



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2019

by J E Jolly BA (Hons) MA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/D3830/D/19/3234145

66 Edward Road, Haywards Heath RH16 4QF

- 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 and Mrs Edmondson against the decision of Mid Sussex District Council.
 - The application Ref DM/19/1913, dated 17 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is for the demolition of an existing porch/glazed lean-to/rear first-floor dormer, and the erection of single storey extensions to the front and rear of the property. Hip to gable works, including a pitched roof front dormer, and a flat roof rear dormer and internal alterations.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in a residential area of one and two-storey dwellings that are set-back behind garden spaces or off-street parking. 66 Edward Road is a detached, chalet-style bungalow with a hipped roof that sits between a similar dwelling and a two-storey house. To the rear of No 66 there is a generous garden that is proportionate with the neighbouring gardens, some of which have single-storey outriggers. The garden slopes to the rear boundary where a wooden gate leads to a hardstanding and garages which appear to be associated with the dwellings on Edward Road. The hardstanding is secured by a gate and hedging that leads to Vale Road which is typified by one-storey bungalows.
4. The proposal is for the demolition of the existing porch, rear dormer, chimney stack, and a glazed lean-to that would be replaced by a gable roof, pitched front dormer and a rear ground floor extension and flat roof dormer. To the front elevation the proposal is relatively modest and accords with other dwellings that face onto Edward Road. However, while the existing ridge height is not exceeded, the breadth of the proposal to the rear of the property, the box-style flat-roof dormer in combination with the relatively deep flat roof extension is incongruous with the surrounding area and would be a prominent feature to both the sides and rear of the dwelling.

5. Moreover, whilst reasonably localised in its extent, and notwithstanding the proposed use of matching materials, the bulk of the proposal would erode the character, appearance and integrity of the host dwelling with consequent harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
6. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to the Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Council, Mid Sussex District Plan 2018, and the Mid Sussex Dormer Window and Rooflight Design Guidance which state, amongst other aims, that large, box-like, flat-roof dormers are generally unacceptable, and that development is required to be of high-quality design that contributes to the private and public realm, and for similar reasons Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework that indicates development should be sympathetic to the local character, including the surrounding built environment.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J E JOLLY

INSPECTOR