The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 May 2021

by R Norman BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th May 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2620/W/20/3262862
Stonehaven, Ramsgate Street, Edgefield NR24 2AX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Andrew & Lesley Rainsford against North Norfolk District Council.
- The application Ref PF/20/0761, is dated 7 May 2020.
- The development proposed is internal alterations and extension of existing dwelling – side extension to ground and first floor - new dormer to first floor.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for internal alterations and extension of existing dwelling – side extension to ground and first floor – new dormer to first floor at Stonehaven, Ramsgate Street, Edgefield NR24 2AX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PF/20/0761, dated 7 May 2020, subject to the following 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: Drawing Numbers PL200; PL201; PL202; PL203; PL250; PL251 and PL300.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surroundings.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises an existing detached dwelling, set back from Ramsgate Street. It has a large driveway to the front and side and an ample area of garden to the rear. The site is located outside of any main settlement in an area of countryside and in the immediate surroundings are sporadic properties set within generous plots.

4. The proposed development would extend and modernise the existing property to provide a reconfigured internal arrangement. A two-storey extension would be located to the side of the dwelling, which would project beyond the existing front elevation. The dormer to the rear of the property would be enlarged also.

5. Policy HO8 of the North Norfolk Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2008) (Core Strategy) relates to house extensions and replacement dwellings in the countryside. It seeks to ensure that proposals would not result in a disproportionately large increase in height or scale of the dwelling and would not materially increase the impact of the dwelling on the appearance of the surrounding countryside.

6. The proposed extension would increase the footprint of the proposed dwelling to the side and partially to the front and rear. It would also have a ridge height above that of the existing dwelling, as well as increasing the overall size of the dormer to provide more useable space to the first floor. The existing property is a chalet style property and the proposed alterations would give the appearance of a larger two storey property. However, the dwelling would not occupy a large area of the appeal site and the footprint and height increase would not be so large as to appear disproportionate or harmful to the character of the host property.

7. The proposed design would introduce a two-storey gable element to the front and rear elevations, the upper part of which would be externally clad in vertical Siberian Larch cladding. There would be the use of flint also which would reflect elements of the existing external elevations.

8. Within the immediate surroundings there are other well-spaced dwellings set within large plots. There is a property on the opposite side of the road which has gable features and timber cladding and the area is relatively mixed in terms of design and materials. The development would introduce larger areas of glazing than the existing property, however I find these to be well related to the overall design of the property and although forming a more modern feature would not be harmful in appearance. The appeal site is well landscaped, and the positioning of the dwelling set back from the road would soften the overall visual impact of the extended property.

9. The proposal would increase the overall size of the dwelling and would introduce some new external materials and design features. However, cumulatively, the scale, design and form of the property would reflect the prevailing character of the area and would reflect and complement other properties in the immediate area.

10. Consequently, I find that the proposed development would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the existing property nor the surrounding area. It would therefore comply with Policies HO8 and EN4 of the Core Strategy, the North Norfolk Design Guide and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019). These seek to secure high quality design, have regard to the local context and preserve or enhance the quality of an area, amongst other things.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition listing the approved plans as this provides certainty. The Council have suggested conditions which I have considered against the tests in the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance.

12. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in the materials specified is not necessary as the external finishes are shown on the submitted plans and are therefore secured by condition 2.

13. I have not imposed the suggested condition relating to landscaping as this is a domestic property with an established garden and I do not consider it reasonable or necessary to require a detailed scheme of planting for a householder development.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission is granted.

R Norman

INSPECTOR