

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 June 2020

**by S Tudhope LLB (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 8 June 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/X3540/D/20/3244688**

**Pipits Hill, Martlesham Road, Little Bealings, Ipswich, Suffolk IP13 6LX**

- 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 Gavin Pooley against the decision of East Suffolk Council.
  - The application Ref DC/19/3602/FUL, dated 12 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 November 2019.
  - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension & reconfiguration of adjoining areas to existing dwelling.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side extension & reconfiguration of adjoining areas to existing dwelling at Pipits Hill, Martlesham Road, Little Bealings, Ipswich, Suffolk IP13 6LX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/19/3602/FUL, dated 12 September 2019, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Block Plan and Site Location Plan Drawing No 19-03-10 Rev A; Floor Plans and Elevations as Existing Drawing No 19-03-01; Elevations as Proposed Drawing No 19-03-04 Rev C; Ground Floor Plan as Proposed Drawing No 19-03-02 Rev B; and First Floor Plan and Section as Proposed Drawing No 19-03-03 Rev C.
  - 3) 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.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property, Pipets Hill.

### Reasons

3. The appeal property is a previously extended detached dwelling, with first floor dormers within its front roof slope. It is situated within a substantial sized plot. There are single storey flat roof extensions to the dwelling's eastern side and two storey pitched roof extensions to the rear and to the western elevation. The property is well screened from the road and neighbouring properties by

mature trees, hedges and other vegetation. A public right of way (PRoW) dissects the eastern part of the site running north west to the countryside beyond.

4. The appeal scheme seeks to widen part of the single storey side projection and to create a first-floor level above; incorporating a balcony area at the rear and a new roof layout. No concerns have been raised in relation to impacts on living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties or on the enjoyment of users of the PRoW. I have no reason to disagree in respect of these matters.
5. Policy DM21 of the Suffolk Coastal District Local Plan, Core Strategy & Development Management Policies Development Plan Document 2013 (LP) requires, amongst other matters, that "...alterations and extensions to existing buildings should normally respect the plan form, period, style, architectural characteristics and ... the type and standard of detailing and finishes of the original building". It further requires that "in order for extensions to existing buildings to be acceptable ... the extension shall be visually 'recessive' and its size and design shall be such that the original building will remain the more dominant feature on the site".
6. Whilst the proposed alterations would substantially alter the appearance of the appeal building, the dominance of the original dwelling has already been compromised by the previous alterations. The property, whilst once modest in scale, presents as a large dwelling with the addition of uncharacteristic flat roof side extensions. The proposed forward-facing gable would deviate from the original form and style of the dwelling, however, in the context of the dwelling as extended, I do not consider that this would look out of place. In addition, the Council does not consider that the original building is of any particular architectural merit, historic importance nor is it located in a sensitive location, such as to necessitate particular protection of its original form.
7. In any case, despite the scale, form and position of the proposed development, because of its slight step down in ridge height and the existing stepped forward break in the building line, it would still be possible to read the original design of the building, albeit that it would not be dominant.
8. There is some conflict with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance 16; (House Alterations and Extensions) 2003 (SPG) advice relating to side extensions. However, whilst the guidance recommends usually seeking to set back side extensions, this is referred to in the context of maintaining gaps between buildings and where necessary, to preserve the character of the street scene. Neither of these matters are considerations here. In this case, the existing single storey side extension already sits forward of the original front elevation and the proposed development would maintain this line. The resulting pitched roof form of the proposal would also comply with the design of roof that is preferred by the SPG.
9. Consequently, in view of the existing flat roof extensions at the property which would be subsumed by the proposed development, combined with the size of the appeal site, which is capable of comfortably accommodating the scale of the proposed development, I consider that the appeal scheme would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property.

10. I conclude that whilst the appeal proposal would not be in strict accordance with the guidance set out in the SPG, it would comply with the overall design aims of LP Policy DM21.

**Conditions**

11. The Council has suggested a list of three conditions. I find that they meet the tests set out in the Planning Practice Guidance.
12. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, this is in the interest of certainty. A condition to require matching materials is necessary to ensure the development is in keeping with the existing property.

**Conclusion**

13. For the reasons given above the appeal is allowed.

*S Tudhope*

Inspector