
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 March 2020 by Mariam Noorgat BSc (Hons)

Decision by Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/X3540/D/19/3242456

1 Holly Lane, Little Bealings IP13 6PW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Doman against the decision of East Suffolk Council.
 - The application Ref DC/19/3562/FUL dated 9 September 2019 was refused by notice dated 31 October 2019.
 - The development is described as proposed alterations and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for proposed alterations and side extension at 1 Holly Lane, Little Bealings IP13 6PW, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: DC/19/3562/FUL, dated 9 September 2019, and 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 following approved plans: Site Location Plan, 1937.01, 1937.02A and 1937.03.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr and Mrs Doman against East Suffolk Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Appeal Procedure

3. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property forms the left-hand half of a pair of two-storey semi-detached houses that are setback a considerable distance from Holly Lane. The semi-detached pair include differently designed side extensions (single storey at the appeal site and two storey at No.2) which do not provide a strong sense of balance or uniformity when viewed from the street scene. There are only a few other properties close to the appeal property which are visible from Holly Lane, all of which vary in style and scale. Overall, the different types of dwellings in Holly Lane informs the character and appearance of the area. However, most of the surrounding dwellings, and that at the appeal site, are set within large verdant plots which, with the open fields opposite, provides a strong sense of spaciousness.
6. Part of the extension would be flush with the front elevation of the main house and would have the same ridge height, which would be contrary to the advice in the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan, House Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance 16, (the SPG). However, the vast majority of the proposed development would be set back from the host dwelling, the ridge would be set down from the host ridge and the development would be set in from the southern boundary. This, combined with the considerable setback from Holly Lane and general retainment of the characteristic spacious garden, would amount to a development that would not appear dominant on its plot or, overall, insubordinate to the host dwelling when viewed in the street scene.
7. The Council state the development would undermine the relationship with the neighbouring dwelling at No.2. However, the different canopy structures above the main entrances of the semi-detached pair, the varied layout of the front gardens, the different plot layouts and the varied extensions, results in a pair of dwellings that do not have a strong relationship with one another. As such, the asymmetry resulting from the proposed development would not harmfully impact the relationship with No.2. Indeed, the proposed development would replace the existing disparate extensions with a development that would restore a greater degree of coherence to the building as a whole and would therefore enhance the street scene. Further, given the varied nature of dwellings close to the appeal site on Holly Lane, the proposal would not appear incongruous within this prominent countryside location.
8. Based on the reasoning above, the proposed development would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, no conflict is found with Policies SP15 and DM21 of the Suffolk Coastal District Local Plan, Core Strategy and Development Management Policies, Development Plan Document, July 2013, which seek to protect landscapes and ensure developments relate well to the scale and character of their surroundings, respectively. These aims are echoed by the SPG.

Conditions

9. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council and where necessary I have amended them in the interests of clarity.
10. In the interests of certainty, a condition is necessary to ensure the development is carried in accordance with the approved plans and within three years of the date of this decision. Furthermore, in the interests of the character

and appearance of the area, a condition is necessary to ensure matching materials are used.

11. It would be unreasonable to request a construction method statement considering the modest scale of the development, the fact that the site is on a very quiet road, and the limited number of neighbouring dwellings.

Recommendation and Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend the appeal is allowed.

Mariam Noorgat

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR