The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 May 2017

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3825/D/17/3171847
23 Pound Lane, Upper Beeding BN44 3JB

- 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 J Manvell against the decision of Horsham District Council.
- The application Ref DC/16/2583, dated 14 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 January 2017.
- The development proposed is a rear and side extension, front porch and bay window, attic works including dormer.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey end of terrace house set back from the road behind a front garden/driveway. The property is located in a mature well-established residential area, typically characterised by terraced and semi-detached properties within the immediate vicinity of the site. A number of dwellings have existing side and rear extensions, although these generally appear as clearly subordinate to the main house.

4. The proposal would entail the construction of a two storey rear and side extension, rear roof extension with dormer and a front porch and bay window projection. The proposed two storey extension would extend across the full width of the house and project out by approximately 3.8m from the rear elevation of the property and about 0.8m from the side elevation. The proposed roof extension would be of a flat topped design built off the ridge of the main roof and over the rear extension with a flat vertical rear elevation set back from the rear building line. The external finish of the extension would be predominantly constructed from brick and painted render with a zinc roof finish. The dormer extension would be finished in zinc and timber cladding.

5. The proposed two storey extension, by virtue of its scale and design, would be a significant addition relative to the main house and, combined with the rear dormer roof extension above, would result in substantial bulk at this side of the dwelling. As such, although set back from the front elevation of the property

and set back at roof level from the rear building line, it would be out of character with the generally more modest rear and side extensions in the area. The proposed two storey extension and roof extension would significantly detract from the form of the main house and would fail to achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property.

6. The consequential harm would not in my view be sufficiently resolved by the limited effect of the proposed side and rear extensions on the street scene. In any case, the site is viewed from the rear of a number of surrounding properties. As such, I consider the development would result in incongruous and out-of-keeping additions that would adversely harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

7. I have considered the appellant's statement that the design of the proposal has been carefully considered in order to take into account the character of the host property and the area and to create additional accommodation to meet the needs of the appellant's family. I note that the proposal has been redesigned following the previously refused application at the appeal property in September 2016[1]. Whilst the use of matching materials and fenestrations would assist in integrating the proposed extensions with the host property, these aspects again do not overcome the adverse effects outlined above. I therefore accord these matters limited weight.

8. I have noted the other developments in the area drawn to my attention by the appellant. The single storey rear extension and dormer extension at no. 21 Pound Lane and the two storey rear extension and roof additions at nos. 25 and 27 Pound Lane are of a different scale and form and have different development characteristics to the appeal scheme. I therefore accord them limited weight as precedents in this case.

9. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area. The development conflicts with Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework 2015, which I consider relevant in this case. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that all new development is of a high quality design that relates sympathetically in terms of its scale, massing and appearance to the built surroundings and respects the locally distinctive character of the surrounding area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR

[1] DC/16/1357