
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2016

by AJ Steen BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3825/D/16/3159730

St Andrews Lodge, Coolham Road, Brooks Green RH13 0JW

- 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 & Mrs C Williams against the decision of Horsham District Council.
 - The application Ref DC/16/1456, dated 28 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed first floor extension on the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Reference is made in the appeal documents to the presumption in favour of sustainable development referred to in the National Planning Policy Framework. This confirms that development proposals that accord with the development plan, such as the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF), should be approved without delay.
 4. St Andrews Lodge is a bungalow set within the rural area at the edge of Brooks Green. It is set above the road, behind a substantial treed verge, with fields to the rear and two new properties under construction higher on the slope of the land on the adjacent site. As such, the bungalow is not visible from the road except in glimpsed views through the access.
 5. The existing bungalow is of simple form and design, with a substantial flat roofed garage of functional appearance attached to the side closest to the neighbouring property currently under construction. Its substantial width and low height result in a horizontal emphasis to the appearance of the building.
 6. The proposal would extend the property with an additional floor above the existing flat roofed garage. This would be tile hung, with a pitched roof that would be higher than the existing roof of the bungalow. The width and height of the proposed extension above the garage would result in a vertical appearance to the proposed extension, which would contrast with the
-

horizontal emphasis of the existing building and would dominate it. This would be exacerbated by the projection of the extension forward of the existing roof, increasing its prominence. Consequently, the proposed extension would appear incongruous and would not be in keeping with the scale and character of the existing building.

7. As a result, I conclude that the proposed first floor extension would harm the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area. As such, it would be contrary to Policies 28 and 33 of the HDPF that seek to ensure development is of a high standard of design and layout that respects the scale and character of the existing building and the surrounding area.
8. My attention has been drawn to another development comprising a two storey extension to the side of a bungalow. Limited information has been provided regarding the circumstances of that case, but that extension provided more contrast in terms of design and location in relation to the original dwelling that had a different effect on the appearance of the development. As I consider that case to be substantially different from that before me, I give it limited weight. In any event, I need to consider the current scheme on its individual merits.

Conclusion

9. On the basis of the above considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

AJ Steen

INSPECTOR