
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2017

by Claire Victory BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 1st August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J3530/D/17/3175777

Stable Studio, Ufford Place, Ufford, Suffolk IP13 6DP

- 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 Ms Z Tibbenham against the decision of Suffolk Coastal District Council.
 - The application Ref DC/16/4949/FUL, dated 23 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is creation of a 60 square metre two storey side extension to provide additional living and sleeping accommodation including internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for creation of a 60 square metre two storey side extension to provide additional living and sleeping accommodation including internal alterations at Stable Studio, Ufford Place, Ufford, Suffolk IP13 6DP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/16/4949/FUL, dated 23 November 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Existing Plans and Elevations incorporating Site Location Plan – Drawing A01/01; Block Plan and Context Images – Drawing A02/06A; Proposed Scheme – Drawing A02/04B.

Procedural Matter

2. The minutes to the Planning Committee held on 22 February 2017 state that in response to a question it was confirmed that the Coach House was not listed but was in a conservation area. However, the Committee Report at paragraph 1.3 confirms that the site is outside of the Ufford Conservation Area.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in the appeal are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area; and

- The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of the Coach House with regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Stable Studio is a 19th century outbuilding with brick elevations and a hipped slate roof, and a more recent flat roof front dormer. The stable building was subject to alterations and extensions in the past and now forms two dwellings, Stable Studio, and Coach House, which is situated to the rear of the appeal property.
5. The two storey extension would have brick elevations to the ground floor to match the existing building, and fibre cement cladding to the first floor. About two thirds of the extension would have a flat roof, but the nearest section to the host dwelling would have a sloping glass roof, and the first floor would not extend the full length of the extension. This would break up the proposed mass. Moreover, whilst the flat roof would give the extension a contemporary appearance, the host property has already been subject to some alteration with a small flat roof front dormer, and the flat roof element would be both modest in size and well below the height of the main roof ridge. Consequently it would not dominate the appearance of the host property and would be appropriate in terms of scale and form.
6. The stable building was associated with a Victorian mansion which has been demolished and the grounds redeveloped to form a low density housing estate, Ufford Place. Properties in the surrounding area are predominantly single storey detached houses set within relatively large plots. Stable Studio and Coach House have smaller plots in comparison and do not reflect the prevailing pattern of development in the area, as they were converted from an existing property rather than new build. Nearby dwellings also vary considerably in design and materials, including other flat roof extensions. For the reasons I have set out above, the proposed two storey extension would not be out of proportion with the host property or incongruous with its surroundings.
7. I therefore conclude that the development would not harm the character or appearance of the host property or surrounding area, and would accord with Policy DM21, which expects development to create comfortable places to live, and to be sympathetic in scale, siting, height, massing and form with its surroundings.

Effect on living conditions

8. The front entrance to Coach House, a single storey dwelling, lies to the rear of Stable Studio. It has a utility room to the east of the front door which extends northwards for several metres, and the existing single storey brick wall of Stable Studio is to the west, with a 1.8m close boarded timber fence along the common boundary. As a consequence, the entrance to Coach House has a somewhat secluded character.
9. As I observed at the site visit, the window in the utility room affords some oblique views over the aforementioned fence towards mature trees along the boundary with Tallboys, the property to the north. This view would be altered if the two storey extension were allowed, with some loss of outlook towards the trees, but due to the position of the glazed section of roof, the view would not

be significantly reduced or oppressive and would remain open to views of the sky. Moreover, this room is not the main kitchen for the property and the main living areas have a south facing outlook onto a private amenity space. Accordingly, the extension would not result in an unacceptable loss of outlook for its occupiers.

10. I conclude that the development would not cause material harm to the adjacent occupiers of Coach House in relation to outlook. Thus it would accord with LP Policy DM22, which requires consideration of the impacts of development on residential amenity, and LP Policy DM23, which requires development not to cause unacceptable loss of amenity.

Conclusion

11. I have found that the development would be acceptable subject to certain conditions. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I shall require the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty, and for the external materials to be used in the development to match that of the existing building, to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.
12. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Claire Victory

INSPECTOR