



*St Edmundsbury*  
BOROUGH COUNCIL

**DEV/SE/16/16**

# **Development Control Committee**

## **4 February 2016**

### **Listed Building Application DC/15/2142/LB**

### **The Rabbit Hutch, Bull Lane, Pinford End, Hawstead**

**Date:** 19 November      **Expiry Date:** 14 January 2016  
**Registered:** 2015

**Case Officer:** Aaron Sands      **Recommendation:** Refuse

**Parish:** Hawstead      **Ward:** Chedburgh

**Proposal:** Application for Listed Building Consent - retention of replacement thatched covering to existing dormer window to rear of property

**Site:** The Rabbit Hutch, Bull Lane, Pinford End, Hawstead

**Applicant:** Mr and Mrs Barneveld

**Synopsis:**

Application under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Associated matters.

CONTACT CASE OFFICER:

Email: [aaron.sands@westsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:aaron.sands@westsuffolk.gov.uk)

Telephone: 01284 757355

## **Background:**

**This application is referred to the Committee following a meeting of the Delegation Panel. The application was put before the Panel at the request of the Ward Member and due to the comments received from the Parish Council being contrary to the Officers' recommendation to refuse.**

## **Proposal:**

1. Listed Building Consent is sought for the replacement of an eyebrow thatched roof form with a gable ended dormer to the rear of the thatched roof property.

## **Application Supporting Material:**

2. Information submitted with the application as follows:
  - Application Form
  - Heritage and Design and Access Statement
  - Location Plan (Drawing no. 3299.3)
  - Photographs

## **Site Details:**

3. The site comprises a 17<sup>th</sup> Century, Grade II Listed property. The dwelling is a detached 1½ storey building set back from the road with a thatched roof. The area is characterised by similar dwellings and a number of eyebrow dormers are visible on other buildings in the vicinity. The site is located in designated Countryside for planning purposes.

## **Planning History:**

4. E/96/2669/LB - Listed Building Application - (i) Removal and blocking-up of doorway and reconstruction of external wall panel to eastern elevation and (ii) internal alterations including insertion of new staircase and structural works . Granted 10/12/1996
5. SE/05/01781 - Listed Building Application - Removal of existing roof to single storey addition and replace with slate. Granted 08/07/2005
6. SE/08/1352 – Listed Building Application - Construction of 1no. dormer window to rear elevation. Granted 23/10/2008
7. SE/13/0996/HH - Planning Application - Erection of single storey rear extension (following partial demolition of internal & external walls). Granted 02/12/2013
8. SE/13/0997/LB - Listed Building Application - (i) Erection of single storey rear extension (following partial demolition of internal & external walls) & (ii) provision of new & replacement windows & doors to new extension. Granted 02/12/2013

9. NMA(A)/13/0996 - Non Material Amendment to SE13/0996/HH - (i) Remove lean-to roof over porch way - north elevation; (ii) reduce window - south elevation; (iii) retain existing windows and doors - south elevation and (iv) remove triple window from north elevation and use on south elevation. Granted 24/07/2015

10.DC/14/1196/LB - Listed Building Application - Erection of single storey rear extension (following partial demolition of internal & external walls) previously approved under SE/13/0997/LB. Granted 17/09/2014

### **Consultations:**

11.Conservation: Objection – *"its proportions make it visually dominant, detracting from the special interest of the building. It therefore fails to accord with the requirements of policy DM15 and paragraph 134 of the NPPF, with no public benefit to offset the harm caused"*

### **Representations:**

12.Parish Council: Support – detailed reasons for the recommendation given.

13.Ward Member (Councillor Angela Rushen): Called the application to the Delegation Panel.

14.Two objections received incorporating the following points:

- Out of proportion with the rear roof of the cottage and the size of the window
- Decrease in privacy to rear garden (*note: the window is an existing window that has not altered in position*)
- Not sympathetic to the style of the property next door

**Policy:** The following policies of the Joint Development Management Policies Document and the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy December 2010 have been taken into account in the consideration of this application:

15.Joint Development Management Policies Document:

- Policy DM2 (Design and Local Distinctiveness)
- Policy DM15 (Listed Buildings)
- Policy DM24 (Alteration and Extension to Dwellings, including Self Contained Annexes and Development within the Curtilage)

16.St Edmundsbury Core Strategy December 2010

- Policy CS3 (Design and Local Distinctiveness)

### **Other Planning Policy:**

17. National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

### **Officer Comment:**

18. The issues to be considered in the determination of the application are:

- Principle of Development
- Impact on Listed Building

#### Principle of Development

19. The proposal is a modest alteration to an existing residential property and in principle some form of alteration would be acceptable subject to tests of appropriate detailing, form and scale.

#### Impact on the Listed Building

20. Permission for a dormer window was granted in 2008 with an eyebrow roof form matching the existing dormers on the adjacent property of Bull Green Cottage. Subsequently, unauthorised, and therefore illegal, works have taken place in order to rectify a supposed leak caused by the form of the dormer and a gable end thatched form was installed. The gable end dormer appears bulky and disproportionate in relation to the modest host dwelling, detracting from its character as a designated heritage asset. The conservation officer has objected to the form of the window and suggests the eyebrow roof be reinstated once the applicant has taken advice on the best approach to prevent leaking from reoccurring.

21. The NPPF clearly indicates that, where proposals lead to less than significant harm to a heritage asset, they must be weighed against their public benefit. The proposal is not considered to be of sufficient public benefit to outweigh the adverse impacts to the character of the Listed Building due to its position located away from readily accessible public points of view and due to its nature as a part of a structure in private use.

### **Conclusion:**

22. In conclusion, the development is considered to be of an inappropriate form that amounts to harm to the Listed Building with no public benefit to outweigh this harm.

### **Recommendation:**

It is **RECOMMENDED** that planning permission be **Refused** for the following reason:

1. The dormer window is a bulky and disproportionate feature that detracts from the character of the Listed Building as a designated heritage asset of historic importance. Its thick thatched covering creates an uncomfortable relationship with a modest dwelling that is wholly discordant with the architectural features of both the host dwelling and the surrounding listed buildings. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM15 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document and paragraph 134 of the NPPF.

**Documents:**

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online;

<https://planning.westsuffolk.gov.uk/onlineapplications/simpleSearchResults.do?action=firstPage>