Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 October 2010

By Sheila Holden
BSc MSc CEng TPP MICE MRTPI FCIHT

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:
21 October 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/M3835/D/10/2136353
28 Smugglers Walk, Worthing, West Sussex BN12 4DP

- 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 G Trimmer against the decision of Worthing Borough Council.
- The application Ref WB/10/00358/FULL, dated 4 May 2010, was refused by notice dated 23 June 2010.
- The development proposed is extension/alteration to form new first floor bedroom.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Smugglers Walk is characterised by detached properties in modest sized plots. Nos. 28 and 30 were originally constructed to the same design and exhibit some common features. However, No 28, which sits in a larger plot than No 30, has already been substantially extended with a two-storey addition on the eastern side and a dormer window above the garage which faces towards No 30. The proposal is to construct a second dormer window, also facing No 30, to provide an extra bedroom.

4. The existing dormer window occupies much of the width of the cat-slide roof which integrates the garage with the main house. The proposed dormer, which would be significantly larger, would sit to its rear in and above a smaller roof to a side extension and it would protrude beyond the wall of this elevation. Its roof would include a cut-off rather than a complete hip to reduce its overall height. In my view this combination of factors would result in the proposed dormer appearing to be a cumbersome and bulky addition to this part of the building which would fail to harmonise or integrate satisfactorily with the existing dwelling.

5. The proposed dormer would also be visible from the street where the similarities and synergies of the roof forms of Nos. 28 and 30 have already been partially lost with the existing dormer. In this context I consider that the appeal proposal would appear poorly proportioned, excessive in size and would further erode the common features of the two properties. It would therefore appear as an incongruous addition to the street scene.

6. I appreciate that the appeal proposal is a reduced scheme which was amended following discussions with Council officers. However, I have considered the proposal afresh on its planning merits and for the reasons set out above conclude that the proposed extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding street scene. It would therefore be contrary to saved Policies BE1 and H16 of the Worthing Local Plan which seek high quality design that respects its setting. It would also fail to comply with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: *Extending or Altering Your Home*, which seeks to resist the construction of excessively sized dormers which fail to harmonise with the existing building.

Other matters

7. Although not an issue between the main parties the occupier of No 30 made representations to the Council about potential overshadowing and loss of light arising from the proposed dormer window. The Council's assessment of the impact of the appeal proposal appears to be consistent with the observations I was able to make at the site visit. I therefore consider that the effects on the living conditions of these neighbours would not be so materially harmful as to warrant refusal of planning permission.

Conclusion

8. I have found that the appeal proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area and for this reason and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Sheila Holden
INSPECTOR