



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2025

by **C Coles MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C1435/D/25/3370811

Cherry Tree Cottage, Stunts Green, Herstmonceux, East Sussex BN27 4PP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Chris Edwards against the decision of Wealden District Council.
 - The application Ref is WD/2025/0864/F.
 - The development proposed is erection of two bedroom first floor extension above existing ground floor rooms. Continuation upwards of existing roof line to form 'catslide roof' to front elevation over new first floor rooms with two new dormer windows. Small ground floor extension to side of existing property to form stair well up to proposed first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.

Reasons

3. The existing dwelling is single storey, unassuming and of a modest scale with a traditional appearance with clay roof tiles and brick and tile hanging on the elevations. The dwelling is set in an elevated position on a large, mature plot, screened from the road by mature hedging. Due to the elevated position of the dwelling on the plot, the dwelling is visible above the hedging.
4. The appeal site is located outside the High Weald National Landscape within a rural area. The surrounding properties vary in size, scale and positioning on the plot relative to the road as well as in appearance, although clay tile roofs, brick, timber cladding and tile hanging walls are unifying materials.
5. Whilst Policies DC19 and EN27 of the Wealden Local Plan (1998) (LP) do not specify a size limitation on extensions to dwellings, proposals should be of an appropriate size and character relative to the original dwelling and not dominate or adversely change the character of the existing building. Wealden Design Guide: Residential alterations and extensions highlights the importance of assessing the cumulative impact of previous extensions on the form and appearance of dwellings and states that extensions in excess of 30% of the floorspace of the original dwelling will normally only be permitted where the Council is satisfied that there is no major change to the character of the building itself or its impact on its setting.
6. Policies DC19 and EN27 of the LP comply with Paragraphs 131 and 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which set out that design

expectations should be clear and that developments should be visually attractive (amongst other considerations).

7. I have not been provided with the details of previous applications, the original form of the dwelling or the exact percentage increase in size of dwelling when compared with the original dwelling or the dwelling as existing within which to consider the cumulative impact of the extensions on the dwelling over time. However, the appellant has indicated the proposal would represent an increase in excess of 30% of the existing building which would not normally be permitted except where the Council are satisfied there would be no major change to the character of the building.
8. The proposal would fundamentally change the character of the existing building and would not be of an appropriate size relative to the dwelling on site. The proposal would dominate the existing building and would appear very top heavy by doubling the height of the dwelling and creating a bulk and mass at first floor level which would be at odds with the single storey dwelling with a disproportionate amount of development within the roof space. The proposed dormers would also be disproportionately large and would be awkwardly spaced in relation to the proposed roof and the existing dwelling.
9. Whilst there may be potential for the site to accommodate an enlarged dwelling, the proposal must be sympathetic to the size and character of the existing dwelling.
10. In light of the above, I conclude the proposal would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling contrary to Policies DC19 and EN27 of the LP. Together, these policies seek to ensure development would be of an appropriate size and character relative to the original dwelling and not visually dominate or otherwise adversely change the character of the existing building and adjoining development.

Other Matters

11. The materials proposed would respond to the existing dwelling and neighbouring properties. However, an appropriate choice of materials would not overcome the harm caused to the character and appearance of the dwelling from the size and scale of the proposed development.
12. I note the lack of objection to the proposed development, however, a lack of objection does not equate to a lack of harm.
13. The Council have not raised objection to the proposed development on the basis of impact on neighbouring properties, the visual openness of the countryside, landscape impact or the impact on the rural setting of the dwelling and I have no reason to take a different view.
14. I have been directed towards planning application WD/2015/1091/F for a replacement dwelling. However, no details have been provided for this planning application and I am therefore unable to make any comparison with the appeal scheme.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Coles

INSPECTOR