

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2017

by K E Down MA(Oxon) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 29 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2620/D/17/3181745

The Anchorage, 4 Rippingall Yard, Langham, NR25 7DW

- 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 Robert Addison against the decision of North Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref PF/17/0405, dated 15 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is a first floor bedroom extension on the footprint of the existing lean-to garden room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. There are two main issues. Firstly, the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the immediate vicinity of Rippingall Yard and the surrounding area; and secondly, the effect of the extension on the living conditions of occupiers of 21 North Street with respect to privacy and overlooking.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is one of four modern dwellings situated in a small development behind North Street. The dwellings differ in design but form an attractive, cohesive group that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area as a result of their similar, traditional architectural style and the use of brick and flint which is characteristic of the village and the Langham Conservation Area (CA) within which the site lies.
 4. The proposed extension would be visible from the courtyard approach to the dwelling, from 21 North Street and from the public highway. It would replace an existing single storey garden room and abut an existing 1.5 storey, gable ended projection that lies in front of the two storey section of the dwelling. It would create a second gable end. Although the position of the extension, beyond the existing projection and set back slightly, would partly obscure it from the access and courtyard serving Rippingall Yard it would, nevertheless be clearly visible.
-

5. The extension would be a similar height to the existing gabled projection and finished with weatherboarding. Although narrower than the existing projection it would, due to its height and bulk, compete with it, appearing as an awkward and unsympathetic addition that would detract from the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. The effect would be exacerbated by the use of non-matching materials which would draw attention to the extension and be uncharacteristic in Rippingall Yard.
6. The appellant points out that weatherboarding is used elsewhere in the village, including on a development close by. However, in most of the examples given it is not the dominant finish above ground floor level and the example of a two storey, fully clad extension does not in my view represent a building form that sits comfortably with the host building or which persuades me that it should be repeated at the appeal site.
7. It is also suggested that a double gable is a form adopted by many traditional residential extensions. That may be so. However, in this case where the extension would abut a centrally placed projection and lie in front of the main two storey element of the dwelling it would unacceptably harm the balance of the existing building.
8. It is concluded on the first main issue that the proposed two storey extension, due to its location, height and materials, would amount to an incongruous form of development that would materially harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the group of dwellings in Rippingall Yard. In consequence, it would conflict with Policy EN4 of the North Norfolk Local Development Framework, Core Strategy (CS), 2008, and the North Norfolk Design Guide, 2008, which, amongst other things, seek to reinforce local distinctiveness with design that has regard to the local context, integrate new residential developments into established settlements without harming their character or setting and ensure that extensions have regard to the appearance and character of their host building. It would also conflict with section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which expects new development to respond to local character and be visually attractive. Moreover, although not a reason for refusal and not a matter on which the appeal turns, I consider that the proposed extension would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.
9. Turning to the effect on the living conditions of occupiers of 21 North Street, the proposed extension would have a window in the gable end which would have oblique views over the garden and towards the dwelling at No 21. However, the existing dwelling has a similar sized window in the main elevation which would have a similar view towards No 21. Moreover, the distance between the proposed window and the dwelling at No 21 would be sufficient to ensure that no material overlooking of the house or the area immediately surrounding it would occur.
10. It is therefore concluded on the second main issue that the proposed extension would have no materially harmful effect on the living conditions of occupiers of 21 North Street with respect to privacy and overlooking. There would thus be no conflict with CS Policy EN4 or the NPPF insofar as they seek to ensure that a

satisfactory standard of amenity is achieved for occupiers of neighbouring properties.

11. The appeal site lies within a designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The Council does not consider that the proposed extension would harm the special qualities of the AONB and I concur with that view. Nevertheless, neither this nor the lack of harm to the living conditions of neighbours would alter or outweigh the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area.
12. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, including the representations of the Langham Parish Council and other third parties, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

KE Down
INSPECTOR