

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2017

by Timothy C King BA(Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 9 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3825/D/16/3162413

The Domain, Greyfriars Lane, Storrington, Pulborough, RH20 4HE

- 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 S Stephens against the decision of Horsham District Council.
 - The application Ref DC/16/1628 dated 15 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is '*Proposed link extension to northern elevation, enlargement of existing dormer to create roof extension together with installation of one rooflight to the southern roofslope, creation of porch to eastern elevation, erection of conservatory and alterations to the fenestration (part retrospective). Amended application to DC/15/1958.*'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. At my site visit I noted that certain elements of this comprehensive scheme are well under construction, and apparently substantially complete. This includes the two sizeable roof extensions; one facing the courtyard and the other to the rear or south elevation with the proposed conservatory evident below. At the time of my site visit the ground floor addition was, though, under tarpaulin and could not be viewed. The enclosed porch to the western wing of the courtyard has, in fact, already been completed, but I consider this minor element to be acceptable in its context. Despite the retrospective nature of the development at appeal I am, however, required to consider the scheme as a proposal in its entirety.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the proposal's effect on the character and appearance of the host building and also the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The proposed development, by and large, was tested at appeal in April 2016, whereby under *PINS ref: APP/Z3825/D/15/3141062* the appeal was dismissed with the Inspector concluding that the proposal would materially harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling. By way of the Inspector's findings and comments set out in her decision letter certain aspects of the
-

scheme have been revised. These include a proposed significant width reduction in the roof extension facing the courtyard, although I note that the section close to the proposed adjacent link building, which the submitted plans indicate would be removed, remains in situ. The link building itself, to be sited to the east of the courtyard, in comparison with that before the previous Inspector, would be reduced slightly in height and its relationship thereby altered with the courtyard's northern wing. On the south elevation, the previously proposed full length balcony overlying the proposed conservatory is to be replaced by two small, Juliet type balconies whilst minor alterations to existing fenestration have occurred.

5. The previous Inspector found that harm would result from all elements of the former scheme save for the porch and, with this a strong material consideration, I must decide whether the modifications now proposed are sufficient to outweigh the harm previously identified. Both dormer roof extensions remain set high to the building's ridge and I consider that their width and extent in relation to their respective roofplanes illustrate a disregard to the host building's original agricultural character, distorting its features. Further, I consider that, notwithstanding the intended deletion of the south facing balcony, the relationship between the dormer and the conservatory below would be awkward, unduly prominent, and deleterious to this façade.
6. The appellant feels that the Council, in refusing planning permission, has had little regard to either the fallback position by way of permitted development entitlement or to the extant planning permission granted in 2014 which permitted a porch and a link building. He also feels that extensions in the immediate locality, notably at St Joseph's Hall should support the proposal. Firstly, I have not been provided with any figures relating to the proposed roof extensions' respective volumes and am unable to therefore comment as to whether these extensions, either individually or even together, would fall within the parameters of a Class B development under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015. Indeed, the correct procedure here would be for the appellant to submit a S192 application under the provisions of the Planning and Compensation Act 1991 to ascertain whether or not various elements of the scheme would require planning permission.
7. I consider that the intended alterations to the proposed link building would represent an improvement in the design that was before the previous Inspector. Indeed, I understand that its revised appearance would be similar to that permitted in 2014. However, given its positioning it is not easily divisible from the adjacent alterations proposed to the north wing.
8. Finally, the existence of nearby extensions, for which the appellant attempts to draw parallels, are insufficient to outweigh the resultant harm I have described. However, I am satisfied that, notwithstanding the proposal's impact on the host building, the site is sufficiently isolated and screened so as not to unduly affect the character of the surrounding area.
9. I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and this would materially conflict with the aims and requirements of Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework.

10. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal does not succeed.

Timothy C King

INSPECTOR