
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2020

by Guy Davies BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3825/D/20/3245544

Calcot Farm Bungalow, Horsham Road, Steyning, West Sussex BN44 3AA

- 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 Simon Kilham against the decision of Horsham District Council.
 - The application DC/19/1795, dated 30 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is extensions to property.
-

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 existing building is a detached chalet bungalow. The first floor accommodation is contained within the roof, which spans across the whole of the building and has ground floor eaves on two sides with half-hipped, gabled ends. The first floor is lit by windows in the gable ends and by small dormer windows in the main roof planes.
4. The design of the two storey extension would introduce a large flat roof area at first floor level that would contrast poorly with the fully pitched roof that comprises one of the main architectural features of the existing building. Although the extension would be subservient in scale with the existing building and replicates the ground floor eaves line and dormer windows, the flat roofed design of its roof would be at odds with the design of the existing building and would appear incongruous and out of place when viewed against the existing pitched roof form.
5. Views of the building are limited by the roadside hedge, but it can be seen from the farm drive and in passing views from the Horsham Road. In any case, restricted views of a development are not sufficient grounds to justify poor design that is unacceptable.
6. The Council raised no objection to the small ground floor extension which would replace a lean to on the western elevation. I also see no objection to that part of the scheme. I note the lack of any objection from interested

parties, but that is a neutral consideration in the appeal and does not offset the harm caused by the design of the two storey element.

7. I note the appellant is a farm worker and needs space for a growing family. The Council was not opposed in principle to the extension of the dwelling but was concerned, as am I, to the design of the appeal scheme. There may therefore be an opportunity for an alternative scheme if it can overcome the problems of design identified above. That would be a matter for discussion between the appellant and Council.
8. I conclude that, due to the flat roofed design of the two storey extension, the development would harm the appearance of the building, and thereby the character and appearance of the wider area. As a consequence, it would conflict with policies 28, 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework, which together seek a high standard of design for extensions that are in keeping with the scale and character of the existing dwelling.

Conclusion

9. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Guy Davies

INSPECTOR