



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2019

by C Osgathorp BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M3835/D/19/3233623

81 Rose Walk, Goring-by-Sea, Worthing BN12 4AT

- 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 Maxine James against the decision of Worthing Borough Council.
 - The application Ref AWDM/0550/19, dated 1 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have used the address shown on the appellant's appeal form in the banner heading because it is more precise than the address shown on the Council's decision notice and the planning application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is located in an established residential area on a corner plot adjacent to the junction of Rose Walk and Goring Road. The northern side elevation of the dwelling forms part of the street frontage on Goring Road, which consists of a row of 2 storey detached and semi-detached properties. Front projections on the neighbouring houses in Goring Road predominantly consist of bay windows or porches that are generally modest in width and depth and appear proportionate to the host dwelling.
5. The proposed single storey extension would wrap around the northern and western elevations of the dwelling and would have a considerable width of around 9.1 metres when viewed from Goring Road. The width of the proposed extension would not be proportionate to the host dwelling, which would result in a bulky appearance. Furthermore, the roof pitch of the proposed extension would be shallow, which would not respect the roof angle of the main roof. Whilst the property has an existing extension that does not reflect the roof angle of the main roof, the discordant appearance of the proposed extension would be more noticeable in the area due to its position facing Goring Road.

The proposed extension would therefore appear bulky and fail to integrate satisfactorily with the host dwelling.

6. Furthermore, the proposed single storey extension would project a sizeable distance of approximately 2.8 metres from the northern elevation of the dwelling towards Goring Road. It would extend noticeably forward of No 45 Goring Road due to its sizeable depth and its close proximity to the boundary. Taking these factors together with its considerable width, the proposed extension would appear as a prominent and discordant feature in the Goring Road street scene. I acknowledge that there is currently hedging along the boundaries with Goring Road and Rose Walk which partially screens the dwelling from the street, however this is a natural feature that cannot be relied on in perpetuity to screen the proposed development.
7. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. The proposal would therefore be contrary to saved Policy H16 of the Worthing Local Plan 2003, Policy 16 of the Worthing Core Strategy (2011), Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Extending or Altering Your Home' and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which, amongst other things, state that extensions to dwellings will normally be permitted providing the scale, design, materials and site coverage would be satisfactory in relation to both the existing property and any predominant characteristics of adjoining properties of the area as a whole.

Other Matters

8. The appellant's statement indicates that the proposed extension would provide space usable by disabled occupants, which is a matter that weighs in favour of allowing the proposed development. In considering this matter, I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty contained in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, which sets out the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.
9. The above matter must be weighed against my conclusion on the main issue that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. In this case, a refusal of planning permission is a proportionate and necessary approach to the legitimate aim of ensuring that harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene would be avoided. Consequently, whilst I acknowledge the personal circumstances referred to in the appellant's statement, I conclude that this is not a matter that outweighs the significant harm that would be caused by the proposal in respect of my conclusions on the main issue.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Osgathorp

INSPECTOR