



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 October 2021

by J Somers BSocSci (Planning) MA (HEC) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M3835/D/21/3276491

17 Ardsheal Close, Gaisford, Worthing BN14 7RP

- 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 T Micklewright (Amber Living) against the decision of Worthing Borough Council.
 - The application Ref AWDM/0317/21, dated 24 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with hip to gable and rear dormer roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council in their refusal reason references the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (the Framework). Since the determination of the application, the 2019 version of the Framework has been superseded by the 2021 version. I have considered the appeal on this basis and refer only to the updated 2021 Framework within my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the appeal property and the character and appearance of the locality.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is located in a cul-de-sac which contains a speculative development of semi-detached dwellings which appear to date from the mid-twentieth century. The dwellings to both sides of Ardsheal Close have a symmetrical composition with hipped roof form, large central coaxial chimney stack, with two storey curved bay windows with rendered facades. The majority of roof forms within this street scene as well as surrounding are hipped which expresses a symmetry throughout the estate between the dwellings as well as between the pair of semi-detached dwellings in which the appeal site is located. The dwellings have similar front and side setbacks with large front gardens and low boundary walls which give an openness in and around the dwellings with large mature vegetation which is visible between gaps on the eastern side of the road. These elements contribute towards the positive characteristics of the character, appearance and local distinctiveness of the locality.
5. The proposed extension would change the hipped roof to a gabled roof which would give an asymmetrical appearance where one side of the building would

be hipped and the appeal building would be gabled. The asymmetrical design would present as a distraction within the street scene which consists of semi-detached dwellings where symmetry in roof form is a positive attribute to their design and relationship to the street scene. The roof extension combined with the dormer window would be a dominant addition that would remove much of the existing roof form, which is specifically discouraged within the Extending or Altering Your Home Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) which supports the Worthing Core Strategy 2011 (CS) Policy 16, as well as the Worthing Local Plan 2003 (LP) saved Policy H16, which are both design led policies which seek good quality architectural composition which responds positively to important aspects of local character; and that the scale, design and materials would be satisfactory in relation to the existing property and predominant characteristics of the locality.

6. I acknowledge comments within the Applicant's Statement of Case (SoC) that there is an existing Certificate of Lawful Development¹ (CLD) for a smaller extension, and that the proposal under consideration according to the SoC is 6m³ larger. The consideration of a CLD under the provisions of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 only seeks to understand whether a development is permitted development or requires planning permission; it does not mean that the development is acceptable in planning terms against a consideration of planning policy. Having regard to the terms in which the CLD was granted, I do not believe that it provides sufficient justification for an enlarged scheme when assessed against planning policy. As such I afford the CLD little weight in this decision.
7. My attention is also drawn to photographs in the applicant's SoC of other similar extensions in the surrounding area, as well as on the neighbouring property. According to the applicant's SoC, each of these extensions were undertaken under permitted development. Having seen these extensions on my site visit, hip to gable roof extensions is not a characteristic feature, and alterations undertaken within the locality do not assist in providing adequate justification towards the harm caused to the character and appearance of the appeal building or the locality. The asymmetrical composition of these limited examples in the surrounding locality does present a poor appearance to the street scene and the host dwelling and would not provide sufficient justification to introduce further development which would erode the positive characteristics of the street scene.
8. The elongation of the ridge, combined with the massing of the dormer window diverts from the strong character of the existing hipped roof form of the appeal building. Taken as a whole, and in conclusion of this matter, the proposed alterations to the appeal dwelling would cause unacceptable harm to the architectural authenticity and integrity of the existing building and the character and appearance of the locality. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to the LP Policies Worthing Core Strategy 2011 (CS) Policy 16, as well as the Worthing Local Plan 2003 (LP) saved Policy H16, which is supported by the SPG as described above; and the design related policies of the Framework.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

¹ Worthing Council Planning ref: AWDM/0320/21

J Somers

INSPECTOR