

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 March 2017

by Claire Searson MSc PGDip BSc (Hons) MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 6th April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2620/D/16/3161672

10 Renwick Park West, West Runton, NR27 9LX

- 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 Vince Buck against the decision of North Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref PF/16/1012, dated 19 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is an extension to create granny annexe and 2 bay car port.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. No 10 is a modest detached bungalow set in large and mature gardens, which slope down towards Renwick Park West. The dwelling is set at an angle to the road and there is also a separate garage. The dwelling is rendered and painted, with a concrete tiled roof and uPVC windows and doors.
 4. Development in the wider area comprises of other detached dwellings. These are a mixture of density, style and designs, with some being 2-storey and some single storey. All of the neighbouring properties to the western side of the road, however, are set well back into their plots and have large and mature front garden which provide screening and give the area a spacious and verdant character.
 5. The proposed development would comprise of a 2-storey side extension with a half-hipped roof and dormer windows. A further single storey flat-roof extension would also be created to the rear. These would be rendered at ground floor level with timber weatherboarding to the first floor. The extensions and the existing dwelling would be re-roofed in concrete plain tiles. The garage would also be extended to form a 2-bay car port.
 6. The development would significantly increase the overall bulk and massing of the appeal property. In particular, the addition of a 2-storey extension to a single storey building would conspicuously alter its scale and form, causing harm. Design details such as the half hipped roof structure and the use of
-

weatherboarding to the 2-storey extension would further compound its prominence as such features and materials are not currently found at the dwelling.

7. I appreciate that increased scale would be in keeping with Nos 8 and 12, which are larger properties than No 10, however the proposed extensions would dominate the original modest dwelling. Overall, I find the development would be discordant and jarring addition which would be highly incongruous to the character of the host dwelling.
8. Due to the unusual positioning of the dwelling within the plot, the proposed development would effectively extend out into the existing sloped front garden area which would increase the visual prominence of the development. While the existing vegetation would act as a screen, the significant scale and bulk of the development would be visible within the street scene, drawing the eye.
9. Longer distance views of the development, and in particular the 2-storey extension, would also be gauged from further along Renwick Park West, because of the local rising topography. I am also mindful that visibility would be likely to increase during the winter months when some of the vegetation is not in leaf. Accordingly, the development would also represent a discordant addition which would adversely affect the character of the area. This would not be likely to be overcome to any great degree through the imposition of a landscaping condition for any additional planting or long term retention and protection.
10. The extensions would constitute a disproportionately large increase to the existing dwelling, however as it is located in a residential suburb, I am satisfied that there would be no harm to the wider rural character of the area in accordance with Policy HO8 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy (2008). Nonetheless, the development would be in direct conflict with Policy EN4 which requires extensions to be suitably designed for the context in which they are set.
11. On this issue, taking all matters into account, I conclude that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons above and having considered all matters raised, the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

C Searson
INSPECTOR