



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 July 2022

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17TH August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D3830/D/22/3294759

Lydcombe, Top Road, Sharpthorne, East Grinstead, RH19 4PQ.

- 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 Nigel Callaghan against the decision of Mid Sussex District Council.
 - The application Ref DM/21/4054, dated 23 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as a two storey front extension.
-

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 host dwelling

Reasons

3. As the planning inspector appointed to determine the previously dismissed scheme, I am familiar with the site and its surroundings. The steeply sloping topography; diverse range of dwellings; varied building lines and plot sizes; and the abundance of hedges and trees all contribute to the spacious and informal character and appearance of this small settlement and its rural setting.
4. Located on the north side of Top Road, the appeal property comprises one of a pair of detached dormer bungalows that are characterised by their simple form and gable roofs. This includes single storey front facing gable projections. Both of the dwellings are located below and set back from Top Road behind generous sized front gardens, which are enclosed by mature hedging. As a consequence, other than in the vicinity of the two accesses, the two dwellings are largely screened from Top Road.
5. Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021(Framework), seeks to ensure that new development is of high-quality design, reflects the distinctive character of the area and address the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape. Consistent with this policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan 2018 (LP), promotes well located and designed development that reflects and retains the character and identity of villages.

Development should create a sense of place whilst addressing the scale and character of the locality and should also optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development.

6. The aim of the of the Mid Sussex Design Guide - Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) is to deliver high quality new development that responds positively to its context. With this in mind the SPD sets out principles and objectives that aim to inspire designers and assist applicants in the process of delivering high quality and well-designed development. Principles DG49 & DG50 advise that the design of extensions should be informed by local character and should respond to the design of the host dwelling. It advises that front extensions will be resisted where they have an adverse impact on the street scene or the appearance of the dwelling. Front extensions are more likely to be acceptable where the building line is staggered or where the dwelling is set back from the road.
7. In 2001 planning permission was granted for a two storey double gable extension to the front of the adjacent dormer bungalow although it was not constructed. The dismissed appeal scheme relating to the appeal property was for a two storey gable extension on the west side of the front elevation. It was to be linked to the existing single storey gable projection by a catslide roof, with a side facing dormer extension above it. In dismissing the appeal the concerns raised related to the catslide roof and dormer window.
8. The proposal is for a full width two storey front extension. It would have a crown roof and the hipped roofs to the front and sides of it would have three different eaves lines. This includes a catslide roof which would replace the existing projecting gable. The front roof-slope of the existing dwelling would be hipped away from the catslide roof and the existing chimney would be visible to the rear of the crown roof. At ground floor level there would be a pitched roof canopy over the entrance and western side of the front elevation.
9. Collectively these features would result in the front of the resultant dwelling appearing completely different and distinct in form and appearance to the retained parts of the existing dwelling. The crown roof would appear contrived and squat and together with the catslide roof would result in the dwelling having uncharacteristic strong horizontal lines.
10. For these reasons the proposed front extension would dominate and would materially harm the simple and uncluttered form and appearance of the dwelling. It would fail to respect or appropriately respond to character and appearance of the host dwelling. The resultant harm would be evident in close views of the dwelling and in the limited views from Top Road. It is not something that could be dealt with by the imposition of conditions and it would outweigh the benefits for the appellant and his family that would result from the additional accommodation.
11. I conclude on the main issue that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling. It would conflict with DP Policy DP26, SPD Principles DG49 & DG50 and Paragraph 130 of the Framework.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR