Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2025

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M3835/D/25/3373119
73 Terringes Avenue, Tarring, Worthing BN13 1JQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Barney Rutherford against the decision of Worthing Borough Council.
- The application Ref is AWDM/0791/25.
- The development is loft conversion.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

2. The application forms confirm that the development had been completed prior to the submission of the application. The application is therefore seeking permission for works already carried out under Section 73A of The Town and Country Planning Act 1990, namely and following the description of development on the application forms, for a loft conversion. The loft conversion includes a hip to gable roof extension as well as a rear dormer and front roof lights.

3. Although not formally confirmed, the Council has acknowledged that, providing the external materials were of similar appearance to those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing dwelling house, a hip to gable extension and rear dormer of the size undertaken would potentially be regarded as permitted development. However, in this case the external materials used for the side gable and rear dormer are of a grey coloured horizontal composite boarding. The Council's reason for refusal is therefore specific to the materials used in the loft conversion and associated works. From my site visit and all the information before me I have no reason to take a different view.

4. Accordingly, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the cladding materials for the hip to part gable roof extension and rear dormer on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and on the local area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached residential dwelling on the south side of Terringes Avenue within a predominantly residential area, comprising mainly semi-detached properties of varied designs, set back from the highway. The northern side of the road is more varied with mainly bungalows, some of which have been

extended with rooms in the roof and the introduction of dormers. The appeal property and its immediate neighbours are of similar design with brickwork and a painted brickwork course under the eaves and with tile roofs. With a very small number of exceptions, the use of brickwork, painted brick and render with tiled roofs is the predominant palette of materials in the immediate vicinity and provides a consistent and cohesive appearance to the street scene.

6. The use of the grey coloured composite boarding for the gable end at roof level and for the rear dormer results in a stark and visually discordant addition to the house and draws attention to the roof level. The materials which are at odds with the materials used for the rest of the house make the roof changes appear top heavy and over dominant in relation to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. The colour selected, which does not match the colour palette for the rest of the house, exacerbates the harm I have found.

7. The gable end and the side of the rear dormer are very evident in street scene views, when approaching from the west and in such views the roof changes appear jarring and over prominent in the street and therefore detract from the character and appearance of the local area.

8. The Appellant has drawn my attention to a small number of examples in the local vicinity where similar forms of cladding have been used, two of which are also in Terringes Avenue. Each application must be considered on its individual merits but in so far as the information has been made available to me, I have taken them into account. However, the very small number of examples of the use of different materials to the host property do not persuade me that more should be allowed, given the harm I have found both to the character and appearance of the host property as well as to the local area. The Council has also referred me to a number of recent applications in the same road where the Council has refused permission for the introduction of cladding materials which differ from the existing materials of the property or has imposed conditions to require matching materials.

9. I therefore conclude that the materials used in the loft conversion at the appeal property do materially harm the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area. This conflicts with Policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan, the Council's SPG 'Extending or Altering Your Home' and the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular Section 12, all of which amongst other matters seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.

Other Considerations

10. A neighbour to the rear of the appeal property in Chippers Road has raised an objection that, amongst other matters, the rear dormer leads to overlooking and loss of privacy for his house and rear garden. However, given the distances involved between the two properties, and the presence of rear facing windows as existing, I do not consider that this would be a reason to withhold planning permission, were there no other matters of concern. The Council did not raise this as a reason for refusal.

11. I have taken into account the reasons for selecting the materials, including to meet sustainability objectives, but these do not overcome the harm I have concluded. There is no issue with the principle of the provision of additional accommodation at roof level, and as set out in this decision letter, the main issue relates to the choice of external materials, including their colour.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including in representations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR