
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 July 2021

by Rebecca McAndrew BA Hons, PG Dip Urban Design, MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P2114/D/21/3274239
Crosstrees, Main Road, Thorley PO41 0SS

- 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 and Mrs Pilcher against the decision of Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02192/HOU, dated 13 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'demolition of existing extensions; proposed extension at first floor level to form additional living accommodation, new vehicular access'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the site and area.

Reasons

3. The appeal scheme seeks to add a first floor extension to an existing bungalow. The proposed scheme would substantially increase the scale and mass of the property. The single storey hipped roof bungalow would become a two-storey pitched roof house. Whilst the resultant dwelling would reflect the scale and mass of other two-storey properties within the area, those houses generally sit further back within their plots, away from the highway and mostly include mature hedgerows along the front boundaries which soften their appearance within the streetscene. By contrast, the appeal dwelling sits forward in the plot, relatively close to the highway, and would include only a short section of newly planted hedge to the front of the extended dwelling. Therefore, the appeal proposal would fail to reflect the development pattern along Main Road and would appear overly prominent and out of character within the streetscene, on this main route through Thorley.
4. The two-storey dwelling which would be formed would be of a contemporary design, including areas of stone, wooden cladding and a clay tile roof. Whilst the two-storey property would vary in character from the existing dwelling and other properties in the immediate vicinity, I recognise that the area is characterised by a variety of house types and designs. I also note that the appellant has submitted details of renovated properties in the wider area,

Rosehaven and Greenfields, which have also secured a contemporary character. However, a contemporary design approach in this position would only serve to exacerbate the unacceptable prominence of the dwelling in the streetscene.

5. In conclusion, due to its design, scale and position, the appeal proposal would be overly prominent within the streetscene and would therefore unduly harm the character and appearance of the appeal site and the area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy DM2 of the Island Plan: The Isle of Wight Council Core Strategy (including minerals and waste) and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2012) (LP) and Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seek to secure high quality design which responds to local context.

Other matters

6. I recognise that amendments have been made to the previously scheme in an attempt to address the Council's reason for refusal. However, these amendments do not overcome the harm I have identified.
7. I acknowledge the benefits of the scheme, including the sustainable re-use of the existing building, that visibility when exiting the site would be improved, that the scheme would not affect the living conditions of neighbours and that the scheme proposes the removal of extensions, which would be beneficial to the living conditions of neighbours. However, none of these matters outweigh the impact I have described on the character and appearance of the site and area.
8. I have considered a number of other properties referred to by the appellant in support of their proposal. Whilst I only have limited information in respect of these properties, their circumstances appear to vary from the appeal dwelling. For example, Goldings is a garage/storage building set away from residential properties and Main Road and Hill Place sits within a substantial plot and is also located away from the highway and other dwellings. In addition, each proposal must be considered on its own merit. Therefore, this does not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR