
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2020

by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/X3540/D/20/3260235
Corinthians, Ferry Road, Orford IP22 2NR

- 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 and Mrs J Broome against the decision of East Suffolk Council.
 - The application Ref DC/20/2675/FUL, dated 16 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 September 2020
 - The development proposed is a single storey extension to existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey extension to existing dwelling at Corinthians, Ferry Road, Orford IP22 2NR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/20/2675/FUL, dated 16 July 2020, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with approved plans PW975_PL100 and PW975_PL101.

Procedural Matter

2. Between the determination of the planning application and my consideration of this appeal, the Council have adopted the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan (LP), in September 2020. The policies of the LP superseded those under which the Council considered the appeal scheme. Specifically of the Suffolk Coastal District Local Plan Core Strategy and Development Management Development Plan Document 2013. The Council have advised as to the relevant new policies and the appellant has made comment. I have determined the appeal with regard to the adopted development plan.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal building is a detached dwelling set back from and broadside onto the road. The appeal scheme proposes a single storey extension projecting from the road facing elevation. It would have a curved roof.

5. Being on the road facing elevation, the extension would be prominent, and the use of a curved roof is arguably uncharacteristic of the building or indeed the wider street scene which has mainly pitched roofs in the shape of hips and gables. That said, the front elevation is partially obscured by a mature hedge which would accordingly reduce the obviousness of the extension's location. The existing dwelling is something of a unique feature in the street, employing a mixture of wall shapes, projections, heights and external materials. I do not feel therefore that this somewhat unorthodox approach to roof form would necessarily appear out of place. Taking into account also my earlier comments. In addition, the extension would be single storey and contextually small in its land take, thus appearing as an obviously subordinate addition that would not dominate the host building.
6. The Council have expressed concerns about the impact of the proposed extension on the longevity of the hedge in that it may lead to pressure to remove it or it will be affected directly by construction works. Ultimately, this would make the extension more prominent. There is a possibility this could happen but at this stage it is conjecture at best. In any case, it strikes me that should the hedge have to be removed some other suitable boundary treatment would be put in its place. In the event it was to be removed and not replaced, as I have said above, I feel the design and scale of the extension to be acceptable on its own merits.
7. With the above in mind, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area and thus it would be in accordance with LP Policy SCLP11.1 which seeks to ensure, amongst other things, that new development is of a high quality design that responds to local context.

Conditions

8. I have imposed conditions pertaining to the timescale for the commencement of development and the plans to which the planning permission relates in the interests of clarity and enforceability respectively. The approved plans also show the proposed materials and external finishes to which neither the Council nor I object. As such, a separate condition would be unnecessary.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons and subject to the conditions set out above, the appeal is allowed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR