



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 December 2024

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L3815/D/24/3350639

29 Cedar Drive, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 3EH

- 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 C & G Alderman against the decision of Chichester District Council.
 - The application Ref is CC/24/00258/DOM.
 - The development proposed is 1 no. dormer to rear elevation, 5 no. rooflights to front elevation and alterations to roof to include gable end.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 1 no. dormer to rear elevation, 5 no. rooflights to front elevation and alterations to roof to include gable end at 29 Cedar Drive, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 3EH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref CC/24/00258/DOM, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: Drawing No 1.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Appellant makes it clear (Grounds of Appeal para 4.1) that an amended drawing submitted during the processing of the application and showing a dormer of 8.115 metres width is the intended development. The Council's Delegated Report makes the same point. I am assessing matters on this basis notwithstanding the Council's Decision Notice which appears to make reference to a superseded drawing number.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.
-

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached, hipped-roof dwelling on an unusually generous rectangular plot. It lies within an area of established residential character with the range of largely hipped-roof semi-detached homes on one side of the road and generally bungalows on the other coming together to form a pleasing suburban scene. The proposal is as described above.
5. The Council is, in paraphrase, concerned that the hip to gable change would be an undue uplift in bulk and not be characteristic of the area and that incongruity and excessive mass of the rear dormer would add to this and also lead to an unbalanced appearance.
6. However, the appeal property is unusual in the street in that it is markedly wider than its attached neighbour and the majority of homes around. It is also on a substantially larger plot. Furthermore, its neighbouring home already has a gable and a flat roofed rear dormer.
7. The starting point is thus appreciably different to the 'norm' locally which is hipped roof, even sized balanced semi-detached houses, with consistent sized gardens. It could be argued that this form would be justifiably protected and that development allowed on the appeal site would not be open to be reasonably cited as a 'precedent'. This dwelling and its neighbour *already* display differences in this stretch of the road and my reading of the streetscene is that no harm would arise if any difference is marginally or notionally increased. The development would not lead to an unbalanced appearance, quite the contrary, and would not represent overdevelopment.
8. In summary, in this instance, my assessment is that whilst the existing dwelling would appreciably increase in scale, the proposed development would result an acceptable change to the overall scene and protect the aesthetic character of the area.
9. Policy 33 of the Chichester Local Plan and Policy P7 of the Emerging Local Plan are pertinent. Taken together and amongst other matters they seek to secure good quality design embodying development of suitable scale, form and proportions such that context is respected and local character protected. I conclude that the scheme would not conflict with these policies.

Conditions

10. The scheme should have the standard commencement condition. The Council suggests the requirement for materials to match the existing building. I agree this condition would be appropriate in the interests of visual amenity. I also agree that there should be a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plan; to provide certainty.

Overall conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property or the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR