



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2025

by **C Coles MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 FEBRUARY 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P1425/D/24/3353992

20 Ifield Close, Saltdean, Brighton, East Sussex BN2 8DL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Daniel Waite against the decision of Lewes District Council.
 - The application Ref LW/24/0576.
 - The development is described as 'Retrospective permission for front dormer'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. At the time of my site visit, I saw that the dormer had already been constructed. Retrospective as referred to in the application form and the decision notice does not constitute an act of development. I have dealt with the appeal on the basis that planning permission is being sought for the construction of the front dormer.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the dormer on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached chalet bungalow located in a cul de sac of similar properties. Permission has previously been granted for two pitched roof dormers to the front of the dwelling. A single wide, flat roof dormer has been constructed instead and it is this dormer which is the subject of the appeal.
5. Although set in from the edges of the roof, the dormer occupies a significant proportion of the roof slope. Its scale in the context of this modest dwelling makes it a bulky and visually prominent structure. The dormer is an incongruous feature in a street where the majority of front-facing roof slopes remain largely unaltered. The adjacent property (No 18) is the exception, having been extended with a pair of flat roof dormers to the front. However, these additions are individually smaller than the appeal dormer and they are more subservient in appearance.
6. My attention is drawn to 22 Rye Close where a large front dormer has been permitted (but has yet to be constructed). However, that development would be viewed in a street scene where a nearby property already has full width dormers. Comparable development does not exist in Ifield Close and therefore the context is different. For this reason, the developments can be distinguished from one another.

7. I conclude that the dormer causes material harm to the character and appearance of the area. It therefore conflicts with Core Policy 11 of the Lewes District Local Plan: Part 1 Joint Core Strategy 2010-2030 and Policy DM25 of the Lewes District Local Plan: Part 2 Site Allocations and Development Management Policies. Amongst other things, these require high quality design, the scale, form, height and proportions of which is compatible with existing buildings and roofscapes.

Other Matters

8. I note that no objections have been received from neighbours. However, this is neutral in the planning balance. A lack of objections does not equate to a lack of harm.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Coles

INSPECTOR