



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 October 2020

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y9507/D/20/3254757

3 Coldharbour Lane, Patching BN13 3XE

- 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 Carl Davey against the decision of South Downs National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref SDNP/20/00242/HOUS, dated 13 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is installation of rear dormer allowing loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue of this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the local area, which is within the South Downs National Park (SDNP).

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey house that sits within a row of 7 similar houses of simplified design, reflective of traditional cottage style. It is located at the end of a terrace of three houses, being fully attached to 4 Coldharbour Lane and partly attached at ground level to 2 Coldharbour Lane. This row of houses has front gardens facing onto the Lane with fields opposite and with back gardens facing onto fields beyond. Whilst associated with the villages of Patching and Clapham, the houses in this row are outside of these settlements. The location of the appeal property is elevated in a valley within a countryside setting, which provides for wider views uninterrupted by other properties.
4. This row of similar cottage style houses presents a coherent collection of properties within both local and wider views and, due to elevated position within the valley and unaltered roof profiles, they are prominent within these views and present a clear cottage style presence within the landscape when viewed from across the valley and the A280. There are extensions to the houses in the row, however, due to these being modest single storey ground floor side and rear extensions, they integrate well with the host properties and are not unduly prominent in views or harmful to the character of the landscape of the SDNP.

5. The proposed dormer extension would sit asymmetrically within the rear roof slope at one end of the hipped roof form that the appeal property shares with its fully attached neighbours at 4 and 5 Coldharbour Lane. Although located at the rear of the property the extension would remain elsewhere visible, not only from the gardens of neighbouring dwellings.
6. Whilst there are dormer extensions to properties within this local area of the SDNP and the appellant has provided some detail of those that have gained approval, there are none in such an elevated or prominent location as the appeal property, I therefore give little weight to the appellant's argument that these examples serve as a precedent in support of the proposed extension and I have considered the proposal on its own merits.
7. Due to the prominent location of the appeal property, the scale, massing and asymmetrical position of the proposed extension would appear dominant and not subsidiary in the context of the appeal property or the row of similar properties that make up the grain and character of the local area and provide its immediate setting. Furthermore, the prominence of the proposal within the roof profile would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the row of cottages and be visually intrusive in wider views of the SDNP and would not conserve or enhance landscape character. Whilst there are mature trees to the rear of the appeal property that provide some screening of the appeal property and the row of houses in some wider views, they only provide partial, seasonal and potentially non-permanent screening and would not significantly ameliorate the detrimental visual impact of the proposal I have identified.
8. Consequently the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of both the appeal property, that of the surrounding area and the SDNP and be contrary to Policies SD1, SD4 and SD5 of the South Downs Local Plan (2019), which seek to ensure that development accords with National Park purposes, conserves or enhances landscape character and is of high quality design that integrates with its host building and the wider area. The proposal is also contrary to Policies HBT 3 and PLACES 5 of the Patching Neighbourhood Development Plan, which seek to ensure that extensions are subsidiary to the host dwelling and reinforce local character and distinctiveness. For these reasons I find the proposal would not accord with the first purpose of the designation of the National Park to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage and be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, where it seeks to achieve well designed places and puts great weight on conserving and enhancing the landscape and natural beauty of the National Park.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR