
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 May 2019

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/G2625/D/19/3224347

80 Cambridge Street, Norwich, Norfolk NR2 2BE

- 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 Ms Rosie Gagen against the decision of Norwich City Council.
 - The application Ref 18/01478/F was refused by notice dated 17 December 2018.
 - The development proposed is the insertion of loft conversion, single-storey kitchen extension, and bay window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed in so far as it relates to the loft conversion. The appeal is allowed in so far as it relates to the single-storey kitchen extension, bay window and removal of garage. Planning permission is granted for a single-storey kitchen extension, bay window and removal of garage at 80 Cambridge Street, Norwich, Norfolk NR2 2BE in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 18/01478/F dated 27 September 2018 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) No works above ground level shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 10, 15, 16, 17, 20 Revision A, 21 Revision A and 22 Revision A in so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the adjacent Heigham Grove Conservation Area, the surrounding streetscene and host dwelling.

Reasons

3. The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 imposes duties requiring special regard to be had to the desirability, at Section 72(1), of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.
4. The National Planning Policy Framework advises that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
5. The appeal property is situated adjacent to the Heigham Grove Conservation Area, a designated heritage asset, characterised as a primarily residential area comprising a predominance of large dwellings and Victorian terraces. The appeal property is a corner property in a Victorian terrace of similar design to the neighbouring terraces within the Conservation Area. The Victorian terraces are of a relatively uniform height in the immediate area, both inside and adjacent to the Conservation Area. I consider this relative uniformity of the height of these terraces makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and its setting.
6. The appeal property is similar in height, materials and detailing to from the rest of the terrace. As a prominent corner property it is, in other ways, different in form from the rest of the terrace, with a wide frontage to Cambridge Street.
7. The proposal includes the raising of the eaves and height of the roof and a loft conversion with dormer windows. There is an inaccuracy in the plans, with regard to the proposed increase in height. The appellant has confirmed that the proposed maximum increase in ridge height would be 300mm. I have determined the appeal on this basis.
8. In such a prominent corner position in an area of significant traditional uniformity of height, I consider that the proposed loft conversion, due to its design and scale, would appear as an incongruous addition, not in keeping with the scale and form of the existing dwelling. This would be exacerbated by the proposed dormer windows, which are not a prominent feature in the surrounding streetscene.
9. The proposed loft conversion would significantly detract from the uniformity of the height and roof design of the terrace within the streetscene. This would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding streetscene and host dwelling. As such, it would make a negative contribution to the significance of the adjacent Heigham Grove Conservation Area. Thus, the proposed loft conversion would not preserve the character or appearance of the adjacent Conservation Area, but this would be less than substantial harm as set out in the Framework.
10. The proposed loft conversion would provide additional living accommodation. This would have only limited wider public benefit. I have attributed considerable importance and weight to the duty and the presumptive desirability of preserving the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, which I do not consider, for the reasons stated above, are outweighed by any benefits of the proposed loft conversion. In particular, having regard to the Framework, I find that the harm is not outweighed by any public benefit.
11. For the above reasons and having taken into consideration all matters raised, I conclude that the proposed loft conversion would have an adverse effect on the

character and appearance of the surrounding streetscene and host dwelling and would not preserve the character or appearance of the adjacent Heigham Grove Conservation Area. Thus, the proposed loft conversion would be contrary to Policies DM3 and DM9 in the Norwich Development Management Policies Local Plan (2014) and Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (2011, amendments 2014), where they seek to ensure a high standard of design that respects local distinctiveness and where they seek to preserve the significance of designated heritage assets. I consider these policies to be broadly consistent with the Framework where the Framework seeks to ensure good design and seeks to conserve and enhance the historic environment.

Single-Storey Kitchen Extension, Bay Window and Removal of Garage

12. Whilst not listed in the description of the proposed development, the plans clearly indicate that the proposal includes the removal of the garage. I have determined the proposal on this basis.
13. The Council has not raised concern regarding the proposed single-storey kitchen extension, bay window and removal of the garage. The single-storey extension would have a flat green roof and would appear as a discrete addition. The proposed bay window would appear as a sympathetic addition. I consider these proposed additions and the removal of the garage would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding streetscene and host dwelling. As such, these proposals would make a neutral contribution to the significance of the adjacent Conservation Area, thus preserving the character and appearance of the adjacent Heigham Grove Conservation Area.
14. As the proposed single-storey kitchen extension, bay window and removal of the garage would be clearly severable from the proposed loft conversion, I consider it appropriate to issue a split decision in this respect.
15. The Council has suggested the imposition of standard time and plans conditions. I consider it reasonable and necessary to impose such conditions. The Council has suggested a detailed condition regarding materials. In the interest of visual amenity, I consider it reasonable and necessary to impose a materials condition.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR