

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2016

by C Jack BSc(Hons) MA MA(TP) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 25 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3825/D/16/3156866
18 Chestnut Walk, Pulborough RH20 1AW

- 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 and Mrs Latter against the decision of Horsham District Council.
 - The application Ref DC/16/0959, dated 26 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is the removal of roof over single storey extension and formation of new first floor, a single storey side extension and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the removal of roof over single storey extension and formation of new first floor, a single storey side extension and internal alterations at 18 Chestnut Walk, Pulborough RH20 1AW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/16/0959, dated 26 April 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawing 1615/P01.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, including the adjacent Pulborough (Church Place) Conservation Area (PCPCA).

Reasons

3. 18 Chestnut Walk (No 18) is a modern detached house, situated in a residential area, predominantly characterised in the vicinity by detached properties of similar design and appearance. No 18 is set back from the road, with a drive and lawn to the front. The PCPCA is situated immediately adjacent to the rear boundary of No 18. It is proposed to add first floor
-

accommodation above an existing single-storey extension to the rear, and to add a single-storey orangery extension to the side.

4. The rear extension would be almost entirely screened from view from the road, apart from glimpses of the side wall between No 18 and No 16. There would be reasonable separation from the neighbouring properties on either side and there would be no public views of the proposed rear roof form, which would anyway be subordinate to the main roof. In addition, the four rear sun pipes would be set into the rear roof slope and thus have minimal visual effect. Accordingly, the first floor rear extension would have no significant effect on either the street scene or the character and appearance of No 18.
5. The single-storey side extension would be well set back from the front elevation of the house and situated behind an existing hedge and close boarded fence, which demark the front and back gardens. As a result, only the top section of the side extension would be visible from the road. Due to the degree of set back from the road, the limited height of the side extension due to its flat-roof, the hedge and fence screening and the manner in which No 18 and No 16 relate to the curvature of the road, this side extension would not be intrusive or prominent in the street scene, or in relation to No 18.
6. Moreover, the proposed development would be very effectively screened from the adjacent PCPCA due to the boundary fence and the various mature trees at the rear. The extensions would also be well set back and set down from the boundary of the PCPCA such that its effect on the character or appearance of the adjacent PCPCA would be negligible.
7. I therefore conclude that both individually and cumulatively the visual effect of the rear and side extensions would not be significant and their design and appearance would not be visually dominant, incongruous or unsympathetic to the host dwelling or in relation to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework 2015, which sets out key development principles, including that the scale, massing and appearance of the development should be of a high standard of design and layout and relate sympathetically with the built surroundings.
8. In light of my reasoning above, I further conclude that while the proposed development would result in a small measure of perceptible change to the setting of the PCPCA, this would not be of a magnitude to constitute harm, particularly given the degree of separation and screening between No 18 and the PCPCA. Accordingly, the effect of the proposed development would be neutral and therefore the setting of the adjacent PCPCA would be preserved. The proposed development would thus accord with the expectations of the National Planning Policy Framework in this regard.

Other Matters

9. I have noted the Council's advice that there have only been two previous two-storey extensions in Chestnut Walk. However, there is no significant evidence before me that this factor should weigh significantly against the proposed development, which I have considered on its own merits and found

to accord with the development plan. Accordingly, this does not outweigh my findings above.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard three year time limit for commencement, I have imposed a condition relating to external materials as this is necessary to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development. I have also imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted drawing, as this provides certainty.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Catherine Jack

INSPECTOR