The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February 2017

by Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge BA (Hons) MTP MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 02 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1510/D/16/3163804
Rose Cottage, Poole Street, Great Yeldham CO9 4HJ

- 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 Mat Mason against the decision of Braintree District Council.
- The application Ref 16/01670/FUL, dated 26 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 November 2016.
- The development proposed is a 2 storey rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have also dealt with another appeal (Ref: APP/Z1510/W/16/3160929) on this site. That appeal is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Rose Cottage is located in the countryside on the edge of Great Yeldham and is set away from any neighbouring properties. The existing property is relatively modest in scale with an attractive thatched roof, brick chimneys and dormer windows. Set within a large plot, it has a pleasing character and appearance when viewed from the road to the east as well as within the site, and makes a positive contribution to the rural surroundings. Notwithstanding the screening effect provided by existing vegetation, it is possible to view the flank elevations of the property from the road, including the existing small two storey rear extension.

5. The proposed two storey rear extension would roughly double the footprint and volume of the existing property. It would not overwhelm the scale of the plot, but would substantially alter the scale and character of the existing property with a large projecting extension. The proposal includes increasing the height of the wall plates and replacing the thatched roof with a tiled roof, which would accentuate the degree of change to this property and make it difficult to spot its original elements. Thus, there would be harm to the character and appearance of the existing property.

6. The proposals would be noticeable from the road not only because of the alterations to the existing roof but also due to the scale and depth of the extension along either flank elevation. The inset of walls from each flank elevation and the screening effect of existing vegetation would only partially hide the extension in such views. Thus, there would also be harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area through the considerable enlargement and alteration of the existing property.

7. The appellant highlights that good quality materials would be used including the roof tiles, but this does not overcome the overall effect of the development in terms of its design, depth and scale. I acknowledge the appellant's personal circumstances, but I have not seen anything in the evidence before me to indicate that this specific proposal is critical in order to meet personal needs that outweigh the harm I have identified.

8. In conclusion, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding area. Therefore, it would not accord with Policies RLP2, RLP18 and RLP90 of the Braintree District Local Plan Review 2005 or Policies CS5 and CS9 of the Braintree Core Strategy 2011. Amongst other things, these policies seek to protect the landscape character of the countryside, with extensions to existing dwellings required to be subordinate and compatible with the scale and character of the existing dwelling in terms of matters such as design and size. The policies also seek high quality design that respects and responds to the local context.

9. The appellant highlights Policy LPP30 from the emerging Local Plan and the Council's report indicates that some limited weight can be afforded to this plan. However, Policy LPP30 is similar in scope to Policy RLP18 in terms of requiring extensions to be subordinate and compatible, and so does not lead me to a different conclusion on this proposal. The development would also not meet the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework which requires good design.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge

INSPECTOR