



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 October 2022

by J White BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D1265/D/22/3303973

5 The Terrace, Pound Road, Thornford, Sherborne DT9 6QA

- 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 Mrs Jude Marwa against the decision of Dorset Council.
 - The application Ref P/HOU/2022/01167, dated 22 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 31 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is to extend the attic out further to create a bedroom with an office space and an en-suite.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to extend the attic out further to create a bedroom with an office space and an en-suite at 5 The Terrace, Pound Road, Sherborne DT9 6QA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/HOU/2022/01167, dated 22 February 2022, and the plans submitted with it.

Preliminary Matters

2. The planning application was made retrospectively. The extension has already been constructed and completed.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development upon (i) the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area including Thornford Conservation Area (CA); (ii) the living conditions of No 4 The Terrace (No 4), with particular regard to outlook; and (iii) the setting of the adjacent listed building, Pyt House.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is an end of terrace house located alongside Pound Road within the CA. The property backs on to farmland and Thornhackett Recreation Area lies to the east. Pyt House is a Grade II listed building that lies adjacent to one side of the appeal site.
5. Although there is more modern residential development on the opposite side of Pound Road, the character of buildings alongside the road with the appeal site are typified by limestone or brick houses with either thatch, slate, or clay tiled roofs. The rear of the terrace provides a variety of window designs, including examples comprised of modern materials such as UPVC. Other than the

- development, which is subject of this appeal, there are two existing dormers of contrasting design, bulk, and materials within the rear roof slope of the terrace.
6. The extension has been constructed into the roof and above an existing two storey brick-built element, which evidently had a flat roof. I note that the extension is not typical of the traditional building vernacular, nor does it resemble the other dormers along the terrace. However, the extension is in a quite discreet location, to the rear of the terrace.
 7. As observed during my site visit, there are some distant views of the extension, including from the recreation area. However, the extension, because of its muted colour and position below the roof ridge line, is not a dominant feature of the area, particularly within the context of the existing dormers. From positions to the front of the terrace, a very small portion of the extension can be seen within the street from the southwest.
 8. In terms of the character and appearance of the dwelling itself, the box dormer has replaced an existing flat roof and, although the dormer is set higher in the roof, it is well below the ridge line of the host building. In addition, the narrow-gabled projection with dual pitched roof extending from the dormer disguises the form and bulk of the dormer to a certain degree. The extension also incorporates slate tiles and clay ridge tiles, and the muted colour of the window frames and cladding to the extension help to integrate it with its backdrop.
 9. Whilst the development has increased the mass of extension to the building, the development is unobtrusive. In the context of the other dormers, I find that the development is subservient. Furthermore, having replaced the flat roof over the two-storey extension, I am satisfied that the design, form, and mass of the extension is acceptable.
 10. The site already demonstrates a variety of building materials and, in this context to the rear of the property, the materials used within the development are congruent. The CA in part derives its significance from its historic plan, quality of built vernacular and buildings of special architectural merit. The development is not a prominent feature from public views, and it does not materially impact on the significance of the CA.
 11. The CA is a designated heritage asset as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). As there is no harm to the character or appearance of the CA, even when attaching great weight to the importance of the heritage asset, I find the details of the development to be acceptable and the scheme complies with the requirements of the Framework in this regard.
 12. In terms of Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Listed Building Act), the proposal preserves the character and appearance of the street and the wider CA.
 13. Therefore, I conclude that the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the existing building or the surrounding area, including the CA. The proposal, in this regard, complies with Policies ENV10 and ENV12 of the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan (the LP), which amongst other things seeks to ensure development contributes positively to local distinctiveness and secures high quality sustainable design.

Living conditions

14. In common with its neighbours within the terrace the appeal property has a long slender garden, and the dwellings have extensions to the rear. In the case of No 4 the extension is single storey. Given the proximity of dwellings, arrangement of existing windows and circulation areas for access to gardens, there is a mutual overlooking between the site and No 4.
15. There are ground floor and first floor windows on the rear elevation of No 4 and the appeal dwelling, which provide an outlook into the courtyard and over the gardens. The courtyard space between these properties is narrow and provides a pathway from a doorway at the rear of No 4 and into its garden. Although it is possible to detect the extension from windows of No 4 and from within the courtyard, the upward extension of the two-storey element does not provide an overbearing impact and there is no detrimental impact on the outlook enjoyed from No 4.
16. The proximity of properties and relationship of buildings provides a mutual impact on residential amenity, including in terms of daylight within the courtyard between the appeal site and No 4. I am satisfied that the development, due to the arrangement and scale of the existing buildings close to the site, would not materially impact on daylight to neighbouring properties.
17. Consequently, I conclude that the development is not overbearing and does not detract from the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at No 4, with particular regard to outlook. As such, in this regard, the development complies with Policy ENV16 of the LP, which amongst other things, requires that development does not have a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of occupiers of residential properties, including through overbearing impact.

Setting of Listed Building

18. Pyt House is a large late 17th Century residential dwelling facing onto the village street but set back from it behind an enclosed garden. It has dressed stone walls and a thatch roof with gable ends and stone gable-copings. The appeal site lies close to the end gable of Pyt House and forward of its principal elevation, with the front wall of the terrace being closer to the highway edge. At the rear of Pyt House, a high stone wall and rear wall of a long single storey stone out building forms the side boundary with the appeal site.
19. The Council identify the significance of the listed building as principally being a result of its architectural and historical qualities. The setting within the street scene and its relationship with other buildings of similar building vernacular, including Grey Cottage and Greenhill Dairy House, contribute to the building's significance.
20. From Pound Road and forward of the principal elevation of Pyt House the extension is mostly obscured. The significance of Pyt House and its relationship with other buildings would be unaffected in such views.
21. From positions within the garden of Pyt House and where the existing outbuilding does not hide it, the view of the extension is mainly of its pitched slate roof and a side elevation. In wider views, including from the recreation area and path leading to it, other buildings, and vegetation obscure views of the development to some extent. In addition, the roof line and distinctive chimney stacks of Pyt House are not diminished by the extensions siting and

design. The prominence of Pyt House is maintained because of the arrangement of buildings, the position of the development to the rear of the site and the nature of the boundary enclosures. Trees also obscure views of the development, but as these features change over time, the presence of trees is a matter I attached little weight.

22. Notwithstanding that, even when the development can be seen with Pyt House, its muted colours, narrow gable projection and position set down in the roof, act to disguise the extension's mass such that the proposal is neither dominant nor prominent on the host building. The consequence is that the development forms a subservient addition, and it has a negligible impact on the setting of the adjacent listed building.
23. As there is no harm to the setting of the listed building, even when attaching great weight to the importance of the heritage asset, I find the details of the development to be acceptable and the scheme complies with the requirements of the Framework in this regard. I conclude that the proposal does not adversely affect the listed building and preserves its setting. Thus, with regard to Section 66(1) of the Listed Building Act, the proposal preserves the setting of Pyt House and the development complies with Policy ENV4 of the LP, which, amongst other things requires that development conserves or enhances the significance of heritage assets.

Other Matters

24. The boiler flue within the courtyard is not part of the proposal before me and this does not, therefore, form part of my considerations. I note the comments regarding the positioning of the site notice for the planning application, however, this does not change my findings above. The Council has noted the retrospective nature of the planning application and the relationship with previous planning applications and has not raised concern on these points. From the evidence available to me, I have no reason to reach a different view.

Conditions

25. The development has already been carried out. I do not consider it necessary to specify additional conditions.

Conclusion

26. The appeal scheme accords with the development plan and the Framework. As such, for the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J White

INSPECTOR