

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2016

by R Barrett BSc (Hons) MSc Dip UD Dip Hist Cons MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 7th November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/M3835/D/16/3157942

87 Hayling Rise, High Salvington, Worthing BN13 3AG

- 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 and Mrs A and V Powell against the decision of Worthing Borough Council.
 - The application Ref AWDM/1044/16, dated 5 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as 'proposed alterations to the existing roof to form gables within the original roof construction, the inclusion of a new roof light, and a rear dormer'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the locality and the living conditions of neighbouring residents at 91 Hayling Rise, with regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site includes a bungalow which has been extended significantly, particularly at the rear. However, its simple form, hipped roof and mainly clear roof slopes are still appreciable as viewed from the street.
 4. The character and appearance of the locality is generally residential, comprising mainly bungalows facing the street. Generally properties are detached with a simple form, hipped roof and clear roof slopes. Whilst some properties have been altered and extended over time, these common characteristics are still apparent. Properties have low boundary walls, are visible from the street and sit prominently within it. For this reason, the locality has a generally cohesive and attractive residential character and appearance. The appeal site, its simple form, hipped roof, generally clear roof slopes and visibility from the street, contribute to that character and appearance.
 5. The design of the roof extensions would result in a completely different roof shape and considerable additional bulk. They would significantly alter the simple hipped roof form of the existing bungalow. Due to their size, they would totally dominate the existing bungalow. As a gabled roof form on the
-

main part of the dwelling is not common in this locality, generally it would jar in the street.

6. Furthermore, the proposed rear dormer would be very large in relation to the existing bungalow, spanning almost its full width. Although not visible from the street, it would be visible from the rear gardens of neighbouring properties. Its size would result in considerable additional bulk at the rear which would fail to relate appropriately to the more compact form of the existing building. Further, its design with a small hipped roof terminating in a flat roof would fail to relate to the simpler areas of hipped roof on the existing building and those buildings around it.
7. Moreover, the proposed large roof light on the front roof slope would be visible from the street and very prominent. Its size and design, which includes one large pane, would dominate the front roof slope. It would appear discordant when seen against the uninterrupted roof slopes in the locality.
8. All in all, the appeal proposal, when seen together with existing extensions, would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the locality. That the appeal site is located in a prominent position in the street, opposite the entrance to Newling Way, adds to my concern. Whilst I note that materials to be used would match those existing, this would not overcome my concerns.
9. It is agreed between the two main parties that elements of the appeal proposal avoid the need for planning permission. This is concluded by the Certificate of Lawful Use or Development (CLD) submitted in support of the appeal¹. However, the proposal before me varies from that development and it is not disputed that it requires planning permission. I have therefore considered the appeal development as a whole.
10. However, I recognise that the appellant could carry out the development set out in the CLD. I consider this to be a valid 'fallback position', to which I attach significant weight. However, the differences between that development and the one before me, which includes the proposed rear dormer and roof lights on the front roof slopes would, in themselves, result in significant harm to the locality and on this basis the appeal fails.
11. I conclude that the appeal proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the locality and would fail to accord with Worthing Borough Council Core Strategy (April 2011) (CS) Policy 16 and Supplementary Planning Guidance '*Extending or Altering Your Home*'. These, together, aim for new development to display a good quality of architectural composition and detailing as well as respond positively to the important aspects of local character, exploiting all reasonable opportunities for enhancement.

Living Conditions

12. The proposed roof would be higher and more bulky nearest to the side dormer of 91 Hayling Rise. That window is to a bedroom and provides mostly uninterrupted views down Hayling Rise towards the A27 main road. Whilst it would inevitably diminish those views from that window, as that property sits above the appeal site and due to the separation distance between the two, it would not be dominant when viewed from that dormer.

¹ AWDM/0642/16

13. Regardless of the above finding, I have had regard to the Certificate of Lawful Use or Development submitted in support of the appeal², which includes a similar extensions and roof form in relation to No.91. I am aware that the appellant could carry out that development and attach significant weight to this consideration.
14. I conclude that the appeal proposal would not adversely affect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with regard to outlook and would generally accord with Worthing Local Plan Policy H18. This aims for development that would not result in an overbearing effect on neighbouring property. It would also generally accord with bullet point 4 of paragraph 17 the National Planning Policy Framework, which in setting down the core planning principles states that planning should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Other Matters

15. I am aware that the appeal development would provide additional accommodation for the appellants' maturing family and enable the proposed development as a whole to be carried out at one time, which would minimise disruption to neighbours. However, these small benefits would not overcome the harm to the locality identified.
16. In coming to these conclusions, I have had regard to the other development in the locality brought to my attention and the side dormers on the adjacent properties in particular. However, I have limited information on those developments, particularly the circumstances that led to them. In any event, those properties retain a hipped roof and the dormers referred to fit within those roof slopes more comfortably than that proposed. Neither justifies the unacceptable proposal before me.

Conclusion

17. For the above reasons, and taking into account all other matters raised, including the views of neighbouring residents, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Barrett

INSPECTOR

² AWDM/0642/16