



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 September 2020

by Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/X3540/D/20/3246271

6 Langdale Close, Felixstowe, Suffolk IP11 9SR

- 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 D Robertson against the decision of East Suffolk Council.
 - The application Ref: DC/19/4464/FUL, dated 14 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is a front extension (revised scheme).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. There are two parts to the Local Plan in East Suffolk: the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan and the Waveney Local Plan. The Suffolk Coastal Local Plan (2020) was adopted on 23 September 2020. The Council referred to policy DM21-Design: Aesthetics, of the East Suffolk Council-Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2013) in its decision notice. I am advised by the Council that policy DM21 has been replaced by Coastal Local Plan policy SCLP11.1: Design Quality. Both policies provide criteria to be taken into account in the layout and design of new development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the streetscene.

Reasons

4. The appeal building is a modern two storey semi-detached dwelling located in a residential area which comprises buildings of a similar age, form, and design. It is sited next to an area of green open space which allows views towards its front elevation and also views of its neighbouring dwellings. The other part of the semi-detached pair of dwellings, no.5 Langdale Close, has a modest single storey front projection. The proposed two-storey front extension at No.6 has been reduced in its width and ridge height compared to a previously refused scheme. It would also have a gabled roof rather than a hipped roof.
5. The layout of other dwellings in the area is varied with no clear building lines. The proposed extension would project forward from the front elevation of the building by around 3 metres and would be around 3.5 m in width. Other

dwellings in the residential area have front projections. Some are original single storey projections, whilst others have been extended over porches to provide two storey projections. However, the majority of front extensions do not project forward as far as that proposed at the appeal building.

6. The appellant has referred to exceptions to this general rule regarding the degree of projection of front extensions in the area. In particular, at No.9 Langdale Close, an integral garage has been incorporated into the living space and a first floor gabled extension added. The appellant advises that the width of that extension is significantly greater than that of the appeal proposal. However, I have no details of the planning history for the extensions referred to by the appellant. Unlike No.9, the appeal building has no integral garage. I consider that the existence of the extension at No.9 Langdale Close and the other examples provided by the appellant would be insufficient reason to justify allowing the appeal before me.
7. The proposed extension would appear overly large, prominent, and intrusive in relation to the host building and the streetscene because of its size, scale, and massing. The extension would not appear visually recessive and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area, contrary to Coastal Local Plan policy SCLP11.1. This policy aims to ensure locally distinctive and high quality design that clearly demonstrates an understanding of the key features of local character and seeks to enhance these features through innovative and creative means. The proposal would conflict with the Council's Supplementary Guidance for House Extensions (2003) which advises that extensions should respect the character and design of the original building. I also find that the proposal would, on balance, not constitute sustainable development as it would fail to meet the environmental objective of paragraph 8, and the aim of good design, of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

8. I have taken all other matters raised into account, including the lack of objection from neighbours and potential to improve the thermal efficiency of the building. However, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR