
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2019

by D Peppitt BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/D3830/D/19/3230198

2 Collingwood Close, East Grinstead RH19 4BQ

- 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 Geoffrey Wickham against the decision of Mid Sussex District Council.
 - The application Ref DM/19/1134, dated 18 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey extension and porch to front of existing house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located on Collingwood Close, a residential street characterised by detached properties with yellow brick and Georgian style windows. The front garden shares its boundary with 48 Stephenson Drive.
4. On entering Collingwood Close from the junction with Stephenson Drive and Victoria Way, the host property is one of the first few properties that are visible, and as such is in a relatively prominent location. The front curtilages of the properties in the close remain readily visible all the way along the road due to the way the properties are angled. Whilst there is some variation in materials and roof form within Collingwood Close, dwellings are regularly spaced and there is a general uniformity to the pattern and design of development.
5. The introduction of a large extension to the front of the property would alter the existing building line and the existing symmetrical appearance of the front elevation. Thus, it would create an incongruous feature in the street scene. On my site visit I did not see any other properties with an extension such as that proposed. Despite the use of sympathetic materials and detailing, the proposal, due to its size and location, would be prominent within the street scene. I therefore consider that it would create a disproportionate and dominant addition to the front of the dwelling. Whilst reasonably localised in its extent,

the effect of the scheme would be to diminish unacceptably the character, appearance and integrity of the host building, with consequent harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

6. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, 2018 and Policy EG3 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan, 2016. These policies, amongst other things, seek to promote well located and designed development that reflects, and is in keeping with, the local character and appearance of the area.

Other Matters

7. I note that interested parties raised the issue of privacy and overlooking. However, as I have already identified harm to the character and appearance of the area, such that the appeal should be dismissed, these other matters do not require further consideration.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

D Peppitt

INSPECTOR