



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 December 2020

by M Shrigley BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3825/D/20/3259885

58 Billingshurst Road, Broadbridge Heath, Horsham, W.Sussex, RH12 3LP

- 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 Chris Ward against the decision of Horsham District Council.
 - The application Ref DC/20/0806, dated 19 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a two-storey side extension and installation of two dormers to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I note that the submitted appeal plans also show a rear dormer extension. But that does not form part of the Council's basis for refusal of planning permission. Nor does it form part of the description on the application form. My decision therefore focuses on the side extension as well as the two dormers on the front elevation.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a large detached dwelling. It is situated within a row of other properties of varying designs. Properties in the immediate vicinity have simple uncluttered roofs. The appeal property has a predominately symmetrical main front elevation which is substantial in width. It also has a single storey side projection on one side and a small attached garage on the other.
5. Whilst the front boundary of the appeal dwelling features a tall hedge its front elevation can still be viewed from the highway. This is because there are gaps in the frontage between neighbouring dwellings either side.
6. The two-storey side extension would significantly increase the overall frontage width of the dwelling which is already considerable. In doing so it would distort the proportions of the property resulting in it appearing excessively wide. As a result, the dimensions of the extension would appear incongruous. It would fail to successfully integrate with the size and appearance of the appeal property or other dwellings within the street scene. The change would be noticeable and

harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling as well as the street scene it would be viewed.

7. The proposed dormers would appear discordant with the simple uncluttered roof design of the appeal dwelling and other neighbouring dwellings within the row. I accept that they would be relatively small and tie in with some of the symmetrical aspects of the existing front elevation. However, their presence on the front roof slope would still be prominent and noticeable. The resultant change would be insensitive to local character and visually harmful.
8. The appellant has referred to other properties with dormers along Billingshurst Road but those are some distance away from the appeal property and not within the immediate street scene surrounding it. Therefore, I attribute little weight to the presence of those. I also acknowledge that the use of external facing materials matching the main dwelling house would be utilised including tile hanging for the dormers. However, the size, design and prominence of the development would still result in significant harm.
9. I therefore conclude that the development would harm the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and the wider surrounding area. The development would conflict with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) which seeks to encourage high quality design for all development across the district. It would also conflict with Paragraph 127 a) and b) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) which seeks that development adds to the quality of the area; and is visually attractive.

Other Matters

10. I have carefully considered that the appellant requires increased internal habitable space to aid in caring for a family member. In doing so I have considered the provisions of the Public Sector Equality Duty under s.149 of the Equality Act 2010. However, there is nothing to suggest the development would provide a specialist form of internal space provision or that alternative internal space solutions could not be up taken. Moreover, any personal benefits arising from increasing the size of the property; enabling local building work; and the absence of harm to neighbouring living conditions do not outweigh the visual harm I have identified.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons the appeal does not succeed.

M Shrigley

INSPECTOR