



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 June 2021

by J E Jolly BA (Hons) MA MSc CIH MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 JUNE 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3825/D/21/3273169

5 Penfold Way, Steyning BN44 3PG

- 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 & Mrs Brown against the decision of Horsham District Council.
 - The application Ref DC/20/1045, dated 8 June 2020, was refused by notice, dated 4 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is for the demolition of existing detached garage, construction of a new attached garage, and conversion of the loft into a habitable space; utilising front facing Velux windows and a dormer to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and the host dwelling.

Reasons

3. Penfold Way is located in a residential area that is typified by brick and tile, dwellings that face onto the road. No 5 Penfold Way is a chalet-bungalow type dwelling that is located to the right-hand end of a short-terrace of 3 dwellings which is characterised by brick and render elevations and a continuous roof span to the front and rear. The terrace is balanced at either end by a single-storey garage which helps to retain a sense of spaciousness in the area. When viewed from the road the host dwelling has a metal gate to the right-hand side that provides access to the rear of the property past a detached garage which is sited adjacent to the fenced boundary with the detached property of No 7 Penfold Way. The host garden slopes up to meet the boundary with the properties on Godstalls Lane, and when looking back towards the host property the rear elevations of the neighbouring terraced dwellings of Nos 1 and 3 Penfold Way can be seen to the right-hand side of the garden. The rear roof span of the terraced row of dwellings is unfettered other than a number of solar panels associated with No 3 which has a rear conservatory extension.
4. The proposal is to demolish the detached garage and to construct a new attached garage as part of a side extension as well as a full width dormer to the rear roof pane that would be built in materials similar to the host dwelling. There would be rooflights to the front roof pane as well as a new front porch with a hipped roof.

5. The development would be in an established residential area. Therefore, the general principle of development on the appeal site is not at odds with the surrounding area. Indeed, the Appellant has brought to my attention a number of dormers and extensions nearby such as those seen on Ingram Road, The Furlongs, Penlands Vale, Greenacres and St Andrews Close, which I noted at my site visit have been constructed in materials that broadly accord with the appearance of the host building and the proposed development. However, I have limited details of those individual schemes before me, and moreover, I cannot be certain if they were considered under the same development plan as the proposed development at No 5 or not. Therefore, I have considered the proposal on its own planning merits.
6. As such, while the side extension proposal would narrow the separation gap between Nos 5 and No 7, the materials and width of the proposal in this respect would accord with the surrounding area. However, while the proposed rear dormer would only be glimpsed to the front, the box style dormer is nonetheless of some considerable scale and mass that extends to the ridge line and side gable of the host dwelling. Indeed, the proposal would not only cover the entire roof pane to the rear of the host dwelling but would also be approximately one third of the simple terraced roof span associated with Nos 1, 3 and 5. Therefore, in my view the extent of the proposal would overwhelm the relatively modest host dwelling. Moreover, the development would be readily visible to occupiers spending time in the back gardens or other rear areas of the neighbouring properties; for example, from the conservatory at No 3. Indeed, while the Appellant contends that the proposal would have a neutral effect on the character and appearance of the area I find to the contrary; that the box like development would be a bulky extension that would be discordant with the simplicity of the host dwelling and the relatively modest properties in the surrounding area, including nearby dormer extensions which I noted at my site visit predominantly sit below the ridge line, and/or are set back from the gable end or side of a host property.
7. I note the Appellants' reference to a previous application on this site¹, for a similar proposal to the one before me that was refused by the Council, and that subsequent changes have been made to the visual appearance of the dwelling before resubmission for planning approval; these include the removal of the front dormers and demolition of the flat-roofed garage. However, despite the notable visual improvements to the front of the dwelling, the proposal would still represent a prominent development to the rear.
8. I conclude therefore, that the scale, mass and design of dormer would be overly dominant and conspicuous in this back garden location, and hence would harm the character and appearance of the area.
9. Consequently, the proposal is contrary to Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework 2015, which says, amongst other things, that developments shall be required to ensure that the scale, massing and appearance of the development is of a high standard of design and layout.
10. For similar reasons the proposal does not meet the aims of Paragraph 127 (f) of the *National Planning Policy Framework* which seeks to ensure that developments create places which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

¹ DC/19/2057

Other Matters

11. Whether permitted development on the appeal site, would be possible within the limits of the GPDO (Class B of Part 1 within Schedule 2) or not, the fact remains that the scheme before me is for a full planning permission. I have determined the appeal on this basis.
12. My attention has been drawn to the fact that no recorded objections have been raised by neighbouring occupiers or other interested parties, and that the proposal is well regarded by a number of local residents. However, as the occupancy of the neighbouring dwellings is likely to change over time, this fact does not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance to the area I have found above.

Conclusions

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J E JOLLY

INSPECTOR