



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2022

by Philip Mileham BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3RD March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/X3540/D/21/3288836

The Barn Mill Lane, Alderton, Woodbridge, IP12 3DB

- 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 Graham Balding against the decision of East Suffolk Council.
 - The application Ref DC/21/3772/FUL, dated 9 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of timber double garage, timber garden shed and associated driveway & fencing alterations.
-

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 known as 'The Barn' is a detached two storey dwelling which is set back from The Street, Alderton. Alderton is located within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and there is no disagreement between the parties that due to the sites' location within the village, there would be no effect on the AONB from the proposed development.
4. The Barn has its curtilage located in front of the dwelling which is currently divided by an existing approximately 1.8 metres high close boarded fence. The area has a mix of dwelling types, and there are a number of dwellings further along The Street towards the centre of the village are located directly on the road frontage. However, The Barn, along with the adjacent property 'Mount Smywea' and its neighbour 'Manor Fields' are all set back from the road frontage.
5. The frontage of the appeal site, in combination with those of Mount Smywea and Manor Fields give this part of The Street a more open sense of character than the more historic dwellings located further along The Street. Although Mount Smywea has a limited frontage onto The Street, the open character of these three properties' frontages collectively makes a positive contribution to the character of the area. The proposed double garage would be sited along the side boundary of The Barn adjacent Mount Smywea. Due to the oblique angle of this boundary, the proposed garage would appear awkwardly positioned when viewed along with the host dwelling, jarring with the pattern of development in the area.

6. The location of the proposed garage building in the frontage of the property would project built development closer to The Street, and whilst nearby Manor Fields has a garage within its front curtilage, this runs perpendicular to The Street and is set further back on the plot. As such, the proposed garage would be sited significantly closer to the road than that of Manor Fields, eroding of the openness of the site. Although there are a number of buildings that are located closer to The Street than the proposal, these are predominantly older properties which provide a more intimate character and pattern of development.
7. The appellant has indicated that the existing boundary vegetation would screen the proposal limiting its impact. The overall height of the garage would be approximately 3.2 metres according to the appellants measurements, and as such, I do not consider the existing vegetation would adequately screen the visual impact of the proposed garage sufficiently to reduce its effect on the open character of this part of The Street.
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 conflict with Policy SCLP11.1 of the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan (2020) (SCLP) which states, amongst other things, that the overall scale and character should clearly demonstrate consideration of the component parts of the buildings and the development as a whole in relation to its surroundings.
9. The proposed development would also fail to accord with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which states that developments will 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