
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 August 2017

by Mr Kim Bennett BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30th August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M3835/D/17/3176980

51 Beaumont Road, Worthing, West Sussex BN14 8HE

- 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 Mrs Sue Burstow against the decision of Worthing Borough Council.
 - The application Ref AWDM/0397/17, dated 10 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 5 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is a roof conversion including raising the height of the existing ridge, side dormers and rear gables.
-

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 dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a two storey detached house located on the western side of Beaumont Road, and close to its junction with Fletcher Road. It is the southernmost house of a number of similarly designed houses on the western side of the road at this point, although to the south, the character changes with No 49 Beaumont Road being a chalet bungalow and a greater mix of architectural styles beyond that.
4. The appellant argues that because of the variety of styles in the area, many of which have involved roof extensions and changes in roof form from hips to gables, there would be no loss of character. Furthermore it is considered that an increase in the ridge height of 400mm would not be perceived from ground level.
5. However, I noted that whilst some alterations had taken place on the western side of Beaumont Road and to the north of No 51, there is a strong uniformity of the roof form in the row of houses at this point, with largely unaltered hipped roofs being the dominant prevailing character. This is more apparent because of a relatively wide road so that there are open views of all the properties from both directions along the road and also when emerging from Fletcher Road. Given that uniformity, I do not agree that an increase in the ridge height will be

hardly perceived and on the contrary, consider it will be quite apparent. Additionally, the two side dormers with their bulk, height and roof forms will, together with the increase in ridge height, result in a very 'top heavy' appearance to the main roof which will be out of character with the existing roof form in the immediate locality.

6. I attach lesser weight to the change of the rear facing hip to a gable end given that it would be less prominent in the street scene, but in combination with the other proposed alterations, it adds to the concern about the loss of character to the existing roof scape in this part of the road and the visual harm which would be caused as a result.
7. I looked carefully at other alterations that have been carried out in the road, including examples drawn to my attention by both main parties and in particular where hip ends had been changed to gable ends. However, I saw no comparable examples of the extent of change to the roof form as currently proposed and therefore they have not been decisive in reaching my findings.
8. I acknowledge that certain alterations could be carried out with the benefit of permitted development rights, although as the appellant observes, that would not include the increase in ridge height which is currently proposed, and therefore the two scenarios are not directly comparable. I also note the lack of objections from local residents, which the appellant has drawn my attention to. However, that could be for a number of reasons and does not in itself justify allowing a proposal which in my view would result in visual harm to the area.
9. I note that the Council raises no objections from a residential amenity point of view and having looked at the detailed relationships with adjoining neighbouring property, I agree with that assessment subject to suitable conditions in respect of obscure glazing, which could have been imposed had I been minded to allow the appeal.
10. For the above reasons, the development would not be compatible with Policy 16 of the Council's Core Strategy 2011, Saved Policy H16 of the Local Plan 2007 or guidance within the Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Extending or Altering Your Home' 2011, in that it would not respond positively to local character, would adversely affect the appearance of the street scene, and the roof dormers would dominate the roof by being overly large.
11. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

Kim Bennett

INSPECTOR