



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 January 2020

by S J Papworth DipArch(Glos) RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3825/D/19/3244025

Hope Cottage, Shoreham Road, Small Dole BN5 9YG

- 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 Powell against the decision of Horsham District Council.
 - The application Ref DC/19/2076, dated 11 October 2019, was refused by the Council by notice dated 6 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey rear extension (resubmission of DC/19/0511).
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Reasons

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers with particular regard to outlook, sunlight and daylight. Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework contains development principles which include the need to ensure that the built environment is designed to avoid unacceptable harm to the amenity of occupiers and users of nearby property and land, for example through overlooking or noise, whilst having regard to the sensitivities of surrounding development.
3. The appeal property is a detached chalet-style 2 storey dwelling, the main half-hipped roof having a conventional bungalow eaves level. There are 2 large dormers to the front roof slope, and a single, wider and deeper dormer to the rear, each having a fully hip-end and each is set in from the main roof verge, up from the eaves and down from the ridge of the main roof. The rear dormer has a flat area of roof behind the 3 ridge lines.
4. The proposal would extend the ground floor plan to the rear at full width, with the first floor similarly extended and, stated to be in response to the proximity of the neighbouring house, the extent of projection nearer the mutual boundary would be less, with the full depth being over approximately half of the width, furthest from that boundary. The roof plan, although not drawn, would apparently incorporate a flat area behind the 3 new ridge lines, with the deeper part extending as a further hip-end.
5. The neighbouring dwelling is *The Sycamores* which was visited at the request of the Council. It is also a chalet-style 2-storey dwelling, but with the roof set side-to-side, and the rear façade is set in under the projecting verge forming a

balcony to an upstairs bedroom. That end of the roof is placed a short distance in from the existing rear building line of *Hope Cottage*.

6. The existing built form of *Hope Cottage* is evident in the outlook from the rear of the adjoining dwelling, but the limited overlap, even though to the south, does not cause harm due to the otherwise open outlook, the set-in of the rear dormer and the low level of the eaves.
7. The proposed arrangement would introduce a full 2-storey eaves and a significant area of blank brick wall continuing the line of the existing gable end further back alongside the boundary and only a short distance from it. The shaded area on the Block Plan shows only the ground level addition and does not indicate the full extent of additional built form which would extend from near the existing main roof ridge. It is accepted however that this information is made clear on the floor plans and elevations.
8. The effect would be a marked addition to the existing built form on the side of the house nearest the neighbouring dwelling, and the limited reduction in depth as compared with the other half further from the boundary does not assist greatly as the shorter extension would appear intrusive in the outlook from *The Sycamores* and being to the south would adversely affect the sunlight and daylight that presently reaches that rear garden nearest the house over the existing roof and to the rear of *Hope Cottage*. Whilst there would remain an open aspect to the west and north, the perception would be of a harmful reduction in outlook, daylight and sunlight, to the detriment of the occupiers' living conditions.
9. The wording of Policy 33 accepts that some loss of amenity could occur since it seeks to avoid *unacceptable* harm. However, in this case the level of harm experienced by the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling would be unacceptable and hence the proposal is contrary to Policy 33 in its effect. The proposal does not reach the standard sought in paragraph 124 of the 2019 National Planning Policy Framework which states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

S J Papworth

INSPECTOR