



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 25 February 2026

by N Praine BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 April 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/W3520/W/25/3370623

47-49 Church Street, Eye, Suffolk IP23 7BD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by J Parker against the decision of Mid Suffolk District Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/25/01417.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of a single storey rear extension to form new conservatory.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/W3520/Y/25/3370105

47-49 Church Street, Eye, Suffolk IP23 7BD

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by J Parker against the decision of Mid Suffolk District Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/25/01418.
 - The works proposed are described as the erection of a single storey rear extension to form new conservatory.
-

Decisions

1. Both appeals are dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. There are two appeals on this site. They relate to the planning application and listed building consent for the same scheme. To avoid duplication, I have dealt with them together, except where otherwise indicated.
3. As the proposal relates to a listed building in a conservation area, I have had special regard to sections 16, 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) ("the Act").
4. During the appeal, a draft version of the National Planning Policy Framework was published for consultation. Having regard to the matters in dispute between the parties and the draft status of the document with the possibility of change following consultation, I attach limited weight to it. I am therefore satisfied that the interests of the parties would not be prejudiced by proceeding to determine the appeal without inviting further comments.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on designated heritage assets.

Reasons

Designated heritage assets

6. The appeal property is part of a listed building (list entry name, Victoria Buildings, Ref.1316615) which is described as a range of three, early eighteenth-century houses, constructed in timber frame which is rendered and colourwashed with a slate roof. The list entry continues to describe the form of the building and the arrangement of openings and architectural features to the front elevation. The listed building is attached to other terraced properties to the northwest, and the appeal property is at the end of the terrace with a hipped roof.
7. For the purposes of this appeal from the details available to me, including the list description, and my own observation, I consider that the special interest and significance of the listed building, insofar as it relates to these appeals, is predominantly derived from its age, form, historic fabric and detailing. Key attributes are the simple vernacular form, the uncluttered facades, consistency of materials and the uninterrupted roof slopes. These key attributes extend to the rear elevation which can be seen from the garden and adjoining land. This is the environment in which the listed building can be experienced and appreciated.
8. The Eye Conservation Area (“the CA”) centres on the historic core of the settlement with its Castle, Church, and Guildhall buildings very much at the heart of a medieval town and key focal points, as well as the tightly grouped historic properties and plot boundaries lining its roads and pathways. The appeal property is prominently situated within the CA and based on my observations, I consider the character and appearance of the CA, and its significance, is mainly drawn from the range of built development within it, and the relationship of the buildings to each other and the spaces around them. The appeal property makes a positive contribution to the area’s character and appearance and can be seen primarily from Church Street.

Effect of the proposal

9. It is proposed to erect a single-storey rear extension. The drawings¹ indicate that the rear extension would be in a traditional lean-to form, finished in featheredge weatherboarding, with double glazed metal doors and windows under a natural slate roof. The roof would also incorporate four glazed rooflights. The proposed extension would be deeper and taller than the existing rear projection.
10. Doors and windows are a key feature of a historic building, and they make an important contribution to its character. The drawings show the proposed windows and doors would be metal double-glazed units. However, there is limited detail before me to confirm the profile and structural elements of these to ensure they would sit harmoniously with the doors and fenestration of the existing building.
11. The introduction of weatherboarding and rooflights of the height and width shown introduce new features to the existing building. In this case sufficient detail would be required to show how these proposed works would respond to the existing roofline and character of the listed building. Similar to that set out in the preceding

¹ Drawing Ref: AT/103/11 rev A.

paragraph, limited details have been provided in respect of the rooflights and materials.

12. I note the extension itself would broadly respect the traditional proportions of a lean-to, however, I am concerned about how it would assimilate alongside the property boundary and the window of the existing lean-to. Without appropriate detail this could appear awkward and wedged into position.
13. While the works are to the rear, the listed building's special interest and significance is not limited to its front elevations or to public viewpoints. In this case more detail is required before planning permission can be granted; for example, 1:10 scale drawings of doors, rooflights and windows, eaves, and verges; amongst other things, are essential to understanding the impact of the proposed works upon the special interest and significance of the listed building. In the absence of this detail, I cannot be satisfied that the extension overall would not preserve or enhance the special interest and significance of the listed building.
14. I have considered the imposition of a condition, or conditions, to agree these details. However, given their understanding is fundamental to the listed building's character and historic significance, these features should not be left to be submitted by condition. There must be certainty as to the effect of the proposal at the time of formally deciding a planning application.
15. The Appellant suggests that the rooflights would be required to ensure the existing rooms behind the extension would have suitable natural light. However, I note the proposed extension would have considerable glazing within the walls of two of its three elevations, and the lighting gain from these in combination with existing windows has not been adequately explained in evidence. This therefore has limited bearing on my findings on this main issue.
16. The slate sections and rooflights of the proposed roof would sit under an existing first floor window. While the proposed lead flashing would sit moderately above the existing first floor windowsill, I am satisfied that this would not create a lightwell.
17. Tying these considerations together, listed buildings are an irreplaceable resource which should be conserved so they can be enjoyed by existing and future generations. From the submitted evidence and what I have seen on site, I am not assured that the proposed structure would preserve and enhance the listed building's special interest and significance, including the simplicity of its form, the uniformity of materials and its details.
18. Given the scale of the works and their location any impact on the wider character, appearance, or significance of the CA would, however, be acceptable.

Heritage balance

19. Paragraph 212 of the Framework advises that, when considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 213 goes on to say that significance can be harmed or lost through the alteration or destruction of those assets and that any such harm should have a clear and convincing justification.
20. Given the scope of the works, the harm I have identified in this instance would be less than substantial and at the lower point of this category. Nevertheless, this is of considerable importance and weight. Where a proposal would lead to less than

substantial harm to the significance of designated heritage assets, paragraph 215 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimal viable use.

21. I acknowledge the Appellant would like to extend and improve their property; however, this would broadly be a private benefit. I have also been given no evidence to show that the continued viable use of the appeal property would be dependent on this proposal or that it would cease in its absence. Therefore, and in conclusion, public benefits either alone or in combination have not been shown to outweigh the great weight attached to the less than substantial harm identified.
22. Although I have found no harm to the character, appearance or significance of the CA, I have found that the appeal proposal would harm the special interest and significance of the listed building. This would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act, the Framework, and the relevant provisions of Policy LP19 of the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan (2023). These, amongst other things, look to safeguard the historic environment.

Other Matters

23. The Council's Officer Report identifies Hillside (list entry number 1316614) and The Cottage White House (list entry number 1316616) as listed buildings. Hillside is opposite the appeal site, and the list entry describes it as an eighteenth-century red brick house under a slate roof. The Cottage White House sits near to the appeal site to the east and the list entry describes it as an early sixteenth century building forming two houses, remodelled in the early eighteenth century. It is a timber framed building of render and whitewashed brick with plaintile and slate roofs.
24. Based on the information before me and what I saw on site, I find that the special interest and significance of both Hillside and The Cottage White House, insofar as these appeals are concerned, mainly stem from their architectural detailing, age, and historic fabric. Having considered the scale, separation and intervening screening of the proposed works, I conclude that there would be no harmful effect on the significance of these other listed buildings.
25. Whilst both parties mention the accuracy of the internal floorplans at the appeal property, this is not a matter before me. I have limited my consideration to the description of the development/works and have not considered this matter.

Conclusion

26. In respect to the above and considering all other matters raised, the appeals should be dismissed.

N Praine

INSPECTOR