



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2022

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D3830/D/22/3303753

2 Park Avenue, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 8LT.

- 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 and Mrs S Mason against the decision of Mid Sussex District Council
 - The application Ref DM/22/1337, dated 25 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 21 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as ground floor enlargement of existing rear extension to create enlarged kitchen/day room and replacement of existing roof over with flat roof, incorporation flat roof lanterns. 1st floor extension to rear to create additional bedroom
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be
 - a) the effect of the proposal on the architectural integrity of the host property and thereby the streetscene, and;
 - b) the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of adjoining residential neighbours, in terms of its potential to have an enclosing and oppressive impact leading to a loss of light and outlook.

Reasons

3. The appeal property 2 Park Avenue is a semi-detached two-storey dwelling with roof space accommodation. Park Avenue is a cul-de-sac, characterised by a mix of semi-detached and detached two-storey dwellings and chalets, built to an eclectic mix of designs and external materials.
4. The appellants propose ground and first floor additions to the rear of the property. The Council raise no objection to the single storey addition. From what I have seen and read I would not reach a contrary view.

Character and appearance

5. It is proposed that the two-storey rear addition would be built off the rear corner of the original dwelling and linked to the first floor accommodation over

the garage, to the front of the dwelling, by a flat roof corridor. The roof over the new first floor bedroom would be of a pitched hipped design.

6. Due to the position of the proposed first floor addition, its relationship to the host property and flat roof link it would appear as an awkward, contrived addition to the host property. For these reasons it would cause harm to the architectural integrity of the host property.
7. The neighbouring property number 3 Park Avenue is a chalet bungalow. Accordingly, the proposed first floor addition would be open, albeit limited to views from the street. I consider that because of the awkward positioning of the addition and its three-dimensional form it would appear as an incongruous addition within the street scene.
8. I therefore conclude in respect of the first main issue that the proposed first floor addition would fail to comply with the objectives of Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan (LP), Policy 9 of the Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan (NP), Principles DG49 and DG51 of the mid Sussex Design Guide SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) as they relate, along with other things, to the quality of design and the need for new development to contribute positively to the private and public realm.

Living conditions

9. The flank wall of the chalet bungalow, number 3 Park Avenue is set some 2.2 metres from the appeal property. There are two ground floor windows facing the appeal site, one being a shallow bay serving a habitable room.
10. Given the position of the flank wall to the side of the appeal property, the two ground floor windows and the relationship of the extension to the flank of number 3, I consider that as well as having an enclosing and somewhat oppressive impact on number 3 the proposed extension would cause an unacceptable loss of light and outlook.
11. For the reasons set out above I conclude in respect of the second main issue that the proposed addition would cause significant harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of number 3 Park Avenue. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with LP Policy DP26 and NP Policy 9, SPD and the Framework as they seek to protect residential living conditions.

Other matters

12. I have noted the revised design submitted by the appellants at appeal. However, this proposal is a significant departure from the scheme design at appeal. It would therefore be for the Council to determine any application for the revised scheme in the first instance. I shall therefore not consider this amended proposal further.
13. The appellants have drawn to my attention concerns that the Council were not prepared to advise on their amended proposal. This is however not relevant to my consideration of the planning merits of this appeal.
14. In reaching my conclusions on this matter I have noted that both the neighbour at number 3 Park Avenue and Hassocks Parish Council supported the original planning application. However, given my conclusion on both of the main issues I have given limited weight to this consideration.

Conclusions

15. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR