St Reg

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 June 2008

by Susan A F Simpson LLB

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

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN
☎ 0117 372 6372
email:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
2 July 2008

Appeal Ref: APP/M3835/A/08/2067335
14 Alder Close, Worthing, West Sussex BN13 3PU

- 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 Chatfield against the decision of the Worthing Borough Council.
- The application (Ref. WB/07/1225/FULL), dated 25 September 2007, was refused by a notice dated 26 November 2007.
- The development proposed is described in the application as a first floor side extension.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Reasons

2. The detached appeal dwelling is located within a modern housing estate of relatively high density. Its immediate semi-detached neighbours (11 & 12 Alder Close) are similar in design but the introduction of a dormer extension in the roof space above No 12's garage has interrupted the rhythm of the trio to the extent that they do not now form or appear as a distinct group. As a result, I do not consider that a further change to the original design concept for these properties would appear incongruous or detract from the character and appearance of this part of the street scene.

3. However, the essential characteristic of this estate development is of closely sited two-storey buildings where gaps at first floor level contribute to a sense of openness and help prevent an overall street appearance of continuous terracing. The proposed extension would completely erode such a gap and result in only a minimal amount of separation between it and No 15. Furthermore, the appeal dwelling's forward siting would only serve to emphasise the resulting inconsistency in terms of the pattern of spacing in the street scene. Accordingly, as the proposal would be incompatible with and adversely affect the spatial characteristics of the locality, it would be contrary to policies BE1 and H16 of the Council's adopted Local Plan.

4. As the front elevation of No 15 is well set back from the appeal dwelling, its occupiers already have a view from their front lounge across to a large part of the flank elevation of the appellant's garage. The proposal would result in an increase in the expanse of the flank wall but in terms of a general outlook from the lounge, I doubt whether the full extent of this increase would be readily discernable. Thus, whilst I accept that the proposal may result in some change

in terms of outlook for residents of No 15, it would not be to the extent of being visually oppressive or overbearing.

5. In arriving at my decision I have considered all the other matters that have been raised including that the accommodation is required to meet the growing needs of the appellant's family and the extension that has been allowed at 17 Silver Birch Drive. In respect of the latter, I saw that the subservient nature of this approved development does not appear unduly obtrusive in the context of general street scene along Silver Birch Drive. However, none of these matters alters my conclusion that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area for the reasons I have given.

S A F Simpson

INSPECTOR