
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: 29 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3825/D/16/3159229

70 Friday Street, Warnham, West Sussex RH12 3QX

- 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 David DeLange against the decision of Horsham District Council.
 - The application Ref DC/16/1028, dated 4 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is a detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed detached garage would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Warnham Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. Warnham Conservation Area contains a variety of styles and ages of buildings, including those on Friday Street that comprises a mix of terraced, semi-detached and detached houses along with a public house within the centre of the village. Buildings along this road are set at varying distances from the road, with some up to the pavement edge and others set some distance away behind substantial front gardens.
 4. 70 Friday Street is in the middle of a short terrace of four houses, set behind a deep front garden. This terrace dates from the 1960's and is of simple and unfussy traditional design, constructed of brick with a concrete tiled roof. The proposal would provide a detached single garage with a flat roof in the front garden of the property.
 5. The location of the garage to the front of the property and close to the pavement edge would result in the building being prominent on the roadside. It is of a simple design, that reflects that of the house. However, the prominent location would result in the garage being prominent in views along this section of Friday Street.
 6. I noted on my site visit that there is a limited amount of vegetation between the location of the proposed garage and the road. Additional planting would assist in disguising the garage to some extent, but the garage would remain
-

visible through any retained access such that it would be obtrusive and incongruous within the street scene.

7. I note that there are other garages along Friday Street, including within front gardens. However, these tend to be set further from the road than that proposed or next to and dominated other houses such that those garages are not prominent within the street scene.
8. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises at Paragraph 132 that, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. In my judgement, the harm to the conservation area in this case is substantial. In accordance with paragraph 133 of the Framework, there are no substantial public benefits that would outweigh that harm.
9. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed garage would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Warnham Conservation Area. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to Policies 33 and 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework that require development to reinforce the special character of the historic environment and ensure development in conservation areas is consistent with the special character of those areas.
10. I note that there is limited on street parking in the area and the proposed garage would provide secure parking in the only practical location at the property. There was a storage shed in a similar location that was disguised by surrounding planting, but that appears to have been a smaller and less intrusive building. However, these matters are not sufficient to outweigh the harm I have found to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Conclusion

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

AJ Steen

INSPECTOR