



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2025

by **P Terceiro BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C1435/D/24/3350110

388 Coast Road, Pevensey Bay BN24 6NY

- 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 Mr and Mrs Eddie Marsh against the decision of Wealden District Council.
 - The application Ref is WD/2024/1270/F.
 - The development proposed is described as proposed internal and external works to form open plan area to upper floor level and loft conversion including dormers to form habitable accommodation at first floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was updated on 12 December 2024. However, the sections pertinent to this appeal have not changed to such an extent as to affect the matters raised by the main parties. It has not therefore been necessary to seek their views, and the revised version has been taken into account in this decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect on the proposed development on the:
 - character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area; and
 - living conditions of the occupants of No 386 Coast Road and No 390 Coast Road, with particular reference to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. 388 Coast Road (No 388) is a detached dwelling which is single storey on its elevation facing the beach and two storey on its elevation facing inland. The dwelling is set back from the road towards the beach, and it displays a hipped roof to the beach side with a crown roof extension to the road side. There is a detached garage near the road.
5. The appeal property forms part of a long ribbon of development extending along Coast Road atop the shingle bank, overlooking the sea. The relatively elevated position of these dwellings makes them prominent in views from inland as well as from the beach itself. The properties are varied in terms of design and style due to later extensions or alterations, although the single-storey aspect to the beach side

is generally retained. The plots are typically deep and narrow, and the dwellings have small gaps between them. However, the roofscape which largely consists of hipped roofs or gabled roofs oriented north-south, assists in providing space around the built form, particularly on the elevations facing the beach.

6. The proposal would introduce two flat roofed dormers on either side elevation of the host dwelling. The dormers would be wall style dormers, such that they would be constructed up from the wall rather than set back from the eaves. Despite being set back from the front and rear elevations, the dormers would still be significantly deep and would only be set down marginally from the ridge of the main roof. For these reasons, the dormers would not be subservient and would instead dominate the gable detail. Consequently, the proposal would appear as a top-heavy form of development that would harm the character of the host dwelling.
7. Given their size, scale and appearance, the dormers would be akin to creating an additional floor. Consequently, and while the street scene may be tolerable to new design, the proposal would fail to retain the single storey aspect to the sea, at odds with the prevailing character of the surrounding development.
8. The north-east facing dormer window would be sited near the side wall of 390 Coast Road (No 390), a two-storey dwelling. Whilst there are existing narrow gaps between homes, by virtue of its scale, siting and wall style design, this dormer would exacerbate the close relationship between flank walls. The space to the side wall of No 390 would not be sufficient to prevent the mass of the dormer window from appearing uncomfortably close to this neighbouring property, and so the proposal would appear cramped. Accordingly, the proposal would appear incongruous in its receiving context and would not be sympathetic to the local character.
9. The proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding area. It would conflict with Policies VB31, EN27 and HG10 of the Wealden Local Plan 1998 (LP) and with Spatial Planning Objective SPO13 and Policy WCS14 of the Wealden Core Strategy Local Plan 2013 (CS). These policies support development of high quality of a scale, style, form and design that respects the character of adjoining development, among other things.

Living conditions

10. The side dormer on the north-east facing side elevation would be close to the neighbouring dwelling No 390. This dwelling has a first-floor side window facing towards the appeal site. Given the scale and proximity of the proposal, the open outlook from this side window towards the South Downs in the distance would likely be compromised by views of the large expanse of unarticulated wall of the proposed dormer. However, the evidence indicates that this window serves a hallway and staircase which are not habitable rooms. Therefore, the impact of this reduced outlook on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 390 would be limited.
11. There is a first-floor balcony on No 390's elevation facing the road. However, the existing dwelling already projects beyond this neighbouring elevation. Due to its siting, the proposal would not unduly harm the outlook from this balcony.
12. The appeal dwelling is sited close to 386 Coast Road (No 386). However, the balcony of this neighbouring dwelling is located near the flank wall of the appeal

dwelling. The design and siting of the proposal would therefore be such that the occupiers of No 386 would retain an acceptable outlook from this balcony.

13. No 386 is a single storey bungalow to the beach side and two storey to the road. It does not have any rooflights on its side elevation facing the appeal site. As such, the siting and design of the proposal would not unduly harm the outlook from the side windows on this neighbouring property.
14. The proposal would have an acceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupants of No 386 and No 390, with particular reference to outlook. It would accord with CS Policy WCS14, and LP Policies HG10 and EN27, where these policies support development that would not have a significant adverse effect on the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Other Considerations

15. The appellant has referred to a planning permission¹ that has been granted by the Council for the construction of extensions and internal alterations to the appeal dwelling. The planning history provided by the Council indicates that this permission dates 2019. The appellant advises that it has been partially implemented and therefore remains extant.
16. However, the evidence indicates that whilst both schemes would have a similar height, the consented scheme is different from the appeal scheme insofar as it comprised small dormers with a limited depth that were set back from the eaves. As such, this scheme was substantially different from the scheme before me, so it would not provide justification to redevelop the site as proposed.

Other Matters

17. The appellant has drawn my attention to other roof extensions built in the surrounding area. However, I note that some of these dormers are set in from the eaves, such as those at No 166 Coast Road, No 220 Coast Road, or No 418 Coast Road. The dormers at No 362 Coast Road are noticeably set down from the ridge. The property at No 400 Coast Road comprises a mansard style roof form and does not have dormer windows. It therefore follows that these examples would not represent a direct parallel to the appeal proposal. As such, I have determined the appeal in its own merits.

Conclusion

18. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

P Terceiro

INSPECTOR

¹ WD/2018/2749/F