



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2017

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

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

Decision date: 16 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M3835/D/17/3175936

24 Ilex Way, Goring-by-Sea, Worthing, West Sussex, BN12 4UZ.

- 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 Hilder against the decision of Worthing Borough Council.
 - The application Ref AWD/1708/16, dated 4 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as creation of new east wing (where garage is currently sited).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be:
 - a) the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host property, the character and appearance of the form and pattern of development in the area; and,
 - b) the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the residents of 22 Ilex Way, in terms of the potential for it to result in an unacceptable loss of light and to have an overbearing and oppressive impact.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property, 24 Ilex Way, although previously extended is a well-mannered attractive chalet bungalow. Although its ridge has been kept below that of the main roof, the existing design incorporates a two-storey section at the property's western end. It is located on the north side of Ilex Way at its junction with Compton Avenue. This low-density suburban residential area is characterised by an eclectic mix of houses, chalets and bungalows set back from the road in mature garden plots. The site itself does not lie within the Goring Hall Conservation Area. However, it faces onto a green space planted with trees that runs down the centre of the road and falls within the conservation area.

4. Following demolition of the existing modest detached garage at the eastern end of the dwelling, the appellants propose the construction of a two-storey front and side extension. The new first floor accommodation would be within the new roof, which would be hipped at the front with a small gablet while the rear would be built as a full gable.
5. The extension would project some 4.4 metres or so in front of the main façade of the existing dwelling towards the road and extend some 11.0 metres or so across the front of the existing bungalow. While the eaves height of the existing roof would be maintained, due to the overall width of the proposed extension, its ridge height would exceed that of the existing main roof. Given the neighbouring two-storey houses some increase in the ridge height here may well be acceptable. However, due to the proposed overall width and height of the hipped roof, the extension as designed would result in a large and dominating addition that, when viewed from street, would appear to both dominate and subsume the original chalet.
6. The appellants propose to reform the original eyebrow window in the centre of the new hipped roof facing the street. However, due to its relatively diminutive size in the context of what would be a large and otherwise unbroken roof scape, it would not serve to reduce the visual mass and overall scale of the proposed hipped roof to any significant extent.
7. The property is located on a large prominent corner plot and therefore, subject to design, might well be able to accept a more substantial form of development than other smaller neighbouring plots. However, by siting the proposed extension at the end furthest from the street corner, the proposed design does not serve to exploit this potential opportunity.
8. I conclude, in respect of the first main issue, that the proposed extension would appear as an overly large, incongruous and dominant addition that would cause substantial harm to the architectural integrity of the host property and thereby the character and appearance of the area. As such the proposal would be contrary to saved Policy H16 of the Worthing Local Plan (Adopted September 2003) (LP), Core Strategy (April 2011) (CS) Policy 16 and the advice at paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) as they relate to, amongst other things, the quality of design and the need to respond positively to the important aspects of local character, exploiting all reasonable opportunities for enhancement of the local character.

Living conditions

9. The neighbouring property to the east, 22 Ilex Way, is a two-storey house that, as I observed, is in the process of being extended by the addition of a single storey side extension that extends up to the common boundary with number 24. At first floor level there are two narrow windows in the west wall of number 22; one has frosted glass and would appear to serve a non-habitable room; the other is a secondary window to a room overlooking the street. There is also a full height bay projecting from the rear facade of number 22.
10. Given the relationship of the properties one to another, the proximity of the rear bay to the extension, the size and function of the two side windows, the eaves height of the proposed extension and as the roof of the proposed extension would rise away from the boundary, I am not persuaded, given the

limited evidence to the contrary, that the extension would result in an unacceptable loss of light to the neighbouring dwelling.

11. Furthermore, given the foregoing considerations, I do not believe that the proposed addition would have an overbearing or oppressive impact.

12. I therefore conclude, in respect of the second main issue, that the proposed extension would not cause significant harm to the living conditions of the residents of 22 Ilex Way, in terms of its potential to result in an unacceptable loss of light or to have an overbearing and oppressive impact. In view of that, the proposal would accord with saved LP Policies H16 and H18 and the Framework as they relate to the protection of residential living conditions.

Conclusions

13. I have concluded that the proposal would not cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property. However, having regard to all other matters, I consider that this factor is outweighed by the unacceptable harm that would ensue to the host building and the surrounding area if the development were to go ahead. To my mind this is a compelling objection. I have considered all other matters raised, including the lack of objection to the extension from the occupier of number 22, but none change my overall conclusion, reached on the planning merits of the proposal, that the appeal should not succeed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR