



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 03 October 2020

by Kim Langford Tejrar LLB (Hons) BSc (Hons) PGDIP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P2114/D/20/3253329

Woodhouse Farm, Barton Estate, East Cowes PO32 6NU

- 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 T Slater against the decision of Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01655/HOU, dated 18 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 09 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is an extension at 1st floor level; alterations to include balcony over conservatory; new detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an extension at 1st floor level; alterations to include balcony over conservatory; new detached garage at Woodhouse Farm, Barton Estate, East Cowes PO32 6NU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/01655/HOU, dated 18 December 2020, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development was changed after the submission of the application. The original description of development was "*extension above existing ground floor extension and erection of new garage; create arbor/ conversion of existing garage by removal of windows and doors/ openings*". As the amended description is succinct and clearer regarding the development applied for, I have utilised the amended description.
3. The address for the appeal site on the decision notice includes a road name, though the application and appeal forms do not. In the interests of consistency, I have used the address given on the relevant forms, which sufficiently identify the appeal site.
4. The Appellant has queried whether it is within the Council's remit to issue split decisions. Local planning authorities are not precluded from issuing split decisions in exceptional circumstances¹, though the usual method of doing so would be by imposition of a condition. It is appropriate to negotiate an amended scheme prior to resorting to a split decision. I have dealt with the whole proposal, as if it had been made in the first instance². Since the appeal is allowed, I have had regard to the conditions imposed by the Council on the previously permitted elements.

¹ Planning Practice Guidance ID: 21a-013-20140306.

² S79(1)(b) Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

5. The Council's delegated report refers to 'consent' being sought. The host dwelling is unlisted and only planning permission is sought.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character of the host dwelling and the effect of the proposal on the character of the area.
7. Though the character of the area does not form a reason for refusal, the Council's delegated report does raise specific concerns in this regard.

Reasons

Character of the host dwelling

8. The host dwelling is an unlisted detached farmhouse set within a generous garden plot alongside large scale farm buildings. The dwelling is constructed in red brick, with buff brick detailing and a tile hung first floor. The main roof comprises of concrete tiles, has a relatively shallow pitch and overhanging eaves. The dwelling has a single storey side extension of approximately 1/3rd width of the original dwelling and a conservatory to the other side constructed in modern brown uPVC. The dwelling is late Victorian in character and has some attractive detailing, though this has somewhat been eroded by the introduction of uPVC windows, the uPVC conservatory and white uPVC window surrounds at first floor level.
9. The appeal scheme proposes a first-floor extension above the existing side extension, a detached garage, a Juliet balcony, a balcony over the existing conservatory and a single storey side extension.
10. The proposed first-floor extension would feature similar architectural detailing, materials and proportions to the host dwelling, such as buff brick features, overhanging eaves, and tile hanging elevations. Whilst the Council has raised concerns regarding the matching of materials, I am satisfied that sympathetic materials could be achieved by way of a condition. In this regard, the detailed design of the proposal would respect the established character of the dwelling.
11. With regards to scale, the proposed side extension would be sited above the existing single storey extension; it would not add to the footprint of the host dwelling and would be approximately 1/3rd the width of the house. The single storey extension is relatively massive and bulky in appearance due to its height and replication of the shallow roof pitch; the additional bulk which would be created by the appeal proposal is therefore somewhat limited. Whilst the extension would have only a marginal set back from the front elevation, as does the existing extension, it would be clearly differentiated from the host dwelling by virtue of that setback and the buff brick patterned corners on the host dwelling and the extension. The host dwelling also features a slight horizontal white timber detailing between the ground-floor and first-floor sections which is not repeated in the proposed extension. The combination of these features would clearly articulate and maintain the original proportions and remnants of symmetry of the host dwelling.
12. Though the extension would elongate the roof ridge of the dwelling rather than have a set-back or set-down, its limited width combined with the detailing on the elevations would achieve a subservient appearance and avoid the appearance of disproportionate length overall.

13. The single storey addition of a 'boot room' is small in scale and is well articulated.
14. The existing dwelling features fenestration of a varied size, with the larger windows sited to the side and rear elevations, as well as a fully glazed conservatory. The addition of a proposed Juliet balcony to the rear elevation of the proposed first-floor extension would be in keeping with the existing fenestration of the host dwelling and would create symmetry with the conservatory and proposed patio doors leading to the balcony above the existing conservatory.
15. The parties agree that the proposed garage, alterations to the existing garage and walk-out platform above the conservatory would have a limited affect on the character of the host dwelling, are in keeping with the host dwelling in respect of detailed design and proportions. By virtue of their siting, scale and appearance, I concur with the parties.
16. For these reasons, the proposal would have a high standard of design which is in keeping with the character of the host dwelling, in accordance with the Framework and policy DM2 of the Island Plan Core Strategy (CS). Policy DM2 seeks, amongst other things, high quality and inclusive design whilst allowing for change.

Character of the surrounding area

17. The appeal site is located within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). It is in an isolated rural location and is prominently located on an escarpment over a wide valley. Due to the distance from other properties and public viewpoints, the dwelling is viewed in its whole farmyard context within the wider landscape. Many of the farm buildings forming part of this context are of large scale and agricultural proportions. In this context, the host dwelling appears modest in scale and the proposed additions would have a minimal impact on the dwelling's appearance in the wider landscape. Views of the proposed extension first floor extension from across the valley would be obscured and filtered by the existing garage building (proposed arbor), due to its scale and the surrounding topography.
18. Moreover, other dwellings within this wider landscape are larger in scale, with long roof ridges. Linear style buildings appear characteristic of the area.
19. For these reasons, the proposal would respect the character of the surrounding area and AONB, in accordance with the Framework and policy DM12 of the CS. Policy DM12 seeks, amongst other things, to conserve, enhance and promote the landscape interests of the Island.

Conditions

20. I have had regard to the conditions previously imposed by the Council. I have imposed the standard conditions in relation to approved plans and a 3 year time limit to ensure the proposal is constructed in a timely manner in accordance with the details of the proposal. Ordinarily a condition limiting the use of a garage to purposes incidental to the dwellinghouse is not necessary as any material change of use would require planning permission, however, as the appeal site is part of an agricultural holding which also contains residential accommodation within another building, I consider it is a reasonable and

necessary condition. For the reasons outlined above, I have imposed a pre-commencement condition relating to materials, with the Appellant's agreement.

Conclusion

21. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal proposal accords with the relevant policies of the Development Plan and that the appeal should be allowed, subject to conditions.

Kim Langford Tejrar

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: WHF0001 OS NTS, WHF0001 OS0001, WHF0002 OS0001, WHF0001FP0001, WHF0001 FP0002, WHF0001 FP0003, WHF0001 FP0004, WHF0001 FP 0005.
- 3) Notwithstanding condition (2), no development shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby approved have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The relevant works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 4) The garage building hereby permitted shall not be used at any time other than for purposes incidental to the residential use of the dwelling known as Woodhouse Farm.