

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2017

by H Lock BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3825/D/16/3164586

North Gates, The Mount, Ifield, CRAWLEY, West Sussex, RH11 0LF

- 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 Malcolm Fillmore against the decision of Horsham District Council.
 - The application Ref. DC/16/2039 was refused by notice dated 21 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is 2no. bay oak framed garage to front garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 2no. bay oak framed garage to front garden at North Gates, The Mount, Ifield, CRAWLEY, West Sussex, RH11 0LF, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref. DC/16/2039 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1:1250 scale location plan and drawing no. 16/08/7 (date stamped 7 SEP 2016).
 - 3) The roof materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached house that forms part of a cluster of buildings within the countryside. There is no uniform siting of buildings within this group, and whereas 'North Gates' is set back from its boundaries, parts of 'Mount Barn' to the east are built next to the roadside verge. Although there are open fields opposite the appeal site and elsewhere along the road, there are also large-scale agricultural and equine buildings scattered in the landscape. There is existing open parking on a gravelled area of the appeal site.
 4. The appeal building would be reasonably large in footprint and height, but it would nonetheless appear proportionate to the main house. The development
-

could be accommodated appropriately within the curtilage of the appeal property and the need could not evidently be met by existing buildings, as required by Policy 28 of the Horsham District Planning Framework 2015 (HDPF). I am not persuaded by the Council's view that the footprint of the proposed building is excessive to house two cars given the size of modern vehicles. Whilst the height of the building would facilitate storage space in the roof, this is a consequence of the traditional design, which would be compromised by a shallower roof pitch.

5. The size of the building would have regard to the host dwelling, and the resultant buildings would appear appropriately grouped together, in accordance with HDPF Policy 28. As this policy allows for garaging within the countryside, I find no conflict with the strategic Policy 26. Given the size and scale of other buildings in the vicinity, the proposal would be appropriate to the countryside character and location, and would not result in an increase in activity levels.
6. The siting of the proposed building would require the removal of some planting which currently screens the site. Although the loss of a conifer tree would increase the visibility of the new building in the street scene, I consider that the design and scale of the building would be appropriate in its context, and therefore it would not detract from the street scene regardless of the tree loss. Other trees and hedging would remain, and would soften views of the new building. Moreover, the proposed garage would be seen in the context of other structures of varying heights in the street scene, and would not therefore appear unduly dominant or obtrusive. The Council acknowledges that in itself the proposed garage would be appropriately designed in terms of materials.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not detract from the character and appearance of the street scene, and would accord with the aims of HDPF Policies 26 and 28, and the overarching principles of HDPF Policy 33, which amongst other criteria requires development to be of a high standard of design in matters of scale, massing and appearance, and to relate sympathetically with the built surroundings and landscape.

Conditions

8. In addition to the standard time limit, I have attached a condition specifying the approved drawings as this provides certainty. It is also appropriate to control the roof tiles to match the existing dwelling, in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the development and the area.

Conclusion

9. The National Planning Policy Framework establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and part of its environmental strand is to contribute to protecting and enhancing the built environment. A core planning principle of the Framework is to always seek to secure high quality design, and for the reasons given above the proposal would comply with this principle, and would be sustainable development supported through the Framework. As a consequence, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

H Lock

INSPECTOR