

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: 28th October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3825/D/16/3157400

26 Patchings, Horsham, West Sussex RH13 5HL

- 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 Colin Minto against the decision of Horsham District Council.
 - The application Ref DC/16/0978, dated 20 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension and single storey extension to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension and single storey extension to the rear at 26 Patchings, Horsham, West Sussex RH13 5HL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/16/0978, dated 20 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 plans DE552/A.01P1; DE552/A.03.1P3; DE552/A.05.1P1 and DE552/A.05.2P1.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have amended the site address from that given on the application form to remove 'The' since it is apparent from my site visit and other submitted details that the appeal property is 26 Patchings.
3. The drawing number DE552/A.03.1P3 relating to the existing plans and elevations differs from the drawing number for existing plans and elevations quoted on the Council's decision notice (DE552/A.03.1P1). However, as this plan was provided to the appeal by the Council, and I saw from my site visit that it adequately reflects the existing situation on site, I am satisfied that no party would be prejudiced by my consideration of drawing DE552/A.03.1P3 in this appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.
-

Reasons

5. 26 Patchings (No 26) is a two-storey detached house situated in a roughly triangular plot with a relatively wide frontage compared to nearby properties. It has a catslide roof on the northern side, which accommodates a large side roof extension flush with the main rear elevation at the back. Patchings is a residential crescent predominantly featuring a variety of detached houses, many of which have been altered, including to the side and front.
6. The proposed development is a two-storey extension to the side, including an integral garage, and a single-storey extension across the full width of the house at the rear.
7. The proposed side extension would be large in relation to the existing house. However, it would be set down from the main ridge and feature a hipped roof, which would help to reduce its scale and visual bulk. The design and details would be in keeping with the host property and the additional width of the building would be broken up by a small front gable and the continuation of the hipped front porch roofline across the entrance to the garage. While the side extension would not be set back from the front elevation of No 26, the set down of the roof would help identify the extension as an addition, and furthermore this would allow for the continuation of the front porch roofline to provide visual interest thereby breaking up the front elevation. Additionally, the house is sufficiently set back from the road that the extension would not be unduly prominent in the street scene.
8. Furthermore, there would be a separation of approximately 1.4m from the side elevation to the boundary. While this would be notably reduced in comparison to the existing separation, it would not be out of character with other houses in the vicinity, many of which are sited closer to their side boundaries than No 26 currently is. For these reasons, the overall scale, bulk, width and design of the side extension would not be out of character with the host property or the varied street scene.
9. The single-storey rear extension would be very well screened from view from the road by the house and existing boundary treatments. It would therefore have no significant effect on the visual amenities and character of the street scene.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework 2015, which among other things seeks to ensure that the scale, massing and appearance of the development would be of a high standard of design and layout and, where relevant, relate sympathetically with the built surroundings.

Other Matters

11. A reference was made in the Council's report to a Design Guidance Advice Leaflet No 1 – House Extensions. I have not been provided with this leaflet, or any significant details of its content, and therefore I am unable to afford it more than a little weight, which does not outweigh my findings above in relation to the development plan.

Conditions

12. 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 plans, as this provides certainty.
13. I have not imposed the Council's additional suggested condition, relating to the removal of permitted development rights for windows in the north east elevation, as the necessity is not clearly justified in this instance.

Conclusion

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

Catherine Jack

INSPECTOR