



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2020

by P Mileham BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D3505/D/19/3236282

5 Mannings Lane, Woolverstone, Ipswich, Suffolk IP9 1AW

- 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 Adam Owens against the decision of Babergh District Council.
 - The application Ref DC/19/02429, dated 19 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of a 1.5 storey extension following demolition of existing outbuildings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellants description of development includes elements that of repetition within the above banner heading and other matters that are not directly related to the proposed development. Therefore, for clarity I have adopted the Council's description of development from the decision notice to which there has been no concern raised.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Woolverstone Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a two storey detached dwelling, finished in red brick with a pantiled roof, the oldest part of which dates from around 1860. The property has been extended to the rear with a red brick extension with a flat roof, along with a small glazed lean-to on the south west side elevation. A concrete and timber clad pitched roof garage is to side of the property located along the rear boundary and there is a small greenhouse adjoining the garage.
5. The significance of the Woolverstone CA is derived from, amongst other things, the use of traditional building materials such as red brick and pantiles such as those at the appeal site. The 20th century garage building that is proposed to be replaced does not make a positive contribution to the significance of the CA due to its unsympathetic design and construction materials. The existing flat roofed extension to the property has been constructed with facing red brick, and whilst its flat roof does not make a positive contribution to the CA, it has a neutral effect and thereby preserves its significance.

6. The proposal would replace the existing garage with a 1.5 storey extension and redevelop the glazed lean-to section of the existing rear extension with a small flat roofed extension following the existing with French style doors. The scale and siting of the proposed 1.5 storey extension is such that it would dominate the front and side elevations of the property by significantly extending the projection of built development. In particular, the significant projection beyond the north east elevation when viewed from the front would result in an awkward relationship with the existing dwelling and would not be read as a cohesive extension to the property.
7. Saved Policy HS33 of the Babergh Local Plan (2006) (the BLP) indicates that permission to extend a dwelling will be granted where it reflects and respects the relationship of the site and its' setting. The appellant has indicated that the lower ridge height of the proposed extension would be supported by paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Although the ridge height would be slightly lower than that of the tallest part of the existing dwelling, the extension would nonetheless result in a large and bulky addition that would dominate the existing dwelling. The removal of the existing garage and its replacement with the extension would have a modest benefit to the CA by removing a feature that neither preserves or enhances its. However, due to the scale, siting and bulk of the proposed extension it would be over-dominant to the dwelling and therefore fail to respect the relationship of the site. As a result, the proposed development would fail to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.
8. The design of the extension is of a contemporary nature and saved Policy CN01 of the BLP indicates that in some locations contemporary designs using modern materials will be appropriate. Whilst the appellant has indicated that the Conservation Area Appraisal is not prescriptive about the use of particular design requirements, the lack of detailing in the front and side elevations of the extension and the extensive use of timber rainscreen cladding would not respond positively to the detailing found in the original dwelling (e.g. the pitches above the windows in the first floor and the ornate chimneys). Although the appellant has indicated that the extension would reflect the silhouette and design features of the original dwelling, the extensive use of cladding would jar with the red brick and pantiles of the existing dwelling. Although the timber cladding has been used to soften the impact of the extension and once weathered, allow it to blend in with surrounding vegetation, the extent and uniformity of this material would clash with the detailing of the existing dwelling. This clash would detract from the character of the existing property and its contribution to the CA. As such, it would result in harm to the CA.
9. My attention has been drawn to the presence of large extensions to the neighbouring dwellings. I do not have full details of the permissions that allowed for these extensions, but in the case of No 4 Mannings Lane, these appear to have been constructed using traditional building materials including red brick and pantiles, and as such, closely reflects the existing dwelling and its use of materials. Other local examples have been cited including Nos 1 and 2 Deer Park Cottages, Deer Park Lodge and Main Road Cottages. These properties appear to have been significantly extended, albeit from the submitted evidence it appears these have used designs and materials that more closely match those found on their host dwellings or elsewhere in the CA lessening any effects. As such, they do not alter my findings in respect of the appeal proposal. The appellant has also indicated that alternative options for

the extension would not be appropriate. However, I must consider this proposal on its merits and it is not for this appeal to consider alternative schemes.

10. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires decision makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, to which I attached considerable importance and weight.
11. Although the proposal would replace a garage building that does not make a positive contribution to the significance of the CA, this is of limited public benefit having regard to the concerns identified with the proposed development. Therefore, this benefit carries limited weight and is insufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified to the significance of the CA.
12. In the context of paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) the aforementioned harm to the CA would be less than substantial. However, for the reasons outlined above, there are no identified public benefits that would outweigh such harm.
13. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Woolverstone CA. As such, it would be contrary to saved Policies CN01, CN08 and HS33 of the BLP which seek to ensure that all new development proposed be of an appropriate scale, form, detailed design and construction materials for the location, that proposals for the extension of an existing building should preserve or enhance the character of the CA or its setting and that the scale, mass, external materials and architectural details of the proposed extension blend in with those of the dwelling and its wider setting.
14. The proposal would also fail to accord with paragraphs 127 and 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to ensure developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding building environment and landscape setting and where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P Mileham

INSPECTOR