The Planning Inspectorate

WORTHING BOROUGH COUNCIL
PLANNING SECTION
RECEIVED - 6 FEB 2012
TO WB
INSTRUCTION

Quality Assurance Unit
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol, BS1 6PN

Direct Line: 0117 372 8252
Customer Services: 0117 372 6372

Viki Beer
Worthing Borough Council
Development Control Section
Planning Section
Portland House
Richmond Road
Worthing
BN11 1LF

Your Ref: WB/11/0215/FUL

Our Ref: APP/M3835/A/11/2161434/NWF

Date: 3 February 2012

Dear Ms Beer

Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Appeal by Mr A Young
Site at 44 Christchurch Road, Worthing, BN11 1JA

I enclose a copy of our Inspector's decision on the above appeal.

If you have queries or complaints about the decision or the way we handled the appeal, you should submit them using our "Feedback" webpage at www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/appeals/planninginspectorate/feedback. This page also contains information on our complaints procedures and the right of challenge to the High Court, the only method by which the decision can be reconsidered.

If you do not have internet access, or would prefer hard copies of our information on the right to challenge and our complaints procedure, please contact our Quality Assurance Unit on 0117 372 8252 or in writing to the address above.

Please note the Planning Inspectorate is not the administering body for High Court challenges. If you would like more information on the strictly enforced deadlines for challenging, or a copy of the forms for lodging a challenge, please contact the Administrative Court on 020 7947 6655.

Yours sincerely

Kevin Plummer

COVERDL1

INVESTOR IN PEOPLE
POSITIVE ABOUT DISABLED PEOPLE

You can use the Internet to submit documents, to see information and to check the progress of this case through the Planning Portal. The address of our search page is -
http://www.pcs.planningportal.gov.uk/pcsportal/casesearch.asp
You can access this case by putting the above reference number into the 'Case Ref' field of the 'Search' page and clicking on the search button

WORTHING BOROUGH COUNCIL
PLANNING SECTION
RECEIEVD - 6 FEB 2012
TO
REF NO
INSTRUCTION

The Planning Inspectorate
EST 1909

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2011

by Ray Wright BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 3 February 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/M3835/A/11/2161434
44 Christchurch Road, Worthing, West Sussex BN11 1JA

- 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 A Young against the decision of Worthing Borough Council.
- The application Ref 11/0215/FULL, dated 22 June 2011, was refused by notice dated 23 August 2011.
- The development proposed is 'conversion and alterations of existing house to create 4 flats. Demolition of existing garage.'

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. At the site visit I saw that works of conversion of the building from a dwelling house to flats had commenced. However, for the avoidance of doubt I confirm that the determination of the appeal is based on the drawings submitted and not on the works as partially constructed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the Council's objective of retaining existing family housing.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a two storey, semi-detached Victorian property with a garage building to its side. It is located in a predominantly residential area, consisting of a mix of single dwellings and flats, interspersed with some, generally community based, alternative uses.

5. The appeal scheme proposes the conversion of the property into four self-contained flats. This would consist of two one bedroom flats at first floor level, with a one bedroom and a two bedroom unit on the ground floor. The two bed unit would comprise of two double bedrooms, a bathroom and a combined kitchen/ living room/dining area leading to the rear courtyard garden.

6. The Council in its decision refers to the proposed development resulting in the loss of a 'small sized' dwelling suitable for family occupation. The appellant disputes this and identifies the property as being too large for such use, with it

previously having seven/eight bedrooms. The 'existing floor plans' however show two of these bedrooms at ground floor level where alternative living space could reasonably be provided. At first floor level a further two bedrooms are shown which are of an extremely small size and limited use, with one being directly linked to a larger adjoining bedroom. It is recognised the property may have been extended in the past at ground floor level, and I do not consider it is 'small sized.' However, in my view it does appear to remain of an overall size and form that could reasonably still be occupied as a single dwelling house which could accommodate a family.

7. Policy 9 of the Worthing Core Strategy 2011 (CS), aims to retain the existing housing stock unless, amongst other matters, the proposal would result in 'a net increase in the family housing stock.'

8. The two bedroom flat proposed at ground floor level could potentially be occupied by a family and therefore represent a family unit. However, with the three other units proposed containing only one bedroom there would not be an increase in family housing stock, as required by Policy 9 of the CS.

9. The Council indicate that its approach to the mix of housing is informed (in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 3 – 'Housing') by its Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). The SHMA identifies that housing in Worthing is focussed towards smaller properties, typically 1-2 bedrooms, and the main objective is to redress the imbalance in the housing mix that has dominated recent new developments, namely smaller flats. A range of housing types is sought with a key objective to retain where possible existing family housing.

10. This proposal in providing four small flats, albeit that one would have two bedrooms, would result in the loss of an existing family house and would therefore be contrary to the aims of Policy 9 of the CS.

11. Overall for the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

Ray Wright

INSPECTOR