
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2019

by R Sabu BA(Hons) MA BArch PgDip ARB RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W3520/D/19/3232513

3 Haughley Road, Harleston, Suffolk IP14 6HZ

- 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 Martin Hookham against the decision of Mid Suffolk District Council.
 - The application Ref DC/19/01587, dated 29 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as, '3 meter double extension from the garden room at the rear of the property & a side elevation above the garage'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is one of a group of detached two storey dwellings along Haughley Road that are that generally characterised by steep roof pitches which extend down to the first-floor level and gable ends fronting the road such that these properties have a distinct character that give the area an attractive and spacious feel.
4. The proposal would include a two-storey side and rear extension that would substantially alter the distinctive roof. It would introduce an additional roof element with a similar ridge height to the existing but set at a right angle such that the side extension would appear prominent compared to the existing dwelling and the other properties in the group particularly when viewed from the street. The proposal would introduce a substantial two storey element in a position where there is currently a single storey flat roof garage. It would therefore significantly reduce the openness between the host dwelling and the adjacent property. Given the distinct roof forms of the nearby properties and the height and position of the proposed extension, the proposal would be prominent in the street scene and would adversely affect the distinctive spacious character of the area.
5. While the proposed roof lights would be an unusual feature in the area, given their modest size they would not in isolation have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area. However, given the substantial size,

height and position of the proposed extension, the lack of harm in this respect would not override the detrimental effect that the proposal as a whole would have on the character and appearance of the area.

6. While I note that other properties on the street including No 10 Haughley Road have had extensions, from the evidence before me and my observations during the site visit, these have generally not substantially altered the host buildings and are in keeping with the distinct character of the area. Therefore, they do not form a direct comparison to the proposal and in any event each case must be determined on its individual merits.
7. Consequently, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would conflict with Policy H18 of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan Adopted September 1998 which among other things seeks development that would not detrimentally affect the character and appearance of the area. It would also conflict with paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework in this regard.

Other Matters

8. I note the comments regarding the Juliet balcony and privacy as well as light. The Council has not objected to the proposal on this basis and from the evidence before me I have no reason to disagree. However, the lack of harm in this respect does not override the harm to character and appearance identified above.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

R Sabu

INSPECTOR