The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 August 2021

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th September 2021

Appeal A Ref: APP/D3830/D/21/3270494
45b Wood Ride, Haywards Heath RH16 4NL

- 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 Gruber (Vero Developments Ltd) against the decision of Mid Sussex District Council.
- The application Ref DM/20/3890, dated 15 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 December 2020.
- The development proposed is for the removal of a conservatory and extension to the north side of the property including associated garaging.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I acknowledge that there is another proposal related to the appeal site for 3 residential dwellings and garaging. However, consideration of the appeal before me is limited to a proposal for a side extension to the host dwelling. I have proceeded accordingly.

3. On 20 July 2021, the Government published its revised *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework). The Framework represents the Government's up-to-date planning policies for England and how they should be applied. Planning decisions must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Framework is such a material consideration where it is relevant to a planning application or appeal. I note however, in this case, that the main parties have made no further comments in respect of these changes.

Main Issues

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on:

   - the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located in a residential area of brick and tile dwellings near to Haywards Heath town-centre. No 45b Wood Ride is accessed via a shared driveway that runs from the highway past No 47 Wood Ride on the right-hand side and towards the two-storey dwelling of No 45a Wood Ride.

6. The driveway turns at a right-angle behind No 47 towards the host dwelling that is accessed via a small pathway to the left-hand side of an older style detached garage associated with No 45b. The pathway opens up onto a substantial garden which is scattered with mature trees that slopes down towards the dwellings on Ashenground Road.

7. The mid-20th Century host dwelling is a two-storey brick and tile dwelling with an open metal rail first-floor balcony to the centre, and a 'cat-slide' roof to the left-hand side, as well as a single-storey glazed extension to the right-hand side when viewed from the path.

8. The proposal is to demolish the detached garage, the single-storey glazed extension and a chimney, in order to construct an angled extension to the left-hand side of the host dwelling that would include garaging as part of a stepped hip and gable roof arrangement, and a flat-roofed dormer to the 'cat-slide'. There would be new doors to the rear.

9. The appeal site is located in an established residential area. Therefore, the principle of development is accepted. Moreover, I noted at my site visit that there are a wide range of dwelling types nearby. However, I have limited details of those developments before me. As such, I cannot be certain if they were considered under the same development plan as the host dwelling or the scheme before me or not. Therefore, as is correct, I have considered the proposed development on its own planning merits.

10. I acknowledge that the development is in a sustainable location near to Haywards Heath town centre that would have a limited effect on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers. In addition, the proposal would be finished in similar materials to the host dwelling on previously developed land.

11. However, notwithstanding the need for internal updating, or the removal of the single-storey extension to the right-hand side, the scale of the proposal would be a significant and dominant addition to the relatively modest host dwelling. Indeed, the proposal would not only have an extended gable roof but also a hipped roof over a bulky angled extension with prominent garage doors. Consequently, the mass, orientation and awkward roof arrangement of the proposal would subjugate the simple and unfettered lines of the attractive 'cat-slide' roof and open-rail balcony to the front of the host dwelling. Indeed, the dormer window on the remaining 'cat-slide' roof would appear as an incongruous addition, that in combination with other elements of the proposal would erode the balanced shape, plain elevations and simple fenestration of the property. As such, the proposal would be at odds with the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

12. I conclude therefore, that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

13. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan 2018, and Policies E9 and H9 of the Haywards Heath Town Council Neighbourhood Plan, as supported by the Mid Sussex Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2020, which require, amongst other things that the design of new development should respect the character of towns and villages as well as the character of the buildings.

14. For similar reasons, the proposal does not meet the requirements of Paragraph 130 (b) of the Framework which says that planning decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture.

Conclusions

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

J E JOLLY

INSPECTOR