



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 May 2023

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P1425/D/23/3318804

31 Piddinghoe Avenue, Peacehaven, BN10 8RJ

- 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 Adam Wymer against the decision of Lewes District Council.
 - The application Ref LW/22/0822, dated 13 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 8 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension at 31 Piddinghoe Avenue, Peacehaven, BN2 8RJ, in accordance with the terms of application Ref LW/22/0822, dated 13 December 2022 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 481.01, 481.02, 481.03, 481.04 and 481.100
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the walls and roof of the extension hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

Main Issues

1. The first main issue is the effect of the proposal on the appearance of the host dwelling and the pair of dwellings. The second main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 33 Piddinghoe Avenue (No.33), with particular regard to visual impact.

Reasons

Appearance

2. The Appeal dwelling is located within a mixed residential area comprising a variety of symmetrically and asymmetrically designed single and two storey detached and semi-detached dwellings. The appeal dwelling and the dwelling at No.33 comprise a pair of semi-detached bungalows designed with symmetrical front elevations. The pair of bungalows have hipped roofs and matching front projections with gable roofs that are separated by a recessed gap. The bungalow at No.33 has a flat roofed timber framed and glazed porch

extension that sits within this recessed gap and is set in from the adjacent front and side elevations of that dwelling. Although this front extension has changed the front elevation of the dwelling it is visually lightweight and modest in form and appearance and the original symmetry of the pair of dwellings remains dominant.

3. Collectively and amongst other things policies DM25 and DM28 of the Lewes District Local Plan Part 2 Site Allocations and Development Management Policies 2020 (DMP), and policy CP11 of the Lewes District Local Plan Part 1 Joint Core Strategy (CS), seek to secure high quality design, which respects and where appropriate positively contributes to the character and distinctiveness of the built environment. New development should respond sympathetically to the characteristics of the site and extensions should respect and respond positively to the character and appearance of neighbouring properties. New development should not have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties due to visual impact, privacy or daylight.
4. The proposed extension would occupy a recessed position between the front projecting wings of the pair of semi-detached bungalows. It would be set in from the boundary between the pair of dwellings and would project forward the same distance as the front extension at No.33. The proposed extension would have rendered walls and a modest height pitched roof with a crown top. The roof pitch, external materials and the proportions and detailing of the proposed front window would all match those of the host dwelling. For these reasons the proposed extension would respect and appear subservient to the host dwelling.
5. Whilst the proposed extension would be different to the front extension at No.33, their depths and eaves heights would be consistent. From the street scene the two extensions would be partially screened by the existing front projecting wings. Where they could be seen, both extensions would appear modest and would respect the overall form, character and appearance of the pair of dwellings.
6. I conclude on the first main issue that the proposal would respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the pair of dwellings. In this respect the proposal would comply with DMP Policies DM25 & DM28 and CS Policy CP11.

Living conditions

7. The proposed extension would project close to the side boundary with No.33 and its eaves overhang would project up to the shared boundary. It would be sited at least one metre from the adjacent habitable room window at No.33 and would project 2.5 metres forward of it. The glazed porch immediately to the front of this habitable room window similarly projects 2.5 metres forward of the window.
8. The outlook from the adjacent habitable room window at No.33 is directly into the porch extension to the front of it. There are further views through the porch front and side windows towards the street scene and into the front garden of the appeal property.
9. The proposed extension would have an enclosing impact on the outlook from the adjacent habitable room at No.3. The views towards the flank wall of the existing front projection of the appeal dwelling would be lost. However,

existing views of the spacious front garden area to the front the appeal dwelling and the street scene would be largely unaffected.

10. Whilst the proposal would result in some loss of daylight and sunlight within the porch and adjacent room at No.33, due to its modest height, depth and hipped roof, the porch and adjacent window at No.33 would continue to receive reasonable levels of daylight and sunlight. Also, as pointed out by the appellant the proposal would remove the existing inter-looking between the front porch at No.33 and the adjacent bedroom in the appeal dwelling. Thus, privacy between the two dwellings would be enhanced.
11. For these reasons I conclude on the second main issue that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.33 due to visual impact. Accordingly, it would comply with CS Policy CS11 and Policies DMP DM25 & DM8.

Conclusion

12. Having regard to the conclusions on both main issues the appeal is allowed.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR