
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/16/3158962

Abbots Barn, Washington Road, Storrington RH20 4AF

- 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 Frank Ashbee against the decision of Horsham District Council.
 - The application Ref DC/16/1573, dated 11 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of rear and side extension to existing converted barn.
-

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. Abbots Barn is located within a rural area next to another property to which it was ancillary in the past. It comprises a converted barn of simple appearance with limited window openings that is excavated into the slope of the land and is set within a substantial garden. To the side and rear of the property is a quarry, with a farm to the opposite side of the road that is within the South Downs National Park.
 4. The proposal would provide two extensions to the side and rear that are similar in form to an existing projection to the front and result in a cross plan to the property. The location of the extensions in relation to the existing building and levels of the surrounding land mean that they would be visible only from very limited vantage points.
 5. The proposed rear extension would be constructed in stone and timber with a glazed link to the main part of the building. This would add bulk to and alter the simple plan of the original building. Although the proposed glazed link seeks to divide the bulk of the proposed extension from the original building, it contributes to the complicated form and appearance of the proposed extension that would dominate the building, despite being lower in height than the main part of the building.
-

6. The proposed side extension would lengthen the original main part of the barn with a lower level extension of matching materials to the original building. It incorporates significant glazed areas, but this, combined with the slightly different pitch to the roof, would result in the proposed extension appearing incongruous against the original building.
7. The differing designs of the various proposed extensions to the building, including materials, amount of glazing and roof forms and height, would result in a complicated appearance and plan form to the building at odds with the simplicity of the existing appearance and layout.
8. As a result, I conclude that the proposed extensions would harm the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area. As such, the development is contrary to Policies 1, 2, 26, 28 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework and the National Planning Policy Framework that require development to be of a high standard of design that complements the character of the area.
9. I understand that it may be possible to extend the property under permitted development rights and these may result in a larger extension than has been proposed, but I have limited information to demonstrate how this is possible. In addition, no substantive evidence has been provided that the building would be extended in this manner should this appeal be dismissed, consequently this limits the weight that I can attach to it as a fallback position.
10. Reference is made in the appeal documentation to another appeal decision, but there is limited information provided to ascertain whether there are similarities to the development proposed. In any event, I need to assess the present scheme on its individual merits.
11. I note that the proposed development would allow a more flexible use of the existing space that would improve the living conditions of occupiers of the proposed development. However, this would not outweigh the harm and policy conflict identified.

Conclusion

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

AJ Steen

INSPECTOR