
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2016

by AJ Steen BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 3 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/M3835/W/16/3152408

16B George V Avenue, West Worthing, Worthing BN11 5RQ

- 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 Chambers against the decision of Worthing Borough Council.
 - The application Ref AWD/0299/16, dated 24 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed roof extension and side dormers on the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. George V Avenue comprises detached houses of similar character, a number of which are of very similar design, including no. 16, most of which have hipped roofs and few extended at roof level. No. 16 has been divided into two flats and is located on the junction with Aglaia Road such that the side of the building faces toward that road, with a small garden area including garages to the rear and detached property of similar character behind. The proposal would extend into the roof space to provide additional living accommodation for the occupants.
 4. The proposed alteration to provide a half hip to the rear elevation would extend the ridge of the roof rearwards when viewed from the side. This would add bulk to the rear of the roof, making it appear unbalanced when viewed from Aglaia Road to the side and harming the proportions of the existing building. This roof form is unusual in this area and would be prominent given the location of this building on the junction of George V Avenue and Aglaia Road.
 5. The proposed dormer windows to either side of the roof would add bulk to either side of the building, would be of differing materials and shapes, with the eaves of each dormer at different heights that would not provide a balanced appearance to the building when viewed from George V Avenue. That to the south side would be wide, but partially disguised by the neighbouring property
-

- and chimney such that it would have a limited effect on the appearance of the building and surrounding area.
6. The proposed dormer on the north side of the building would be prominent within the roof from views along both George V Avenue and Aglaia Road. The mock Tudor design and materials would reflect those on the building below, but would add to its prominence given their contrast with the existing roof materials. Although the appearance of the dormer would seek to reflect that of the porch below, the roof pitch differs from that. Dormers are unusual on George V Avenue and those on Aglaia Road tend to have flat roofs. These factors would result in the proposed dormer appearing prominent and incongruous on the roof of the building.
 7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed roof extension and side dormers would harm the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area. As such, the development would be contrary to Policy 16 of the Worthing Core Strategy, Policy H16 of the Worthing Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework that seek good quality design that takes account of the characteristics of the building and area.
 8. Reference is made to the proposed development being partially obscured by a tree and rear boundary planting. The tree has been removed and the rear planting is not substantial and would have limited effect in obscuring the proposed development in views from the street.
 9. I understand that the proposed development may have been permitted under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 had the building been a single dwellinghouse. However, I have limited evidence to demonstrate that is the case and this position would not overcome the harm to the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area from the proposed development.

Conclusion

10. On the basis of the above considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

AJ Steen

INSPECTOR