



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2024

By Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 April 2024.

Appeal Ref: APP/F2605/D/23/3333579

Larkshall House, Thetford Road, Wretham, Thetford, IP24 1RU

- 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 Jordan Greenwood against the decision of Breckland Council.
 - The application Ref 3PL/2023/0815/HOU, dated 16 August 2023, was refused by notice dated 1 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension over previously approved single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first-floor extension over previously approved single storey extension at Larkshall House, Thetford Road, Wretham, Thetford, IP24 1RU, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3PL/2023/0815/HOU dated 16 August 2023, and the plans submitted with it, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those on the extensions approved under planning permission reference 3PL/2022/1384/HOU.

Preliminary matters

2. The application form described the proposed development as "Change of first floor extension roof line, to second floor level". The council changed this to the description used in the heading above, as did the appeal form. I have adopted it as it more clearly identifies the development proposed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the appearance of the dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

4. Larkshall House, a detached two storey dwelling, is situated on Thetford Road (A1075), to the south of the main hub of Wretham village. It is accessed by a track off the main road and sits in the centre of a triangular plot that is screened from the highway by an extensive belt of trees. A few other dwellings, accessed from the same track, lie to the south of the site. The site lies outside of any defined settlement boundary.

5. The starting point is planning policy. Policies COM01 and GEN02 of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted 2019) seek to achieve the highest standard of design in all new developments. Of more specific relevance to the appeal proposal is Policy HOU11, which has the title 'Residential Replacement, Extension and Alteration'. The 'Extension or alteration' part of this policy states:
- "Extensions or alterations to existing residential properties will be permitted where all the following criteria are met:*
- A. The extension or alteration is not disproportionate in size in relation to the original dwelling/plot and does not alter substantially the character of the dwelling.*
- B. The extended or altered dwelling respects the character of the existing dwelling.*
- C. The design remains in keeping with the existing dwelling and building materials.*
- D. The extension or alteration will not adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring property".*
6. As background to the appeal proposal, planning permission was granted in 2022 for the erection of a two storey side extension with new pitched roof over a flat roof side extension, new porch, and two storey extension to rear. In addition, the existing garage was to be demolished and a replacement two bay garage be erected. This permission has not yet been carried out. The appeal proposal is to add a first floor to that single storey element that had an added pitched roof approved. The new pitched roof, over the proposed first floor, would result in a continuation of the main roof with the ridge line being maintained.
7. Taking the points of excessive size and scale and a lack of subordination to the existing dwelling in turn, bearing in mind the size and scale of that which is already approved, I do not consider that the proposed first floor extension can reasonably be said to be excessive in either regard. It would not be a disproportionate addition to the approved scheme. However, I see that it would not be subordinate to the enlarged dwelling, inasmuch as the roof would rise to the existing ridgeline, rather than being dropped down to indicate that it is an extension.
8. In this case I take the view that what is proposed is an integration into the design of what largely amounts to new build. As such, the design is sound, and does not amount to poor design, nor would it be detrimental to the appearance of the dwelling as already permitted. Since the design satisfactorily relates to the approved scheme, I do not see that it can be detrimental to the streetscene. In addition, it is almost impossible to view the existing house on the site from the public highway, because of the bank of trees lining Thetford Road, so that the streetscene would not be affected. Furthermore, views from what I take to be a private track, from which the appeal property takes its access, would not be detrimentally affected.

Conclusions

9. For the reasons that I have set out above, I have concluded that the effect of the proposed extension on the appearance of the dwelling, as permitted to be extended, would be satisfactory and amount to good design; thus a well-designed building, as would result from the addition of the appeal proposal to

the dwelling as permitted to be extended, would not be harmful to the street scene. I therefore consider that the proposed extension would meet the criteria of the relevant part of Policy HOU11.

10. In coming to this conclusion I have, of necessity, had to make a decision on the basis of the development that has already been permitted. It is not realistic to view the appeal proposal on the basis of the effect on the existing house.

11. The appeal will be allowed.

Conditions

12. The statutory condition that provides a time limit on the start of development must be imposed. In addition, the council has suggested 2 conditions in the event that the appeal is upheld. I have considered these in the light of Planning Practice Guidance.

13. These seek that the development should be carried out in accordance with the plans and that the materials match the existing. I agree that the first of these conditions is necessary for certainty and avoidance of doubt as to the development permitted (and can be incorporated into the wording of the decision) and the second is necessary to ensure that the appearance of the development integrates with the existing permitted extensions in a visually satisfactory manner.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR