
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 October 2017

by R J Maile BSc FRICS

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

Decision date: 27 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C1435/D/17/3178934

82 Heron Ridge, Polegate, East Sussex, BN26 5BL.

- 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 & Mrs Richard Johnson against the decision of Wealden District Council.
 - The application ref: WD/2017/0621/F, dated 13 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 1 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is bedroom addition and conversion of garage into habitable accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed alterations to form the bedroom addition upon the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. No. 82 Heron Ridge is a modern detached house with an attached single storey garage. It is located within a development of similar detached, semi-detached and terraced houses.
4. The scheme before me proposes alterations to incorporate the garage into the ground floor living accommodation, together with a small extension above the pitched roof of the garage to create an enlarged fourth bedroom.
5. I see no objection to the alterations to incorporate the garage into the living accommodation. Only minor works would be necessary to the front elevation to replace the garage door, whilst adequate on-site parking would remain to serve this modest dwelling.
6. Chapter 7 of the Framework¹ focuses on issues of good design. Paragraph 64 states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

¹ The National Planning Policy Framework.

7. "Saved" Local Plan² Policy HG10 states that extensions to existing dwellings will be permitted where the scale, style, design and materials are appropriate and sympathetic in relation to existing buildings. I have also had regard to the detailed advice contained in the Council's Design Guide³, which was referred to in the Officer's Report.
8. The proposed extension above the garage would appear contrived having regard to its small size and stark front-facing elevation. It would not accord with the symmetry of the garage roof, nor possess a front-facing window to reduce the impact of the unrelieved section facing directly onto the street.
9. I noted during my site visit that a similar, slightly larger extension above the garage roof has been completed at no. 79 nearby. That extension, however, with its front-facing pitched roof dormer window, has a more appropriate and sympathetic relationship to the host dwelling.
10. The proposed alterations to form the bedroom addition do not ensure visual harmony and uniformity of appearance. As such, I have found upon the main issue that development as proposed would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area, contrary to national policy at Chapter 7 of the Framework and "saved" Policy HG10 of the Local Plan.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

R. J. Maile

INSPECTOR

² The Wealden Local Plan (December 1998).

³ The Wealden Design Guide – Supplementary Planning Document (November 2008).