

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 March 2017

by C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 11th April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H2265 /D/17/3168320

Yew Tree Barn, Long Mill Lane, Crouch, Borough Green, Sevenoaks, TN15 8QB

- 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 James Barton against the decision of Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council.
 - The application Ref TM/16/02587/FL, dated 25 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is the creation of a first floor across existing footprint of house and new roof with ridge height raised 0.5m above existing; demolition of existing conservatory and rebuild up to line of junction between properties to the south.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a large dwelling that lies within a rural setting, within the village of Crouch. I understand it was formed following the conversion of barns, along with its neighbour of Horsnayles. The building has been extended and altered over the years, including a conservatory to the front.
 4. There is a tall boundary wall fronting Long Mill Lane, but there are some views of the property from the front of the building. There are also views towards the property from further northwards along Long Mill Lane, and in those views the scale and form of the existing building is particularly evident, where the side elevation and the roof form can be seen: the broad similarity between the roof profile of Yew Tree Barn and Horsnayles is clear in those views. The overall impression of the property when seen from the north and west is that it is in scale with the neighbouring buildings, and the wider rural area.
 5. The proposed works to the building would see a substantial change to the scale and form of the property, through a forward extension the full length of the building both at ground and roof level. The design of this would incorporate a new crown roof addition. This change in scale would be disruptive to the
-

existing subdued appearance of the house in the street scene along Long Mill Lane, and its appropriate relationship to the neighbour: the extensions to the building would appear of excessive proportions to the original building, and the resulting building would sit uncomfortably next to Horsnayles. This would be particularly when seen from the north, where the substantial increase in depth of the building and the change in roof profile would be very noticeable and represent a harm in the relationship between the buildings, and the setting of the appeal property in the street.

6. The appellant states that the proposed extensions would rationalise past alterations and extensions to the building. However, for the reasons given above I consider that this would be achieved with the result that the extended building would in fact be of a more intrusive design and form than currently exists.
7. The proposed development would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and thus conflict with the objectives of the relevant development plan policies, namely Policies CP1 and CP24 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Core Strategy 2007, and saved Policy P4/12 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council Local Plan 2010, the general thrust of which is to seek a high standard of design in all new development that accords with its locality. Policy DC1 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Managing Development and Environment Development Planning Document 2010 states that extensions to converted rural buildings with not normally be granted and, due to the harm I have identified in this instance, the proposals would also not be consistent with the objectives of that Policy.
8. The design of the proposed extension would not lead to any greater overbearing effect on neighbouring residents due to the distance retained to properties, and the drawings show the use of obscure glazing on new windows to the south to ensure no loss of privacy. I therefore consider there would not be any harm to the living conditions of adjoining occupiers. However, the harm on the main issue and conflict with the development plan is sufficient to outweigh other matters and the appeal is therefore dismissed.

C J Leigh
INSPECTOR