
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 December 2016

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 30 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/P1425/D/16/3160858
13 Gladys Avenue, Peacehaven, BN10 8PG

- 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 P Davis against the decision of Lewes District Council.
 - The application Ref LW/16/0540, dated 28 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension with a complete new roof and front balcony.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. 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

3. The appeal property is a visually low key bungalow with hipped roofing in an area with some range in scale and design of homes but one which sees similar modest dwellings in the great majority. These dwellings with their understated form combine to give an unremarkable and pleasant appearance to the area which is of established 'quiet' residential character. The proposal is as described above. It incorporates replacement of the existing hipped roof with a narrow flat roof with pitched sides and gables to front and rear with the former being primarily glazed and having its roof projecting foreword over the planned balcony area and the ground floor elevation.
 4. The proposal would be a bold solution to meet a wish to increase residential accommodation and regrettably it would lead to an ungainly and uncharacteristic building being overly dominant in the streetscene. The approach to the roof treatment would simply appear too excessive and top heavy for what would lie below and around the area. The varied building line found locally would allow some give and take on siting but the upper level sizeable projection would still look out of place even in this context. The gable end would be larger than those few found nearby and locally distinctive design does not embody extensive glazing at upper front facing levels. Other than on
-

a few dormers the use of flat roofs is also not a local characteristic and while I appreciate the pitched sides would help mask this from some angles it would certainly be apparent within a section of the streetscene and the sides themselves would have a steep degree of pitch not generally seen locally. The appeal proposal would simply look very awkwardly out of place and would unsatisfactorily overwhelm the original property and its subtle qualities.

5. The Lewes District Local Plan includes Policies ST3 and RES13 and the Lewes District Local Plan Joint Core Strategy embodies Policy CP 11. These policies, taken together and amongst other matters, seek schemes which are of high design quality, respect the overall scale, character and rhythm of neighbouring buildings and the local area, and demonstrate suitable subsidiary characteristics to the original dwelling. I conclude that the appeal proposal would run contrary to these policies.

Other matters

6. I sympathise with the wish of the Appellant to increase internal space and undertake refurbishment. I would agree that the case would not raise overriding concerns relating to residential amenity. I have considered the information provided in respect of 4 The Esplanade Telscombe Cliffs. However this case varies from the appeal proposal in terms of locational context, relationship to neighbouring homes and the style of those dwellings, and the precise details of the scheme itself and I would certainly not see that development as a precedent. I shall determine this proposal on its own merits. I would agree that buildings of relatively bold modern idiom have a place in the improvement of dwelling stock but siting for such structures needs to be carefully selected and the design itself ought to be of high quality when such change is being contemplated. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
7. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered; the Council's policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within that document.

Overall conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR