

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February 2017

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3825/D/16/3161395

Hillyards, Sunset Lane, West Chiltington, Pulborough RH20 2PB

- 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 Mrs Michele Paske against the decision of Horsham District Council.
 - The application, Ref. DC/16/1463, dated 24 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing garages and construction of a one and a half storey with rooms in the roof side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings.

Reasons

3. I saw on my visit that Hillyards is on the western side of a generously sized triangular plot in a low-density residential area. Although there is boundary planting the dwelling can be seen from a number of vantage points in both Sunset Lane and Monkmead Lane.
 4. The Council's concern is that the proposed one and a half storey extension on the south eastern flank of the dwelling would be too large and inappropriately designed. As regards size, the Council cites its guidance on household extensions that '*A side extension should appear as a smaller element when viewed against the main house*'.
 5. Bearing in mind the large size of the plot, I see no problem in principle with a height of one and a half storeys or with an extension of substantial width and depth, provided that the design is such that the addition is seamlessly integrated with the host dwelling. However, this would involve a substantial re-design and alteration of the existing building, whereas the appeal scheme seeks to retain its main profile and characteristics but extend disproportionately.
 6. The outcome would be an addition that dominates the host building in scale rather than be subservient to it. In particular, the increase in ridge height is an unfortunate feature and the large front gable would be incongruously scaled in
-

relation to the existing gable. Both the front and the side elevation are over-fenestrated and the unsuitability of the extension in terms of both scale and design is in my view clearly illustrated by all four elevations on the submitted drawings.

7. The grounds of appeal appear to interpret the Council's assertion of dominance as being related to nearby dwellings. However, I consider it is dominance and unsympathetic design as regards the relationship with the host dwelling that is at issue, and accordingly that the decision to refuse permission was correct. This lack of harmony with the existing building would be evident in views from the public realm. I have some sympathy with the grounds of appeal in respect of external materials, but the more fundamental point is one of the side extension's appearance in terms of inappropriate scale and detailed design.
8. Overall, I conclude that the proposed extension would have an unacceptably harmful effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings. This would be in conflict with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework 2015 (Policies 1 & 2 referred to by the Council do not appear to be particularly relevant). There would be a similar conflict with Section 7: 'Requiring Good Design' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
9. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR