
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2020

by Paul Jackson B Arch (Hons) RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 21st January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3825/D/20/3257194

1 Howard Road, Horsham RH13 6AB

- 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 M Rayner against the decision of Horsham District Council.
 - The application Ref DC/20/0594, dated 23 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is a part single, part two storey side and front extension, and garage conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area. Howard Road consists mostly of modest semi-detached dwellings with open frontages. Originally constructed with semi-projecting integral garages, some of these have been converted to living accommodation, sometimes including a new entrance porch or hall and sometimes an adjoining extension to living accommodation embracing the whole width of the property. In general, despite the mixed appearance of the various extensions, they all appear subsidiary to the host dwellings and do not interfere unduly with the simple design concept of the small estate, which depends upon the prevailing rhythm in the massing and siting of the houses combined with a consistent roof line.
3. In contrast, cumulatively, the proposed extensions to the side and front of No. 1 would appear quite out of keeping. The proposal noticeably fails to take account of the characteristics that make the street a mostly pleasant and easily understood and appreciated exercise in urban design of its time. The front extension would repeat the main roof pitch which on its own would be respectful, but then indicates a rather mean 'clipped' eaves and verge detail with no obvious reference or inspiration, which would emphasise its particularly bulky presence in the street scene. The oddly asymmetrical window positions and the proportions of the projecting front porch, which has the characteristics of an afterthought, only add to the uncomfortably bulky and over prominent appearance of this element.
4. There is no indication of how the roof is intended to meet the simple flat felted roof of the adjoining property or how rainwater in general is to be dealt with. The difference in approach and the relative attractiveness of different types of

detailing is readily illustrated by comparing existing front extensions at Nos. 5 and 7, though these have far less bulky hipped roofs.

5. But despite these disadvantages, the straightforward appearance of the existing house, which is an important part of the street scene on the first corner on entering the road, is proposed to be further changed by a 2 storey side extension projecting forward of the main building line. This would have eaves and verge details which match the main roof, but would utilise a small front gable. The gable would be unique in the street scene. I understand the reasons why a front projecting extension is proposed, but the gable would be particularly out of keeping on this prominent corner. Having said that, the principle of a 2 storey side element might be acceptable, but in combination with the ground floor projection the scheme would completely dominate the house and would be unacceptably out of character in the street.
6. A 2 storey side extension has been erected at No. 2 on the opposite side of the approach opposite the appeal property. This is set back from the main building line and appears subservient to the main house. It is not comparable to the appeal proposal.
7. Leaving aside simple massing and form, the details of rainwater disposal and the profile and detail design of junctions between differing materials are important when adding complex building envelopes to existing simple buildings. The failure to grapple with these issues adds to the impression that the final result would be even more uncomfortable than the drawings suggest. The aim of character, design and appearance policies of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) and section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is that developments should function well and add to the overall quality of the area. To achieve that, visually attractive, good architecture is essential. The National Design Guide refers to good design being fit for purpose, durable and bringing delight.
8. In conclusion, the proposed development falls a long way short of contributing positively to the character and appearance of Howard Road. The proposal would conflict with the objectives of policy 33 of the HDPF and with national guidance on design.
9. For all these reasons, the appeal should fail.

Paul Jackson

INSPECTOR