



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 April 2022

by Zoe Raygen DipURP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E2530/W/21/3285190

54a North Street, Bourne PE10 9AB

- 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 Nigel Lavender against the decision of South Kesteven District Council.
 - The application Ref S21/1013, dated 20 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is a full width dormer installed to rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the address of the property from the appellant's appeal form, which I saw on site more accurately describes the appeal site than that on the application form.
3. As the proposal is in a conservation area, I have had special regard to section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and streetscene bearing in mind the extent to which it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Bourne Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The Bourne Conservation Area (CA) covers much of the historic market town centre and along the main routes in and out of the town. Buildings are typically at the back edge of the pavement giving a sense of enclosure. They range in style and age with a number of examples of well-preserved historic buildings. Although there may be examples of dormer extensions similar to that proposed in Bourne, none have been drawn to my attention within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site. At my site visit I noted that roof forms were generally simple and unaltered. The significance of the CA, insofar as it relates to this appeal, is primarily associated with the historical townscape and street pattern.
6. The appeal property forms a two storey building with commercial use at ground floor. Although it has later additions and alterations, it retains sufficient original features to make a positive contribution to the CA.

7. The proposed dormer extension would extend across most of the rear roof slope. Although positioned below the existing roofline and set in from the sides of the roof, its size and bulk would significantly alter the original roof form creating a dominant and top-heavy appearance to the rear elevation. As a result, it would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and thus its contribution to the significance of the CA.
8. Due to the set in from the side, and the angle of the roof slope, the dormer would have very limited visibility from North Street. Furthermore, there would only be glimpsed views from Meadow Gate. Consequently, the impact on the streetscene would be negligible. Nevertheless, it would be very visible from a number of residential properties to the rear thereby causing harm to the wider character and appearance of the CA.
9. Given the above, I find that the proposal would fail to preserve the significance of the CA. Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to their conservation. In this instance, I find the harm to be less than substantial but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight.
10. Under such circumstances, paragraph 202 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The proposal would provide additional living space for the appellant, but this is a predominantly a private benefit and not sufficient to outweigh the harm caused to the significance of the CA.
11. For the reasons above I conclude that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and fail to preserve the character or appearance of the Bourne Conservation Area. It would therefore be in conflict with Policies EN6 and DE1 of the South Kesteven District Council Local Plan 2011-2036 adopted 2020 and the Framework. Together these seek to ensure that development is of high quality design that seeks to protect and enhance heritage assets

Other Matters

12. There are a number of listed buildings on North Street. However, the dormer would not be viewed in association with the buildings to any material degree. From the evidence before me there is no historical association between the appeal property and the listed buildings. Therefore, their significance would not be adversely affected.

Conclusion

13. There are no persuasive material considerations in this case to indicate that the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan.
14. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude on balance that the appeal should be dismissed.

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR