
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 March 2020

by Martin Small, BA (Hons), BPI, DipCM, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3825/D/19/3242513

1 The Moat, Pulborough, RH20 2DJ

- 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 J Kidwell against the decision of Horsham District Council.
 - The application Ref DC/19/1454, dated 17 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is 2-storey side extension with single storey front extensions all to provide enlarged family living accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side extension and single storey front extension at 1 The Moat, Pulborough, RH20 2DJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: DC/19/1454 dated 17 July 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 19-112-Loc Location Plan & Block Plan, 19-112-01 Plans, Elevations and Simple Sections as Existing, 19-112-02 Plans and Elevations as Proposed and 19-112-03 Roof Plan as Proposed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of the development in the banner heading above is taken from the application form. However, I have used the description of the development from the Council's decision notice in my decision as this more accurately and concisely describes the proposed development. As this is the description used by the appellant on the appeal form, there is no prejudice to the appellant's case in my use of this amended description.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property forms one half of a pair of semi-detached dwellings set back from and at a higher level than the road at the junction of Moat Lane / The Spinney with The Moat. The Moat is a small close of semi-detached 2-storey dwellings of generally similar design, although I observed during my site

- visit that some of the pairs of dwellings have catslide roofs and others have full hips. I also observed that some of the dwellings have been extended.
5. The appeal property and its partner dwelling have catslide roofs. Although the dwellings are partially hidden by vegetation to their front boundaries, this roof form can be appreciated from Moat Lane / The Spinney both through the access to the appeal property and from opposite the entrance to The Moat. However, whilst sited at a high point, the properties are not prominent in the street scene due to being set back from the road and intervening vegetation.
 6. When viewed from opposite the entrance to The Moat, the appeal property and its partner dwelling are seen in the context of the other properties on The Moat with which they share similarities in form, design and materials. However, the appeal property faces Moat Lane / The Spinney and reads as part of the street scene along these roads, particularly when approaching from the south.
 7. Both Moat Lane and The Spinney host properties of varying forms, sizes and designs, thus resulting in a less homogenous street scene than that of The Moat. Whilst the two dwellings immediately to the south of the appeal property are bungalows, other properties include large detached and semi-detached dwellings. Opposite the appeal property and its partner dwelling are large semi-detached dwellings with hipped roofs.
 8. The proposed side extension is substantial and would result in the loss of the existing feature catslide roof, thus unbalancing the appearance of the pair of dwellings. The proposed extension would not be subservient to the host dwelling and so would result in a substantial change to its appearance.
 9. However, whilst catslide roofs are a feature of some of the properties on The Moat and can be found on other properties on Moat Lane, they are not a predominant roof form in the area, even on The Moat. The extension would have a full hip, which is also a roof form to be found in The Moat and on Moat Lane and The Spinney. The roof form of the proposed extended dwelling would therefore not appear incongruous in the street scene.
 10. The proposed extension would be no higher than the existing ridgeline of the host dwelling. Given this, the set back of the appeal property from the road and the size and variety of design of properties on Moat Lane and The Spinney, the overall form and bulk of the extended dwelling would not be harmfully at odds with the character or appearance of the area.
 11. I therefore conclude that proposed development would not be significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the area. I note that no objection was raised to the proposal by the occupiers of nearby dwellings or, from the Council's Delegated Report, by Pulborough Parish Council.
 12. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policies 32 or 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) which seek to secure design quality. The policies set out that developments will be expected to complement locally distinctive character and required to ensure that the development is of a high standard of design and relates sympathetically with the built surroundings and respects the character of the surrounding area. I note that neither policy sets out specific requirements or restrictions for extensions to dwellings, nor has my attention been drawn to any policies that do. Furthermore, the proposed development would not conflict with paragraph 127 c) of the National

Planning Policy Framework, which requires planning decisions to ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character.

Conditions

13. The Council has indicated the conditions it would wish to see attached were planning permission to be granted. I have had regard to these with the conditions I have set out although I have not attached a condition regarding materials as these are specified on the approved plans. I have attached a condition specifying the standard time limit for commencement. A condition requiring compliance with the approved plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted subject to conditions.

Martin Small

INSPECTOR