



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 September 2021

by K Winnard LL.B (Hons) Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 September 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/X3540/D/21/3274339

147 Stradbroke Road Lowestoft NR33 7HP

- 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 Mrs Samantha West against the decision of East Suffolk Council.
 - The application Ref DC/21/1165/FUL, dated 10 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as follows: An extension to the west side of the property, full height and to mirror the length of the original property with an open ground floor storage area allowing access to the back of the property. The original roof will be carried across the new proposed west extension finished with matching reclaimed roof tiles to keep the 1930s style of the house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading above is based on that used in the decision notice. For clarity I have used that in preference to the description on the original application form, which was longer and included wording related to the merits and purposes of the proposal rather than descriptive of the development.
3. The appellant refers to a 3D video image including reference to an alternative scheme whereby the width of the extension is reduced to 2200cm. There is no evidence that the 3D video image has been considered by the Council or that the proposal has been subject to any form of consultation. As such and given the lack of details and any amended plans showing this proposal, it would not be appropriate for me to consider this alternative option. I will base my decision on the information and plans which were assessed by the Council during the original planning application.
4. Reference has been made to inconsistencies and omissions in the layout and boundary plans submitted. However from the information before me it is clear that the appeal relates to the building as previously extended and I shall consider the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

- 5 The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

6. There is a variety in the style and design of properties along Stradbroke Road. Detached properties on the part of Stradbroke Road to the west of where the appeal property, No 147 Stradbroke Road (No 147) is located, are set in large generous plots. As a result, there is a general open aspect to this part of Stradbroke Road which adds to a spacious and generally verdant feel in this location. Whilst not a listed building or within a Conservation Area, No 147 itself is an attractive detached property with distinctive Art Deco features which makes a positive contribution to this part of Stradbroke Road. No 147 has been previously extended and this extension, which has a lower ridge height to the original dwelling and is set back from the original front wall, is well assimilated and is sympathetic to the design of the original building.
7. Whilst matching the height of the ridge line of the original dwelling, the proposed roof extension would introduce a bulky addition to the property. The lack of articulation in the form and continuation of the ridge line would appear disproportionate and dominant. By extending to the west of the original dwelling, the entire width of the plot of No 147 would be infilled. Because of the close proximity of the boundary fence, the proposed extension would result in a cramped appearance when viewed from this part of Stradbroke Road and in the context of the spacious immediate neighbouring gardens and access way to No 149 Stradbroke Road. From the information before me, it would appear that the eaves of the roof as proposed to be extended, would overhang the boundary fence. This would in itself create a discordant feature in the street scene and contribute to the cramped appearance of the side extension. As such the proposal would cause material harm to the character and appearance of No 147 and the streetscene.
8. I acknowledge that the appellant has sought to balance the appearance of the dwelling by matching the original ridge line, and would intend to use matching reclaimed roof tiles. However the effect of the roof design is such that it would add to the bulk of the property and would represent overdevelopment of the plot. As such it would be out of keeping with the underlying building pattern on this part of Stradbroke Road. The appellant has drawn my attention to other roof designs on Stradbroke Road. However these are of a different scale to the current proposal and relate to semi-detached properties. As such they are not directly comparable with the appeal proposal. Nor can I be certain of the circumstances in which these developments were accepted and as such give them limited weight. In any event each case must be determined on its own merits and the individual circumstances involved.
9. As such I therefore conclude that the side extension would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. It would be in conflict with Policy WLP8.29-Design of the East Suffolk Waverley Local Plan 2019 which specifies that development proposals should respond to local context and the form of surrounding buildings in relation to, amongst other matters, the overall scale, character, layout and site coverage.

Other Matters

10. I appreciate the wish of the appellant to create additional storage facilities. Whilst I have given the personal circumstances as set out, careful consideration I am mindful of the advice contained in Planning Practice Guidance that in general planning is concerned with land use in the public interest and that personal circumstances seldom outweigh such considerations.
11. It has also been raised that the construction and maintenance of the scheme as proposed would require access to land within the ownership of a third party. However this is a civil matter and not for me to consider as part of this appeal.

Conclusion

12. The proposed side extension would have a harmful effect on the host dwelling and the character and appearance of the area. There are no other considerations which would outweigh these findings or the conflict with the Development Plan. Accordingly I dismiss the appeal.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR