
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2022

by Philip Mileham BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/X3540/W/21/3281932

Willowcroft Chapel Road, Otley, IPSWICH, IP6 9NU

- 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 Steve Evans against the decision of East Suffolk Council.
 - The application Ref DC/21/2517/FUL, dated 24 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is Increase height of double garage by 900mm to accommodate a gym at first floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached double garage with a pitched roof which is located in the front curtilage of 'Willowcroft', a detached two storey dwelling. The area is predominantly characterised by two storey dwellings, a number of which have pitched roofs with front dormer windows.
4. The existing garage has a pitched roof with ridge and eaves heights that appear to be below the respective levels of those of the main dwelling. The appeal proposal would raise the height of the garage roof to a level where the ridge height would be significantly increased when viewed against the main dwelling. I consider that the proposed height of the garage roof ridge would increase the building's scale to a level that would reduce its visual subservience to Willowcroft when viewed from Chapel Road.
5. The existing dwelling has a steep pitched roof with limited distance between the top of the windows and the eaves, and the garage has a similarly short distance between the top of the garage door and its eaves reflecting the character of the main dwelling. The proposal would result in the garage having a significantly increased distance between the top of the garage doors and the eaves, which, when viewed in combination with the host dwelling would give the appearance of significantly added mass. The added mass of the proposal would jar with the proportions of the front elevation of Willowcroft, failing to respect the scale of the existing dwelling, harming its character.

6. The host dwelling along with a number of other dwellings in the area has front dormer windows within the roof plane. Although the proposed dormers in the garage roof plane would not be obtrusive or result in harm to the living conditions of adjoining neighbours, due to the close proximity of the garage and the dwelling, they would further erode the sense of subservience between the garage and Willowcroft.
7. The proposed development would increase the ridge height of the garage by 0.9 metres, and whilst the garage is currently partly screened by the front boundary hedging, the proposed development would project the overall height of the garage roof significantly above the level of the hedge boundary. The existing front hedge boundary would not screen the proposal due to its increased height and massing, and the lack of screening would result in the building having a significantly greater prominence in the street scene. I consider this additional prominence would be harmful to the overall character of the area.
8. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would not comply with Policy SCLP11.1 of the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan (2020) (SCLP) which states, amongst other things, that permission will be granted where proposals respond to local context including that the height and massing of developments should be well related to that of their surroundings.
9. The proposed development would also fail to accord with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which seeks to ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Mileham

INSPECTOR