Sec. Reg

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2009

by S J Emerson BSc DipTP MRTPI

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: 16 January 2009

Appeal Ref: APP/M3835/A/08/2084572
37 Rosebery Avenue, Goring-by-Sea, Worthng BN12 4EX.

- 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 Owen against the decision of Worthing Borough Council.
- The application Ref WB/08/0095/FULL, dated 31 January 2008, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2008.
- The development proposed is a first floor extension with a pitched roof.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the street scene.

Reasons

3. Apart from 2 detached houses at one end, Rosebery Avenue consists of 2 similar types of semi-detached houses. One style was built with a catslide roof over the garage at the side of the house with a small dormer in the catslide roof. The other style has a full first floor above the garage. The design of both styles included fully hipped main roofs and distinctive, large 2 storey bays at the front.

4. No 37 has a catslide roof over the garage and retains its original small dormer at the side. Planning permission was granted on appeal in 2005 for a first floor extension over the garage with the main roof extended over it retaining a fully hipped form. This would make the dwelling look similar to the original 4 bed houses in the road. This permission is still valid and it is likely that the appearance of No 37 will change even if I were to dismiss the present appeal. The present proposal is for a first floor extension over the garage with the extended roof forming a gable end. The main visual difference in relation to the street scene between what has been permitted and the present proposal is the change from a hipped roof to a gable end.

5. On many of houses with catslide roofs, the small dormer has been enlarged or the roof altered in some other way. Some of these alterations are ungainly. However, in most cases, the dwellings retain part of the catslide roof. I saw 2 dwellings where an original hipped roof has become a gable. One (No 9) has retained its catslide roof, but the main roof has become gable with a small hip at the top. The other (No 17), is of the style with a full 1st floor over the garage, but the original hipped roof has been extended to form a gable end.

The appearance of this house is similar to what is now proposed for No 37. Despite all the changes, I consider that there remains an attractive visual coherence to the street scene along Rosebery Avenue. The hipped form of most of the roofs contributes to this coherence.

6. The extension to No 37 that has already been permitted would, if built, detract from the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached houses of which it is part, but there would be an even greater impact in this respect if No 37 had a gable end to the extended main roof. The proposed roof would be noticeably more bulky than the permitted hipped roof extension. The change from a hipped to a gable roof would also make the house stand out as an untypical building in the road. If I were to allow this appeal, it would make it harder for the Council to resist other similar changes, the cumulative effect of which would be to seriously undermine the visual coherence of the road. I therefore consider that the proposal would harm the street scene and be contrary to policy H16 (i) of the Worthing Local Plan 2003, since it would not be satisfactory in relation to the existing property or in relation to a predominant characteristic of adjoining properties.

7. I appreciate the appellant's desire for more space to accommodate his family. The extension already permitted would provide additional accommodation tand I consider that the personal benefit of a bathroom within the larger roofspace now proposed does not outweigh the public interest in retaining the attractive qualities of this street.

Simon Emerson

INSPECTOR