

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2016

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 11 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M3835/D/16/3159430

79 Terringes Avenue, Worthing, West Sussex BN13 1JQ

- 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 Chris Rae against the decision of Worthing Borough Council.
 - The application, Ref. AWDM/1069/16, dated 12 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 24 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey extension on the north (front) elevation and to rebuild the existing porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are (i) the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the building and the street scene, and (ii) the effect on the living conditions for the occupiers of No. 81 Terringes Avenue as regards outlook and light.

Reasons

3. On the first issue, the Council's objection is that the proposed front extension to enlarge the kitchen would be unsympathetic to the character and appearance of No. 79, which with No. 81 forms a pair of largely symmetrical dwellings.
 4. I saw on my visit that the pattern of development on this side of Terringes Avenue is one of matching pairs of substantial semi-detached houses. There are several different designs, but although Nos. 79 & 81 have matching pairs of one of these other designs to each side, there are other examples of the particular design for Nos. 79 & 81 further along the road.
 5. There are several examples of inappropriate front extensions on some of the other houses, but a good number are acceptable and overall the street scene still benefits from the original design concept of paired symmetry within the different house types. In the case of Nos. 79 & 81 this symmetry is largely intact, albeit the substantial vegetation in front of No. 79 prevents this being easily seen from the road.
 6. The proposed extension would partially infill the recessed area between the gabled projections of the pair of properties and in my view comprises a jarring feature that would harmfully disturb the pleasing symmetry. I acknowledge
-

that the extension would not be large and in itself is not of a poor design, but in this particular position I agree with the Council's view that it would be an obtrusive, alien and discordant addition.

7. I understand that as part of the proposal at least some of the vegetation in front of No. 79 would be removed and if so this would increase the prominence of the addition. However, even if the planting were to remain or be replaced its retention cannot be guaranteed to screen the addition.
8. On the second issue, the extension would be positioned tight to the boundary with No. 81 and would project 1.8m from the front elevation. The extension would breach the standard test of a 45-degree angle from the nearest window in the front of No. 81 and would inevitably result in a loss of light and outlook. I acknowledge that the current occupiers have raised no objection, but whilst this is a material consideration in the appellant's favour it is not the determining factor in any assessment of householder development.
9. Overall, although I have had careful regard to the grounds of appeal, I conclude that the proposed front extension would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of Nos. 79 & 81 and the Terringes Avenue street scene, and have a detrimental impact on the living conditions for the occupiers of No. 81 in terms of light and outlook. I have noted the other similar extension to this house type in the road, but to the extent that it forms a precedent I consider that it is not one that would be appropriate to follow.
10. The appeal scheme would therefore conflict with Policy 16 of the Worthing Core Strategy 2011; Saved Policies H16 & H18 of the Worthing Local Plan 2003; the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Extending or Altering Your Home', and Section 7: 'Requiring Good Design' and the core planning principles of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
11. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR