

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2017

by Nick Palmer BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 9 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J3530/D/16/3162439

17 Red House Walk, Levington, Ipswich IP10 0LY

- 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 & Mrs C Mayhew against the decision of Suffolk Coastal District Council.
 - The application Ref DC/16/2314/FUL, dated 1 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a carport.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is at the edge of the village of Levington and adjacent to open countryside. It is at one end of a mid-20th century housing development. The houses are arranged in a symmetrical layout around a green and extend at either end along Bridge Road for short distances. The houses at each end including the appeal property are sited forward of their neighbours. Adjacent to those houses at the outer edges of the development there are garages which extend further forward still.
 4. Although the houses on Red House Walk have a staggered arrangement the symmetry of the layout and the consistency of design provide formality. The front gardens contribute to a sense of spaciousness in combination with the central green. As such those gardens form a key part of the character. The appellants say that there is an extant permission for development forward of the house at N^o 3 but details of the development authorised by that permission are not before me. The appellants have also referred to small outbuildings within a front garden. However those outbuildings do not alter the overall character of Red House Walk.
 5. This development differs from the more informal pattern of development along Bridge Road. I saw on my visit that there are buildings such as garages that are forward of dwellings along that road. However for the reasons given the context of the appeal site differs from that of Bridge Road in general.
-

6. The proposed car port would be a dominant feature in the street scene because of its size, height and forward siting. It would be seen on entering the village and along Bridge Road. It would be intrusive in the context of the open front gardens and would detract from the symmetry of the Red House Walk development and its distinctive character.
7. The hedges and fences along the boundaries of the site and adjacent properties would provide some visual screening. Additional planting is proposed at the front of the site. However these features would not be sufficient to overcome the intrusive effect of the proposal.
8. The site is within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Although the Council's reasons for refusal note that the site is within the countryside as is defined in the development plan the appellants consider that the site is within the settlement boundary of the village. I acknowledge that the proposal would be seen in the context of the built area of the village and in this respect it would not be intrusive in relation to the open countryside or harmful to the landscape or scenic beauty. However this does not alter my overall conclusion that for the reasons given the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area.
9. I have taken into account the support expressed by neighbours and all other points raised including the avoidance of on-street parking but those matters do not alter my conclusion on the main issue. Policy DM21 of the Local Plan¹ requires that proposals relate well to the scale and character of their surroundings in terms of their siting, height, massing and form. Policy SP15 of the Local Plan requires the preservation and enhancement of attributes of distinctive historical and architectural value. The attributes of Red House Walk are distinctive and of value. The proposal would not accord with those policy requirements which are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework² in terms of responding to local character and history.
10. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Nick Palmer

INSPECTOR

¹ Suffolk Coastal District Local Plan Core Strategy & Development Management Policies (2013)

² NPPF paragraph 58