



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 July 2020

by J E Jolly BA (Hons) MA MSc CIH MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M3835/D/20/3248377

163 South Farm Road, Broadwater, Worthing BN14 7TW

- 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 Emily Sherman against the decision of Worthing Borough Council.
 - The application Ref AWDM/1776/19, dated 12 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side (North) extension, loft conversion scheme including Velux to side (South) and dormers to rear (North and West) elevations. Widen existing vehicular crossover.
-

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 area, and the host dwelling.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located at the junction of South Farm Road and Wiston Avenue in a residential area that is typified by brick and tile dwellings, some of which have extensions, dormers or garages to the rear or side elevation.
4. No 163 South Farm Road is a two-storey semi-detached property that is positioned on a corner plot with the main entrance facing South Farm Road behind a landscaped set back. There is an attached garage to the right-hand side of the main entrance of the property when viewed from the road. To the rear of the appeal dwelling there is a modest garden with a single storey extension which includes two store-type areas, and access to the rear of the host dwelling. To the right-hand side of the property, when viewed from the rear boundary, there are a number of single-storey outriggers that can be seen in the adjacent gardens, and a flat-roofed rear extension to a neighbouring dwelling can be seen further along the road.
5. The proposal is to demolish the existing garage and store buildings and to construct a two-storey 'L' shaped extension with stepped, flat-roof dormers to the first and second floor and a pitched roof to the ground floor in matching materials to the host dwelling. The proposal would be flush with the main elevation of No 163 as it faces onto South Farm Road, and it would retain the same ridge line when viewed from Wiston Avenue. The existing landscaping would be retained, and a new vehicle crossover would provide access to the dwelling from South Farm Road.

6. The principle of development on the appeal site is accepted by the Council as the proposal would be located in an established residential and generally built up area. However, while the proposal would be flush rather than set forward of the main elevation, the two-storey development when viewed across the relatively narrow garden set back would extend further across the appeal site than the existing single-storey garage. As such, the development, notwithstanding the retained landscaping, would be an overly prominent and incongruous addition to the dwelling when viewed from South Farm Road.
7. Moreover, despite the hipped roof to the side, the proposal, as shown on the submitted drawings, would have a stepped flat-roof configuration, some of which would be above the eaves of the host dwelling, and a dormer to the second floor that would project onto the first floor bath room extension to accommodate the master bedroom en-suite above. Therefore, notwithstanding the relatively large corner plot available, the scale and mass and multiple features of the extension would be at odds with the neighbouring properties which, irrespective of building style or period have, where they exist, 'low-key' extensions or single-storey outriggers. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area generally.
8. Consequently, the proposal is contrary to saved Policy H16 of the Worthing Local Plan 2007 and Policy 16 of the Worthing Core Strategy 2011, as supported by the Worthing Borough Council 'Supplementary Planning Guidance – Extending or altering your home', which say, amongst other things, that the scale, design, materials and site coverage of development should be satisfactory in relation to both the existing property and any predominant characteristics of adjoining properties or the area as a whole. For similar reasons, the proposal does not meet the aims of Paragraph 127 (c) of the *National Planning Policy Framework*, which requires that development is sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.

Other Matters

9. I acknowledge that the proposal is in a sustainable location that would have a limited effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, provide parking and a wider vehicle crossover, and a number of social, economic and environmental benefits associated with the development. However, while I note that there has been no neighbour objections to the proposal, and that the development would increase the living space available to the appellants household, this does not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area and the host dwelling I have found.

Conclusions

10. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J E JOLLY

INSPECTOR