



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2022

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F3545/D/21/3277251

Rose Corner, The Street, Icklingham, Bury St Edmunds IP28 6PN

- 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 R Morris against the decision of West Suffolk Council.
 - The application Ref DC/21/0550/HH dated 12/03/2021, was refused by notice dated 20/05/2021.
 - The development proposed is described as conversion of garage roof from a flat roof to a pitched roof to create an office space and shower room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for conversion of garage roof from a flat roof to a pitched roof to create an office space and shower room at Rose Corner, The Street, Icklingham, Bury St Edmunds IP28 6PN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/21/0550/HH, dated 12/03/2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to conditions set out below.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed elevations and floor plans drawing no 2021-01-BD2 REV A and Site location plan drawing no 2021-01-BD3.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council altered the description of development, this is also the description used by the Appellant on the appeal form. I consider this to be a more accurate description of the appeal proposal and accordingly I have adopted the amended description in the heading above rather than the Appellants application form description of development.
3. Since the determination of the application the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (the Framework) has been published. The revised Framework does not diverge significantly from the previous version with regard to relevance to this appeal. No party has been prejudiced or caused any injustice by me proceeding with the appeal in light of this change in policy.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

5. The site is a detached property on a corner plot within a small group of residential dwellings. Predominately properties along the A1101 (The Street) are built up to the footpath, the appeal property has a front garden with the built form set back from the highway.
6. A high wall extends from the property and wraps around a small external courtyard connecting to the existing large garage. There are limited views of the garage from The Street due to the screening the wall provides.
7. Policy DM24 of the Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Local Plan, Joint Development Management Policies Document (2015) (the Local Plan) requires alterations or extensions to existing dwellings in the countryside to be subordinate in scale and proportion to the original dwelling. The proposed extension and alterations will increase the prominence of the garage.
8. The materials for the pitched roof would be similar to the existing dwelling, however cladding is proposed to the gable which would give a rural outbuilding appearance. This combined with the set back of the proposed development, the slight increase in ground levels from the host dwelling and the orientation of the garage which is largely screened from view, I find that the bulk of the extension would be read as a separate building. Whilst visually the proposed development would not be subordinate to the existing dwelling, it would also not be viewed as an attached extension.
9. In the context that the existing built form of the appeal site is different to other properties within The Street and set back from the building line, the proposed development would not be incongruous to the streetscene.
10. I find that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area and the host dwelling.
11. There is no conflict with Policies DM2, DM24 of the Local Plan and Policy CS5 of the Forest Heath Local Development Framework, Core Strategy Development Plan Documents 2001-2026 (with housing projected to 2031) (2010) which seek amongst other things to ensure development respects character, scale and density of the locality.
12. There is also no conflict with the Framework which seeks to ensure developments are of good design appropriate and sympathetic to their surroundings.

Conclusion and Conditions

13. I have imposed a standard condition relating to the commencement of development. I have included a condition specifying the relevant plans which include the external materials proposed as this provides certainty.
14. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR