



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2024

By Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMi

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11.03.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/U2615/D/23/3332276

55 Station Road South, Belton, Great Yarmouth, NR31 9AA

- 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 Glen Parrott against the decision of Great Yarmouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 06/230574/HH, dated 17 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 20 October 2023.
 - The development proposed is removal of roof, replace with higher pitch and raise eaves to form accommodation within roof space. External insulation to main walls with render finish.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the removal of roof, replace with higher pitch and raise eaves to form accommodation within roof space. External insulation to main walls with render finish at 55 Station Road South, Belton, Great Yarmouth, NR31 9AA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 06/230574/HH, dated 17 July 2023, and the plans submitted with it, 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 materials used on the external surfaces of the development hereby approved shall be those that are specified on the application form.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are: i) the effect of the proposed increased roof height on the character of the existing dwelling and the street scene; ii) the effect of this proposal on the living conditions of the neighbouring dwelling at No.53 Station Road South.

Reasons

The effect of the proposed increased roof height on the character of the existing dwelling and the street scene

3. The appeal site is a detached house, probably dating from the early twentieth century, set close to the highway. It is now surrounded by much later built properties. It has a rather shallow pitched roof, as have a good number of the houses and bungalows in the vicinity. But there is also a considerable variety of roof types and steepness. For example, across the road from the appeal site is a public house with a roof of similar steepness and relative height to that

proposed. This building is mainly 2 storey, but part of the roof comes down in a catslide. The pub is of some age and the height of the eaves are rather low, so that the roof is quite a dominant feature of the building, but none the worse for that. A little way in the other direction there are also dwellings with quite tall roofs.

4. The neighbouring bungalow at No.53, mentioned in the second refusal reason, is to the south east and set well back in its plot. Its substantial double garage, with a high-pitched roof, is situated at the front, close to the highway. The appeal dwelling is rather conspicuous in the street, partly due to its shallow frontage, but also because it is on a bend to the east. From this easterly direction however, the appeal dwelling is less conspicuous than it might otherwise be because of the garage to No.53, close to the highway, with its high gable that faces down the road to the east, and is seen in front of No.55.
5. From the above observations, I consider that the issue comes down, more to the impact of the proposal of the appearance of the subject dwelling, rather than whether the roof would be of some unusual form, alien to the locality. In this regard, part of the description of the proposed development should be observed: the proposal includes raising the eaves. This can be clearly seen by comparing the drawings of the existing house with the drawings of the proposal. I refer to this as it has an impact on the relationship of the height of the front elevation and the height of the roof. I would also remark that the front roof plane obviously slopes back to the ridge, rather than, as seen on the drawing, in apparently the same plane as the façade below it.
6. The loss of 1 of the chimneys is perhaps unfortunate, and would be of some importance if the house were in a row of similar houses, all with chimneys book-ending the ridge. As it is, whilst the building is clearly of a certain age, and interesting to a degree because of that, it has no heritage status that would make this a significant element in the decision.
7. I take the view that the proposed roof would just be another variation on the variety that exists in the area, and the increased height of the first floor and roof would not have a harmful effect on the character of the existing dwelling, or on the street scene.

The effect of this proposal on the living conditions of the neighbouring dwelling at No.53 Station Road South

8. The front corner of the bungalow at No.53 Station Road South is about 6.4m to the southeast of the nearest corner of the appeal dwelling. Its front windows face directly onto the garage at the front of its curtilage, perhaps 10m away. I cannot see that the view from these windows would suffer to a material extent from the increased pitch, and therefore height, of the proposed roof. In the front garden of the bungalow, it would be necessary to gaze in an upward direction to be affected by the increased height of the neighbouring roof.
9. From within the private open space to the rear of the bungalow, the proposed roof would probably be barely be apparent. Furthermore, because this bungalow is situated to the south-east of the appeal dwelling, the increased height of the roof would have no material effect on daylight or sunlight, even in summer when the sun sets north of west.

10. In my judgement there would be no harmful effect from this proposal on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers at No.53 Station Road South, sufficient to warrant refusal.

Conclusions

11. For the reasons that I have set out above, I conclude that the increased height of the first floor and roof, as proposed, would not have a harmful effect on the character of the existing dwelling, or on the street scene. Nor, in my judgement, would there be a harmful effect from this proposal on the living conditions of the neighbours at No.53 Station Road South.
12. I therefore consider that the proposal accords with Policy H9 of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan Part 2 (2021), which I consider is the most important policy in considering the development proposed, since it would maintain or enhance the character and appearance of the building, street scene, its immediate surroundings and the wider townscape, and would not significantly affect adversely the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.
13. Therefore I will allow the appeal.

Conditions

14. The statutory condition that provides a time limit on the start of development must be imposed. The council has not suggested that any other condition is necessary in the event that the appeal is upheld. However, I consider that the external materials should be controlled in the interests of the appearance of the development. These materials are specified on the application form, and the condition can refer to that.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR