
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 January 2021

by R Sabu BA(Hons) MA BArch PgDip ARB RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D3505/D/20/3259887
104 Bures Road, Great Cornard CO10 0JE

- 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 & Mrs Hart against the decision of Babergh District Council.
 - The application Ref DC/20/02153, dated 3 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as, 'first floor side extension to property over existing garage (providing additional 1no. bathroom and 1no. bathroom/ensuite) and replacement of double garage doors with single garage door and side door'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the significance of the non-designated heritage asset on the site; and
 - whether the proposed development would provide adequate provision for parking.

Reasons

Non-designated heritage asset

3. The area around the appeal site is primarily characterised by historic detached and semi-detached dwellings. While the buildings on the same side of the road have varying spacings and setbacks compared with the opposite side which has a more unified pattern of development, the area generally has an attractive, spacious character and appearance.
4. While the site does not lie within a Conservation Area and the host building is not listed, it is a Non-Designated Heritage Asset, the significance of which lies in the evidence of historic architecture with original detailing. It is a historic detached dwelling in a similar style to others in the area such that it provides a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. It is also set forward of other buildings on this side of the road such that it is prominent on the street scene. The existing garage has a single pitch that slopes down away from the host building at an angle that does not relate to the pitches of the roof of the host building. As such, the existing garage appears somewhat incongruous when viewed against the host building and wider area.

5. The proposal consists of the alteration of the garage to include a single access door and single garage door, and a first-floor side extension of the host dwelling over the existing garage. The flat portion of the proposed roof may be partially hidden by the neighbouring property and the scheme would remove the window in the flank elevation. However, the proposed gable end form with a roof pitch steeper than that of the host property would result in an awkward juxtaposition with the roof of the host building which is hipped with a shallower pitch.
6. I note that the garage would continue to be set back from the front elevation of the host building, and the proposal would have a lower height than the host building. However, since the overall height of the side extension would be significantly greater than the height of the existing garage and given the awkward juxtaposition of the two roof forms, the proposal would appear more prominent, amplifying the incongruity of the first floor extension when compared with the host building.
7. While render may not necessarily appear incongruous against the materials of the host building, given the height of the flank elevation and its siting forward of the adjacent building, the proposed use of render would present a stark, blank elevation to the street.
8. Furthermore, while the proposed dormer window would be a similar size and style compared with the other windows on the building, it would project past the eaves level and would not be in line with the windows of the host building, thereby appearing awkward against the host building. I note that visibility of the proposed extension when travelling south would be restricted and the vegetation to the south of the site would somewhat reduce visibility of the scheme. However, there is no certainty regarding the permanence of the vegetation, the foliage of which would be likely to be less dense during winter months. Therefore, while I note the conclusions of the Heritage Impact Assessment, the proposal would appear discordant against the host building, diminishing the significance of the non-designated heritage asset and adversely affecting the character and appearance of the area.
9. While I note the reference to a scheme at The Limes, little further information is before me to allow a direct comparison with this appeal. In any event, each case must be determined on its own merits.
10. Consequently, the proposed development would harm the significance of the non-designated heritage asset on the site. Therefore, it would conflict with Policy CN01 of the Babergh Local Plan Alteration No.2 Adopted June 2006 (LP) which requires, among other things, that all new development proposals be of appropriate scale and form and detailed design. It would also conflict with LP Policy H33 which supports extensions to existing dwellings if the scale, mass and architectural details of the proposed extension blend in with those of the dwelling and wider setting. The scheme would also conflict with Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework in this particular regard.

Parking provision

11. The parking provision on the site would be unchanged by the proposal. The site has three parking spaces including a single space within the garage. Since the Suffolk Guidance for Parking Technical Guidance Adopted November 2014 Third Edition – May 2019 (PTG) requires a minimum of three spaces for a dwelling with four or more bedrooms, the proposal would meet the requirement

regardless of the number of bedrooms in the host building. In any event, the Appellant has confirmed that the existing building can be considered a 4-bedroom dwelling.

12. Consequently, the proposed development would provide adequate parking provision. Therefore, it would not conflict with LP Policy TP15 which requires new development to provide parking in accordance with parking standards. It would also not conflict with the PTG in this respect.

Other Matters

13. I also note that no local objections were received and the support for the scheme by the Parish Council. It has therefore not altered my overall decision. However, I have necessarily assessed the proposal based on its planning merits, and these matters have not altered my overall decision.

Planning Balance

14. Paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
15. The existing garage, given its single pitch and rendered elevations, appears incongruous against the host building, thereby diminishing its significance. However, given its modest height, the overall bulk of the existing garage, it is not unduly prominent when viewed from the street. The proposal on the other hand, would significantly increase the height and mass of the side extension. Accordingly, the proposed roof, which given its form, pitch and height would appear discordant against the host building, would appear more prominent than the existing garage. As such, since the proposal would replace the existing garage roof with a more discordant extension, I attach moderate weight to the harm to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset that would result from the proposal.
16. I note the scheme would provide additional internal accommodation for the Appellant's family. However, these are private benefits which, along with the other matters raised by the Appellant, do not override the harm identified.

Conclusion

17. For the reason given above, the appeal is dismissed.

R Sabu

INSPECTOR