The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 March 2017

by D J Board BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 11 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J3530/W/16/3164244
Tanglewood, Elham Drive, Foxhall, IP10 0DG

- 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 Arlberg Services Ltd against the decision of Suffolk Coastal District Council.
- The application Ref DC/16/3471/FUL, dated 17 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 October 2016.
- The development proposed is demolition of existing bungalow (Tanglewood) and construction of three new detached 4/5 bedroom dwellings.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

3. Development Management Policy (DMP) DM3 allows housing in the countryside where it comprises '…minor infilling within clusters of dwellings well related to existing sustainable settlements …'. DMP DM7 and DM21 are cited in the Councils decision as being supportive of additional development where there is not harm to the character and appearance of the area. The Council acknowledge that there is a cluster of dwellings on Felixstowe Road and Elmham Drive and that the location is not unsustainable.

4. Tanglewood is located on the corner of Elmham Drive and Felixstowe Road. There are dwellings along the Felixstowe Road frontage and also behind along Elmham Drive. Beyond the site to the east frontage dwellings continue on the opposite side of the road. There are also a number of commercial premises within the immediate locality and I appreciate that there are some detached outbuildings within the street scene. As such the overall character is varied and this is shown on the appellant's context plan. Further, the appellants submit that the townscape quality of the area is limited. However, within this the residential properties are primarily detached and set within substantial plots with rear gardens areas. Generally the dwellings are set back from the road frontage with space around them. By contrast the introduction of three dwellings on the site would reduce the plot sizes, space around the new dwellings and in the case of plot 1 would result in a mainly side rather than rear garden area. This can also be seen on the appellant's context plan.

5. I understand that planning permission was granted on the site in October 2015[1] for the erection of a new dwelling and garage in front of the existing dwelling. The footprint of this scheme is provided within the submitted plans. This approved dwelling would come forward of the front of the adjacent property. The appeal scheme would have a footprint that would include further built form in the area forward of the adjacent dwelling which the appellant submits would be about 3m deep, 5m wide, with an area of about 15.9sqm over two stories. However, even if the projection itself would not be substantially greater than the approved scheme it would represent additional built form on a smaller plot area. Overall, the addition of a third dwelling to the development of the site would significantly reduce the space available around the individual dwellings.

6. I note that the submitted plans demonstrate that the scale of the dwelling on plot 1 would not be substantially greater than the approved scheme. Furthermore, the retention of existing trees and landscaping would serve to lessen views of the buildings. Nevertheless, the provision of three dwellings on the site would, through further subdivision and reduction in overall plot size, have a harmful effect on the spacious character and appearance of the area.

7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would be in conflict with DMP policies DM7 and DM21 which seek to resist cramped forms of development out of character with the area.

Other matters

8. I appreciate that the scheme would make an efficient use of land in an area on the Ipswich fringe where there would be access to nearby services. However, this does not alter or outweigh the harm identified to character and appearance.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

D J Board

INSPECTOR

[1] LPA Ref DC/15/3039