
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 November 2016

by David Reed BSc DipTP DMS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/C1435/D/16/3158762

The Granary, Grove Hill, Hellingly, East Sussex BN27 4HG

- 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 Paul & Johanne Read against the decision of Wealden District Council.
 - The application Ref WD/2016/0796/F, dated 1 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 24 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey extensions to the east and north elevations and extension to the existing first floor roof to create additional first floor accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and permission is granted for single storey extensions to the east and north elevations and extension to the existing first floor roof to create additional first floor accommodation at The Granary, Grove Hill, Hellingly, East Sussex BN27 4HG, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref WD/2016/0796/F, dated 1 April 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: L-002 Rev A and L-004.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The developer shall afford access at all reasonable times to any archaeologist nominated by the local planning authority, and shall allow that person to observe the excavations and record items of interest and finds.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing building and area generally.

Reasons

3. The Granary is a detached three bedroom house set in spacious grounds on the eastern side of Grove Hill. The house, converted from a granary in 1979, has been substantially extended and altered with dormers to the front and rear, a large part two-storey part single-storey rear extension and a small flat roofed

conservatory also to the rear. As a result of these changes, little of the character of the original granary building remains.

4. The proposal is for a further two-storey extension to the rear, squaring off the existing L-shaped extension, together with a canopy for a new entrance on the side of the property, a flat roofed single-storey dining/kitchen extension to the rear and a larger single-storey utility room/dog area to replace the existing conservatory. There is no dispute that the latter utility room/dog area element of the scheme is acceptable.
5. Whilst the proposed two-storey extension would add considerably to the bulk and massing of the current house, and involve a large area of flat roof, it would square off the existing property, not extending beyond either the side or rear of the building. It would also reflect the character of the existing building by picking up the half hipped roof of the rear extension and replicating the prominent side facing pitched roof as part of the northern elevation. In this way the remaining vestiges of the end profile of the granary building would be retained. The canopy over the new side entrance would not be prominent.
6. The flat roofed single-storey extension to the rear would extend the building further, but would be a relatively discreet addition adding only limited further bulk to the building. It would not affect the original granary structure.
7. Both the two-storey and single-storey extensions would be situated to the rear of the existing building, within the private rear garden area. As such they would not affect the more public front elevation of the building which faces the road. In addition, the house is set well back from Grove Hill with extensive screening along the road frontage and the other boundaries of its spacious plot. The proposal would not therefore be prominent either within the immediate vicinity or in the wider Low Weald landscape.
8. For these reasons the proposal would not significantly harm the character and appearance of the existing building or the area generally and would comply with Policies DC19, EN27 and EN8 of the Wealden Local Plan 1998¹. These preclude extensions to dwellings in the countryside that visually dominate the character of the existing building, have an adverse impact in terms of scale or form, that are intrusive in the landscape or fail to conserve the Low Weald.
9. The Council put forward three conditions should the appeal be allowed and I agree they meet the relevant tests. In addition to the standard implementation time limit it is necessary to define the plans which have been approved in the interests of certainty. The materials to be used also need to be controlled to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development. Finally, the County Archaeologist states that the development may impact upon archaeological interests, so a condition allowing suitable access is required.
10. Having regard to the above the appeal should be allowed.

David Reed

INSPECTOR

¹ The other policies listed in the decision notice are not referred to in the delegated officer report.