of the roof, with these new dormers, would contrast markedly with that of its immediate neighbours within this small cul-de-sac, whose frontages comprise a single dormer located above the front entrance, an original design feature currently replicated on the host property.
 9. The proposed dormers would extend up to the existing ridge of the main roof, whereas traditionally dormers are set well below the ridge. Combined with their width and height, and the fact that they would, in some cases, not align with the existing windows below, the proposed dormers would represent an incongruous addition that would disrupt the rhythm of roofscapes within this small cul-de-sac, and would not be proportionate, either to the host property or to other properties nearby.
 10. The proposed dormers on the rear elevation, in Appeal A, would also be unacceptable for the same reasons as those set out above. Their impact on the character of the wider area would, in fact, be more pronounced given that the rear elevation to the host is prominent and highly visible from various public vantage points. Whilst I accept that there are dormers on the rear elevation of No.58, their design, mass and height is on a smaller scale and as such they sit more comfortably within the roofscape to that property and do not dominate it

visually. As I also observed on my site visit, there are other properties along the seafront that have dormers, but again most are modest in terms of their overall scale and proportions, occupying a small and central part of the roofscapes in question.

11. Turning to the proposed mansard roof, shown in Appeal B, this would also, in my judgement, visually dominate the appearance of the rear roofscape to the host property. The bulk, mass and design of the proposed mansard would introduce an alien feature to the existing roofscape that would be out of keeping with the appearance of the host property and wider streetscene. The proposed mansard would disrupt the rhythm of the existing roofscape and would not be subservient to the host property.
12. I appreciate that the appeal proposal has been designed in order to secure more accommodation for a growing family, but that does not affect the findings I have reached above. It has also been suggested that the proposed dormers and mansard would be compatible with and would not compete with the host or adjoining properties. Given the above findings, that is not a view I share.
13. Accordingly, I find that the proposed dormers, as shown in Appeal A, and the proposed dormers and mansard roof, as shown in Appeal B, would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and wider area contrary to policies 2 and 33 of the Chichester Local Plan 2014-2029 and paragraph 130 b) and c) of the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021). These policies seek, amongst other requirements, to support development where it secures the highest standard of design; is sympathetic to local character and the surrounding built development; and respects and where possible enhances the character of the area and its setting in terms of the proposals proportions, form, massing, siting, layout, size and scale.

Other Matters

14. Concerns have been raised over the potential overlooking of neighbouring properties from the proposed dormers. I note that this matter was addressed in the Delegated Report where Officers concluded that the proposed dormers, on the front elevation, would increase overlooking into neighbouring properties, but that these concerns could be overcome through conditions requiring obscure glazing and for the windows to be fixed shut. Based on the submitted plans and my observations on site, I concur with the Council's findings in this respect and if I were minded to allow these appeals then these are matters that could have been conditioned accordingly.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above and having taken all the matters raised into account, I conclude that both appeals should be dismissed.

G Roberts

INSPECTOR