



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2019 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3825/W/19/3226009

202 Crawley Road, Horsham RH12 4EU

- 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 Stuart Powell against the decision of Horsham District Council.
 - The application Ref DC/18/2697, dated 14 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 6 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is part two storey and part single storey over existing building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a single storey building with a pitched roof located on a corner plot at the junction between Crawley Road and Leechpool Lane. The existing building is currently used by a sign production company and is attached to Anfield House, a two-storey dwelling fronting Leechpool Lane. There is a back-office and W.C section which wraps around the side and rear part of the adjacent dwelling, appearing as a lean-to monopitch extension.
 5. The site lies within a predominantly residential area characterised by a mix dwelling types and architectural styles. There are terraced properties, semi-detached properties, single-storey bungalows, as well a small block of flats to the east of the appeal site on the opposite corner with Leechpool Lane. Most of the buildings in the vicinity are set back from the highway whereas the appeal building directly abuts the footway, making it appear prominently on the street scene.
 6. The proposed extensions would result in a two-storey building with a hipped roof which would copy the roof structure of the existing building. The lean-to
-

back office section attached to the adjacent property would be retained. The proposal would also include a central gable feature fronting onto Crawley Road which would appear to mimic the community hall opposite.

7. I find that the proposed extensions would result in a large and conspicuous building which would appear overbearing due to its prominent location close to the footway and on a highly visible corner plot. The height and general scale of the proposed building would stand out on the street scene, especially when viewed from the east on Crawley Road. It would not tie in with the existing grain of development in the surrounding area which features buildings detached from the footway.
8. Furthermore, the development would appear cramped on what is a small sized plot. This detracts from the appearance of the area which is more spacious, being characterised by small front gardens and driveways.
9. It is noted that this scheme represents an amendment to a previous proposal, by reducing the footprint and omitting the triangular corner feature. However, it is considered that the scale, siting, and design of the proposal would still result in an incongruous addition to the street scene that would fail to appear sympathetic and in keeping with its surroundings.
10. The appellant refers to other developments in the local area. However, these examples are different forms of development in different settings and are not directly comparable to the proposal before me. Furthermore, each application and appeal should be determined on its individual merits, and this is the approach that I have adopted.
11. I acknowledge the proposal would enable the business to grow, and would provide better customer access. However, I only afford limited weight to these points and they do not outweigh the proposal's detraction from the character of the area.
12. I conclude the proposal would significantly harm the established character and appearance of the area. I therefore consider that the proposed development conflicts with policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework which together seek to ensure high-quality design of buildings and spaces.

Recommendation

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

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR