
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/16/3159431

23 Montpelier Gardens, Washington, West Sussex RH20 3BW

- 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 Ms Emma Hogsden against the decision of Horsham District Council.
 - The application Ref DC/16/0625, dated 17 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of side and rear 2 storey extension to provide 2 additional bedrooms and new kitchen/dining room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Montpelier Gardens forms part of a small housing estate outside the village of Washington, comprising predominantly two storey semi-detached houses with hipped roofs, along with a small block of flats toward the end of the road. The houses are of a consistent design and most remain largely unaltered, the flats being of differing design and appearance. No. 23 is the end semi-detached house, adjacent to the flats, with a larger side garden than other houses in the road that had a garage, although that has now been removed.
 4. The proposal would extend the property to the side with a two storey extension and single storey garage, and a single storey extension to the rear. The side extension would continue the existing front elevation of the building at first floor and roof level, with a hipped roof above and be constructed in matching materials. In continuing the front elevation and roof slope in this manner, the proposed extension would result in this house appearing significantly wider than the attached property, such that it would dominate and unbalance the pair.
 5. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area. As such, the development is contrary to Policies 1, 28, 32 and 33 of the Horsham
-

District Planning Framework that require development to be of a high standard of design that complements the character of the area.

6. I understand the appellants wish to provide additional space for their family and improve their living conditions and there have not been objections from neighbouring occupiers or the Parish Council. This is not an uncommon scenario and, while I have sympathy to the circumstances described, they are not sufficient to outweigh the harm and policy conflict identified.
7. I note that other houses in the road have been extended. In particular, nos. 5 and 7 have been extended in a similar manner, albeit with hipped roofs, however they are an attached pair that maintain the symmetry and balance of the building by both having the extensions of matching designs. The extension at no. 8 is set back at first floor and roof level, which ensures that extension appears as a later addition to the property and mitigates the unbalancing effect to some extent. I have not been provided with the details of the history of any of these properties. As I consider those cases to be substantially different from that before me, I give them limited weight. In any event, I need to consider this case on its individual merits.

Conclusion

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

AJ Steen

INSPECTOR