



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2022

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/X3540/D/21/3280092

7 Anchor Way, Carlton Colville, Lowestoft, Suffolk NR33 8GR

- 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 & Mrs Jack against the decision of the East Suffolk Council.
 - The application Ref DC/21/1817/FUL dated 09/04/2021, was refused by notice dated 08/06/2021.
 - The development proposed is described as two storey front extension plus enlargement of garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on (i) the character and appearance; and (ii) highway safety.

Reasons

Character & Appearance

3. The site is a detached residential property within a modern residential estate. The existing property is set forward from the adjacent property, No. 5 Anchor Way). Due to this relationship, along with the road layout and building orientation the existing property is prominent within the streetscene. The proposed two storey extension would add further mass to this prominent elevation.
4. The appellant has drawn my attention to other properties in the area set forward towards the highway. From my observations the appeal proposal is not comparable to those identified as it projects significantly forward on an already dominant built form.
5. The proposed single storey extension to the garage is inconspicuous and would not be a dominant addition to the property. Notwithstanding this I find that the proposed development would be incongruous to the streetscene and would harm the character and appearance of the area.
6. There is conflict with Policy WLP8.29 of the East Suffolk Council, Waveney Local Plan (2019) which amongst other things requires developments to be of a high

quality design taking into account relationships between buildings and the streetscene.

Highway Safety

7. There is disagreement between parties as to the length of driveway which would be retained as part of the appeal scheme. There is agreement that the remaining driveway would be less than the 6m required by the Suffolk Guidance for Parking, Technical Guidance (May 2019) (the Technical Guidance) relating to the development of garages with parking spaces in front.
8. The appellant contends that this does not account for roller shutter doors and that the driveway could be reduced in this situation. I note that the Technical Guidance at section 4.1.2 (1) does reference a reduction of 0.5m when a roller shutter door is installed on a garage. Whilst this relates to deterring inappropriate parking I see no reason why this reduction could not apply to the scenario before me.
9. I note from the appellant that the stone chipped area to the front of the property is proposed to be utilised for parking, thereby extending the width of the parking area. I have also been provided with photographs by the appellant which demonstrate that a car can be accommodated in front of the proposed garage extension, in line with the existing building.
10. Notwithstanding this I have not been provided with demonstrable evidence which confirms the exact extent of the proposed driveway and therefore I cannot be confident that adequate parking could be achieved.
11. I find that the proposed development would lead to vehicles overhanging the shared access drive which would be detrimental to the safety of other highway users which conflicts with the Technical Guidance.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR