



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2020

by P Mileham BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2620/D/20/3244363

2 Ivy Farm, Honing Road, Dilham NR28 9PN

- 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 Alistair Paterson against the decision of North Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref PF/19/1565, dated 12 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 03 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two storey extension to the rear of the property to create a downstairs toilet, utility room and an upstairs ensuite.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling. The property has a white painted front elevation with the side and rear elevation finished with flint and red brick. The roof has a steep pitch with clay pantiles and to the rear is a small porch with a brick and flint base and a clay pantiled roof. A blockwork barn is located to the immediate south of the property and a further red brick barn beyond. The character of the area is predominantly rural and although not listed, the appeal property makes a positive contribution to the character of the area through its traditional design.
4. The proposed development would introduce a new two storey rear extension to the property which would link with the existing rear porch. The extension would be constructed with a red brick plinth with oak cladding above. The proposed use of red brick detail would be sympathetic to the existing red brick found at the property; however, the proposed oak cladding would introduce a new material to the palette of materials currently found at the property. Whilst the extension would not be visible from the public highway, the cladding would nonetheless result in a stark contrast between the extension and the existing property's brick and flint detail. The cladding would introduce a uniformity to the finish that is uncharacteristic of the more subtle effect of the existing brick and flint detail of the dwelling. As a result, I consider the uniformity would jar with the existing dwelling harming its character.

5. The extension would have a shallow pitched roof finished with a single pitched grey membrane type material. The inclusion of this material would result in the use of a further building material into the palette found at the property. The flat grey roof would lack detail and thereby fail to assimilate positively with the existing clay pantile roof. Furthermore, the proximity of the grey membrane finish to the lower edge of the existing rear dormer window would appear awkward in the context of the existing property, adversely impacting the symmetry provided by the existing pair of dormer windows. The introduction of a shallow pitch would introduce another roof angle to the property. When considered cumulatively with the pitch of the main roof and the porch roof, I consider this would result in the confusion of to the legibility of the existing building. This confusion would detract from the building's rural character which is partly defined by its traditional design which includes its steep pitched pantiled roof. As a result, the proposal would appear as an incongruous addition to the building resulting in harm to its appearance.
6. The appellant has provided pictorial examples where oak cladding has been used on traditional buildings in Norfolk. However, no details have been provided as to their location, context or the planning decisions that may have allowed for them. Whilst the use of contrasting oak cladding may be appropriate in certain circumstances, a number of the examples shown also utilise additional details and finishes that compliment their host dwellings such as pitched roofs, the use of clay pantiles. A number of the examples are also not of comparable scale to the appeal proposal and therefore would have a different impact on their host dwelling than the appeal proposal. As such, these are afforded limited weight.
7. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would be contrary to Policy EN4 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy including Development Control Policies Document (2008) which states that design which fails to have regard to local context and does not preserve or enhance the character and quality of an area will not be acceptable.
8. The proposal would also be contrary to paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P Mileham

INSPECTOR