



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 January 2021

by Graham Wyatt BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/D/20/3254152

Holly Barn, 139 High Road, Needham, Harleston, Norfolk IP20 9LG

- 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 Ann Marriott against the decision of South Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/0556, dated 13 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as a "Proposed first floor en-suite shower room."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a proposed first floor en-suite shower room at Holly Barn, High Road, Needham, Harleston, Norfolk IP20 9LG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2020/0556, dated 13 March 2020 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 217:50 (survey Drawing of Existing), 217:51 (Proposed First Floor En-Suite Shower Room) and 217.52 (Block Plan and Location Plan)

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and the host property.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a former agricultural barn that has been converted into residential use. The proposal seeks to erect an en-suite bathroom at first floor level through the insertion of a dormer style extension that would be installed over an existing ground floor lean-to extension. The Council argue that the scale, height, and massing of the proposal would erode the traditional appearance of the barn and its rural surroundings.
4. The building has undergone many alterations to enable its residential use and contains such items as roof lights, a television aerial, metal flues, domestic fenestration and doors, a glazed canopy over the door to the side of the property, and external lighting. Such features have impacted on the character of the former barn so that, when viewed from the rear where the proposed extension would be erected, its rural quality has been largely diminished.

5. Consequently, I am not persuaded that the introduction of a small extension over an existing lean-to, which would be constructed of materials to match the existing building, would result in undue harm to the appearance of the building or its rural setting. Moreover, the ridge of the proposed extension would be set below that of the main roof so as not to appear dominant within the roofscape or from its rear and side elevation, where the development would be most visible.
6. Thus, the proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the host building or the rural quality of the area. It would not be in conflict with Policy 2 of the Joint Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk 2014 and Policies DM1.4, DM3.6, DM3.8(1) and (4) and DM4.5 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document 2015 which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development proposals are of a design and scale compatible to the area's character and appearance.

Other Matters

7. Miles House at 137 High Road is a grade II listed building and lies to the north of the appeal site. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the decision maker to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving a building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
8. In undertaking this duty, I have based my assessment on the evidence presented before me and the observations I made during my site visit. Given the separation distance and intervening fields and woodland between the appeal site and Miles House, I am satisfied that the development would have a neutral effect on the setting of the designated heritage asset.

Conditions

9. The Council has suggested conditions which I have considered in accordance with the Framework and the national Planning Practice Guidance. Along with the standard time condition, the approved plans should also be specified to provide certainty.
10. As the approved plans also indicate that the materials to be used for the development would match the existing building, there is no requirement to condition such matters.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and having regard to the development plan when read as a whole, the appeal is allowed.

Graham Wyatt

INSPECTOR